Attachment A

Summary of and Responses to Matters Raised in Submissions

Summary of and responses to matters raised in submissions

Agency submissions	
Summary of submission	**Response to submission**
Land and Housing Corporation <u>The requirement for site specific DCP/Concept DA</u> LAHC is seeking recognition that a future site specific DCP or Concept DA will not be required and that clause 7.20 will not apply to the site due to the already detailed nature of the proposed controls.	This request is considered well founded. The Design Guide prepared by the City addresses the matters for consideration outlined in clause 7.20 of Sydney LEP 2012. The Design Guide contains development controls consistent with what would be included in a site-specific DCP. **Recommended action: The Planning Proposal be amended to include an exemption to clause 7.20 of Sydney LEP 2012 and the requirement to prepare a DCP where the consent authority considers that the development is consistent with the Design Guide.**
Land and Housing Corporation <u>Design Guide amendments</u> LAHC has prepared an updated version of the proposed Design Guideline to accommodate the exhibited reference scheme.	The majority of LAHC's suggested changes to the draft Design Guide have been accommodated. They are considered minor changes that reflect design development and do not impact the intention of the original provisions. They also better reflect the exhibited reference scheme. The amendments will provide some design flexibility for the design excellence process, whilst still providing certainty to the community in regard to potential environmental impacts. Land and Housing Corporation have reviewed the revised Design Guide and maintain that the following edits should be made: - That car parking and basements, beyond access connections, should be able to extend underneath through site links; - That no more deep soil other than the 15 per cent required by the Apartment Design Guide should be required, and; - A different Design Excellence Strategy with a proponent majority jury and a less prescriptive terms. The City doesn't believe the above amendments are well substantiated. Controls relating to deep soil and tree canopy are essential in regards to delivering a positive canopy outcome on an existing site that is already heavily landscaped. The proposed Design Excellence Strategy is considered to be essential in terms of delivering a diverse architectural response for the site. **Recommended action: majority of changes made as appropriate to the Design Guide.**

Land and Housing Corporation Height LAHC has requested minor adjustments to the proposed height of building map in order to accommodate the reference scheme and to allow for appropriate flexibility to occur at design excellence and design development stage.	Amendments made to the height of building map in line with LAHC's recommendations. Changes made are considered minor and consistent with the exhibited reference scheme. They provide sufficient flexibility for design development to occur, whilst maintaining certainty of potential impacts for the public. **Recommended action: amendments made to the height of building map in line with LAHC's recommendations.**
Land and Housing Corporation Conditionality of proposed FSR and prescription of tenure While LAHC is supportive of Councils proposed maximum FSR of 2.75:1 on the Site, LAHC is not supportive of the restrictive site specific provisions linking the maximum FSR to a range of requirements and the Council's proposed provision, including restrictions on tenure and ESD provisions.	This objection is addressed in the body of the committee report. **Recommended action: site specific provision amended to clearly separate community facility GFA from the maximum GFA available to the remainder of the site. Additional site specific provisions are maintained, as discussed in the body of the committee report.**
Land and Housing Corporation Offset of developer contributions LAHC are of the view that the provision of space for the community facility on-site warrants an appropriate offset against any development contributions liability for the site and would like to reach agreement with the City of Sydney in this regard.	The part of the site occupied by the PCYC is currently zoned for that use. The planning proposal ensures that a similar use continues on site and that there is no loss of community infrastructure. Future development of the site will generate additional demand for additional community infrastructure. Any offset of contributions towards additional community infrastructure can only be dealt with at development application stage when the delivery and ownership details of the community facility are known and a public benefit offer is made. **Recommended action: no change.**
Shelter NSW The 'bundling' of social and affordable housing Object to the 'bundling' of social and affordable dwellings to meet the 'social' requirement under the Communities Plus model	This objection is addressed in the body of the committee report. The objection is considered to be well substantiated and is supported by the City. **Recommended action: the planning proposal has been updated to decouple required social and affordable rental housing, with 7.5 per cent affordable rental housing required in addition to the 30 per cent social housing, as per the intent of**

