

Attachment E

**Summary of Matters Raised in Submissions
– 1-3 Burrows Road, St Peters – Post
Exhibition**

Summary of submissions – 1-3 Burrows Road, St Peters

Submission	Issue	Response
Goodman (the proponent)	<p>Restrictions on business and building identification signage.</p> <p>Objects to restrictions proposed on business and building identification signage for the site's St Peters Interchange frontage. Argues signage contributes to wayfinding, business identification, placemaking and activating the city skyline.</p>	<p>Signage will add to the visual impact of the building.</p> <p>The site's only approach will be facing Burrows Road and Canal Road, so the visual impact of signage can be balanced against the benefit to wayfinding and business identification.</p> <p>The St Peters Interchange will be used by recreational users of public open space, and long distance drivers bypassing the site. Any signage on this frontage will only add to the visual impact of the building in the service of advertising, without any positive contribution to wayfinding and business identification.</p> <p>Placemaking and building identification can be achieved without signage through architecture, design features and public art.</p> <p>As such, the LEP and DCP provisions restricting business and building identification to the Burrows Road and Canal Road frontages have been maintained.</p>
	<p>Green roof requirements</p> <p>Objects to the minimum requirement for green roofs to have a minimum 15 per cent coverage of the entire roof area.</p> <p>Argues the warehouse roof component will not have the structural integrity necessary to support a green roof.</p> <p>Proposes a green roof for the ancillary office component.</p>	<p>It is more appropriate for design considerations of green roof coverage to be considered by the consent authority at development assessment stage. At this stage there will be more information available about materials and structural support, and trade-offs with competing roof uses can be more fully assessed with reference to a detailed development application.</p> <p>The minimum coverage requirement has been removed in the draft DCP, and replaced with a general requirement for a green</p>

Submission	Issue	Response
	<p data-bbox="352 322 730 353">Design excellence strategy</p> <p data-bbox="352 376 938 719">Raises concerns about the language in the design excellence strategy contained in the draft DCP. The strategy includes language about undergoing a competitive design process, while section 6.21 of Sydney LEP 2012 does not always require a competitive design process be undertaken. For example, if the capital investment value or height triggers are not met, or if the consent authority agrees to waive the requirement.</p> <p data-bbox="352 741 938 869">Requests the design excellence strategy be amended to make clear a competitive design process is not required if it is not required by the LEP.</p>	<p data-bbox="962 219 1305 286">roof to be installed without reference to size.</p> <p data-bbox="962 322 1422 495">The design excellence strategy is included in the draft DCP to guide any future competitive design process required by Clause 6.21 of the LEP.</p> <p data-bbox="962 517 1430 719">No DCP provision can override the LEP. If a competitive design process is not required or waived by the consent authority, the design excellence strategy has no capacity to require one.</p> <p data-bbox="962 741 1342 831">The wording of the design excellence strategy has been amended to clarify this.</p>
NSW Environment Protection Authority	<p data-bbox="352 909 863 976">Air pollution impacts from M8 tunnel ventilation outlets</p> <p data-bbox="352 999 938 1160">Notes the Westconnex New M5 Project (now known as the M8) did not include assessment of air pollution impacts from ventilation outlets to buildings of 30 metres or taller in the vicinity.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1182 927 1317">Recommend an air impact assessment be undertaken to ensure users of the building are not exposed to pollution, especially PM2.5 particles, from the ventilation outlets.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1339 826 1406">Confirmed they have no outstanding objection to the planning proposal.</p>	<p data-bbox="962 909 1385 1043">The proponent has committed to undertaking an air impact assessment at development application stage.</p> <p data-bbox="962 1066 1430 1402">The site-specific LEP has been amended to include a clause requiring consideration of human health impacts from the M8 ventilation facility. This will ensure if a development application causes concerns about exposure an air impact assessment will be undertaken and mitigation measures put in place.</p>
Transport for NSW	<p data-bbox="352 1491 746 1523">New drainage infrastructure</p> <p data-bbox="352 1545 916 1641">Recommends that a new flood model be prepared to consider the recently approved Sydney Gateway project.</p> <p data-bbox="352 1675 724 1706">Traffic impact assessment</p> <p data-bbox="352 1729 927 1825">Suggests higher trip generation rates for the ancillary office space should have been used in the traffic and transport study.</p>	<p data-bbox="962 1491 1410 1626">Proponent has confirmed the stormwater context for the site is unchanged, as the site is currently mostly impervious surfaces.</p> <p data-bbox="962 1675 1374 1771">The trip generation rates of the predominant industrial uses are correct.</p> <p data-bbox="962 1794 1426 2033">A future development application will include a more final and detailed breakdown of land uses by floor area, and the consent authority can work with the proponent at that time to establish appropriate trip generation rates.</p>