(70:30 private:social). Shelter NSW have long argued for affordable housing to be part of the Communities Plus approach, they did so in advocating that it would be in addition to social housing, not instead of it.	**the City's original planning proposal.**
Shelter NSW 10% affordable rental housing is consistent with the Region Plan, District Plan and the City's Local Strategic Planning Statement and Housing Strategy Shelter NSW provide supporting evidence for a significant increase in the stock of social and affordable rental housing in the Sydney LGA. They highlight that Independent Advisory Group for Waterloo South concluded that affordable rental housing (above and beyond social housing) was 'essential' and furthermore, that the target for that site ought to be 10%.	This objection is addressed in the body of the committee report. The objection is considered to be well substantiated and is supported by the City. **Recommended action: the planning proposal has been updated to decouple required social and affordable rental housing, with 7.5 per cent affordable rental housing required in addition to the 30 per cent social housing, as per the intent of the City's original planning proposal.**
Shelter NSW Concerns about the 'one size fits all' application of Communities Plus and the 70:30 rule They call on the NSW Government to: - publish clear targets for social and affordable dwelling increases (net) across NSW and Greater Sydney – indicating the proposed combined net impact of Communities Plus renewal projects such as the Elizabeth Street proposal, and - review the proposed Private : Social/Affordable floorspace split for the Elizabeth Street proposal taking account of: local	The City supports Shelter NSW's call for the NSW Government to publish clear targets for social and affordable dwelling increases (net) across the City of Sydney, Greater Sydney and NSW. In the absence of a coordinated and transparent approach from LAHC and the NSW Government, the City has a responsibility to assess LAHC planning proposals on a site-by-site basis as they are lodged. They City will continue to maximise the amount of social and affordable housing provided for on NSW Government sites, in line with the City Plan 2036. **Recommended action: no change.**

housing need, alignment with and preservation of the cultural heritage and socio-economic profile of the local community and capacity of the site to provide a reasonable commercial financial return for the people of NSW.	
Shelter NSW <u>Highlight two communities, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and Key Workers, as key communities affordable housing should be provided for</u> They recommend LAHC: - offer assurance that a certain proportion of Affordable Housing be dedicated to and managed by an Aboriginal Community Housing provider, and - actively engage its fellow public service agencies to assess the current and future demand for public sector key worker housing in the Sydney LGA.	The design guide has been amended to address the provision of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affordable rental housing. The required affordable rental housing will be available to Key Workers. **Recommended action: the design guide has been updated.**
Shelter NSW <u>Provide general design and community considerations</u> - utilise universal design principles in the development catering for a full range of disabilities (not just physical) including for example, cognitive impairments like dementia which currently affects three in ten Australians aged over 85 years and one in ten aged over 65 - require strengthened energy and environmental standards, NatHERS21 for example (beyond minimum standards) of energy efficiency, to ensure new dwellings at Explorer Street (private, social or	The considerations are well made. The NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide, LAHCs own design requirements and the City's Design Guide address issues of universal design and sustainability minimums. The Design Guide in particular address requirements for Ecologically Sustainable Development, requiring increased targets for water and energy efficiency. In regard to the future community facility, the City supports the future owner/operator of the facility to actively engage local residents in the design and specification of the new community facility. This engagement will be determined at development application stage once an owner/operator is determined. **Recommended action: no change.**

affordable) are of good quality, environmentally sustainable and lower cost for owners and tenants. - ensure that affordable renewable energy is accessible to all tenants across the site – delivering low-cost energy to tenants and potentially supporting the development of a precinct-based Clean Energy Hub. This includes access to electric vehicle charging facilities. - actively engage local residents in the design and specification of the new community facility so that it will become a useful and flexible space for a diverse range of groups within the local area.	
Counterpoint <u>Amount of social and affordable housing</u> Disagree with the gateway decision by DPIE that reduced the City of Sydney's proposal of a minimum of 40% of social and affordable housing. Of the firm view that opportunities to increase social and affordable on government-owned land, especially in inner-city areas, should be maximised. Hence, has serious concerns with LAHC's rigid social mix of 70:30 as per the Communities Plus policy.	This objection is addressed in the body of the committee report. The objection is considered to be well substantiated and is supported by the City. **Recommended action: the planning proposal has been updated to decouple required social and affordable rental housing, with 7.5 per cent affordable rental housing required in addition to the 30 per cent social housing, as per the intent of the City's original planning proposal.**
Counterpoint <u>Aboriginal Affordable Housing</u> The planning proposal does not require dedicated Aboriginal affordable housing. Given the historical and cultural importance of Redfern and Waterloo to Aboriginal people, calls for 10% Aboriginal affordable housing	The design guide has been amended to address the provision of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affordable rental housing. The NSW planning framework does not enable planning controls to establish requirements for who may occupy buildings, only how a building may be used. For affordable housing delivered through the planning framework, the occupants are allocated on the basis of household income but there cannot be a requirement for who occupies the housing within those

on all government controlled land.	income bands. Nevertheless, a provision has been inserted to encourage future housing providers to provide a minimum 10 per cent of affordable housing for Aboriginal people. **Recommended action: the design guide has been updated.**
Counterpoint <u>Community facilities</u> Supports securing a community facility. The community facility should be multi-purpose to meet the diversity of needs in the surrounding community. The facility and land should be publicly owned and managed by existing local providers. Community rooms should be provided for in each building.	The detailed design, ownership and management of the secured community facility will be determined at a later stage. The City would encourage LAHC and the future community facility operator to consult with the community in regard to the design, ownership and management of the facility. Determining such arrangements now is beyond the scope of the planning proposal. The provision of community rooms in each of the buildings on site will also be determined at detailed development application stage. **Recommended action: no change.**
Transport for NSW <u>Car parking rates</u> The City's existing maximum car parking rates may be excessive given the proximity of the site to existing and planned public transport. TfNSW supports the City's approach to review the maximum car parking rates via a comprehensive LEP amendment, rather than a site specific amendment and the aim to encourage a mode shift to public transport. <u>Proposed vehicle access</u> TfNSW supports all access to the carpark being via Walker Street, as the Bus Network 2020 plan retains the high frequency bus route along Elizabeth and Phillip Street. <u>Traffic report</u> Council should be confident the impacts of the proposal	Noted. **Recommended action: no change.**

are accurately detailed and understood so any required mitigation can be implemented through appropriate and equitable contribution mechanisms. Bus network Bus Network 2020 for the South East is currently under public consultation. This plan retains high frequency bus services on both Elizabeth Street and Phillip Street in Redfern.	
Sydney Water Water and wastewater servicing is available to the site. Amplifications, adjustments, and/or minor extensions may be required.	Noted. **Recommended action: no change.**
Heritage NSW Redfern Park and Oval Believe the proposal is unlikely to have a direct physical impact on Redfern Park and Oval, a State listed heritage item. Support the provision to ensure that there is no additional overshadowing to Redfern Park and Oval. Archaeology If the proponent has not already undertaken their own investigation to assess the likelihood of 'relics' and any subsequent management required under the Heritage Act 1977, they should do so.	Noted. **Recommended action: no change.**
Community submissions	
Summary of submission	**Response to submission**
City's scheme preferred to LAHCs The City's proposed built form is supported over the Land and Housing Corporations original proposal.	Noted. **Recommended action: no change.**