Submission	Issue	Response
		A future DA is very likely to require referral to TfNSW under clause 104 of SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 for traffic-generating developments, where trip generation rates can be agreed upon and any implication assessed.
	<p>Sizes of vehicles accessing the site</p> <p>Recommend a traffic impact assessment undertaken at development application stage include consideration for the size of vehicles using the site, including demonstrating sufficient manoeuvrability for all heavy vehicles anticipated to use the site.</p>	A consideration for development application stage. Has been provided to the proponent for consideration in preparation of a development application.
	<p>Construction traffic management plan</p> <p>Note a detailed construction traffic management plan will be required following approval of a development application.</p>	The City will require a construction traffic management plan as part of the conditions of consent for any future development application.
	<p>Ancillary use</p> <p>Advise the City to consider the Planning Circular on 'How to characterise development' in development assessment to determine whether the proposed office component is ancillary or otherwise.</p>	<p>The City is aware that any office space as part of future development will need to be ancillary and subordinate to industrial uses, in line with the IN1 General Industrial zoning of the site. The City has advised Goodman a future development application will need to justify any office space and demonstrate that it is ancillary to the industrial uses.</p> <p>The City will use the Planning Circular to assist in classifying the office component.</p>
Heritage NSW	<p>Heritage impact assessment</p> <p>Notes the City's heritage specialists have recommended a heritage impact assessment will be required as part of any future development application, and supports the recommendation.</p>	A heritage impact assessment can be required under existing LEP clauses at development application stage. The statement will assess the impact of development on nearby Alexandra Canal, including key views from Ricketty Street Bridge.
	<p>Alexandra Canal is a state heritage item</p> <p>Highlights the planning proposal did not identify Alexandra Canal as a state heritage item.</p>	The statement of significance for Alexandra Canal in its state heritage listing, including key views from Ricketty Street Bridge, were part of the assessment of this planning proposal request. Renders were requested from the proponent

Submission	Issue	Response
		<p>to illustrate views of the proposed built form from Ricketty Street Bridge to aid in this assessment.</p> <p>The planning proposal did identify Alexandra Canal as a local heritage item, but omitted reference to its state heritage listing. This has been corrected in the post-exhibition version.</p>
	<p>Nearby local heritage items</p> <p>Notes the subject site is nearby two listings for local heritage items, being the Terrace Group at Campbell Road and the recently demolished Rudders Bond Store. Suggests Council should be satisfied that heritage assessment of impacts to these local heritage items is undertaken prior to finalising the planning proposal.</p>	<p>The City has undertaken a heritage assessment as part of assessment of the planning proposal, including consideration of impacts to Alexandra Canal and the Campbell Road terrace group. This assessment has also noted the demolition of the Rudders Bond Store as part of construction of the St Peters Interchange.</p>
<p>Sydney Water</p>	<p>Additional servicing needs</p> <p>Notes the current development on the site is not serviced by a gravity fed waste water system, instead relying on a pump to sewer arrangement which is not condoned by the authority.</p> <p>Requires any future development on the site to apply to Sydney Water to confirm potable water supply, wastewater servicing and trade wastewater discharging arrangements.</p>	<p>This information is not relevant for the planning proposal. It will be provided to the proponent for their development plans.</p>