The development needs to include at least 30% of total residential floor area for the purposes of social housing and 10% of total residential floor area for affordable housing. Social and affordable housing is critical for low income and disadvantaged families on the Redfern/Waterloo area and needs to be increased, not decreased. Without this, many of the residents of Redfern/Waterloo will have to move out of the area and communities will be fragmented.	This objection is addressed in the body of the committee report. The objection is considered to be well substantiated and is supported by the City. **Recommended action: the planning proposal has been updated to decouple required social and affordable rental housing, with 7.5 per cent affordable rental housing required in addition to the 30 per cent social housing, as per the intent of the City's original planning proposal.**
The proposal is too dense The proposal is far too big and dense on a relatively small plot size. Such high densities do not work and create community problems.	The Planning Proposal presents an opportunity to optimise NSW Government owned land to deliver new social and affordable housing on a site that is predominately vacant and extremely accessible to a range of public transport infrastructure, jobs and services. At approximately 180 dwellings per hectare, the proposed density is not inconsistent with other successful urban renewal precincts across the City inducing parts of Moore Park Gardens with a similar density at 175 dwellings per hectare. **Recommended action: no change.**
High density residential should not approved on such a busy road	The City's Design Guide contains provisions that will minimise the impact of road/traffic noise on future residents and require apartments to be naturally ventilated. **Recommended action: no change.**
The site should be open space and not redeveloped Redfern/Waterloo is substantially deficient in open space and Covid has exacerbated this. Our suburb needs more green spaces and parks as the area is already impacted by high population density.	The Planning Proposal presents an opportunity to optimise NSW Government owned land to deliver new social and affordable housing on a site that is predominately vacant and extremely accessible to a range of public transport infrastructure, jobs and services. Existing and proposed open space and recreation facilities in the area are considered sufficient to support the additional density proposed. The site is currently zoned for residential development and community facilities under South Sydney Local Environmental Plan 1998. The site is not zoned for public open space, therefore it would be unreasonable to restrict its use to open space. The Planning Proposal secures a minimum 3,500sqm

	community facility on site, which is earmarked for a community recreational facility, as well as public footpath and frontage upgrades and new internal streets. Existing public open space is extremally accessible to the site with Redfern Park and Oval immediately adjacent. The City has also secured a new large park, more than two hectares, and a smaller park as part of LAHC's Waterloo South Planning Proposal, which is 350 meters west of the site. **Recommended action: no change.**
Overshadowing of Redfern Park The proposed height should not be supported due to shading of Redfern Park, particularly in the morning and in cooler months of the year	The Planning Proposal permits additional density and height on the subject site on the strict condition that any development on site does not overshadow Redfern Park and Oval between the hours of 9am and 3pm all year round. This condition is secured via a site specific amendment to Sydney LEP 2012. **Recommended action: no change.**
Overshadowing and the impact on street trees The proposed building height will create overshadowing that will negatively impact on the health of street trees	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment report has been submitted in support of the proposal. Any overshadowing as a result of the proposal is not considered to be of an extent that will impact on the health of street trees. The majority of existing street trees are on the sites eastern, northern and western frontages and will receive sufficient direct sunlight access so as to maintain their health. The Design Guide contains controls that require the retention of street trees and setbacks permitted onsite directly respond to the requirement to retain street trees. **Recommended action: no change.**
Proposed height inconsistent with established character The proposed height is inconsistent with the established height of buildings surrounding the park. It should be reduced to around 3 to 4 stories, below the existing tree line. The proposed height is inconsistent with the established low-rise height of the immediately surrounding neighborhood. The proposed tower is regrettable and regressive. It is imposing in mass and will cast a deep shadow wherever	The built character of the sites immediate locality can be described as diverse. East of the site are two to three storey modern residential terraces and apartments, north are three to nine storey residential apartments and south of the site are predominantly single storey residential Victorian terraces. Just over 100 meters east of the site, the Poets Corner collection of buildings are 17 storeys in height. A contemporary four to sixteen storey form on the subject site is not be considered to be obtrusive in this diverse context particularly where no additional overshadowing is created to Redfern Park and Oval. How the subject site addresses Redfern Park and Oval is also considered an important consideration. The proposed form is considered to be positive, providing a strong built edge and activation to the park, and amenity for future occupants. The overall strategic merit of the proposal is

it is positioned.	considered sufficient to justify the proposed form. **Recommended action: no change.**
Lower transitional height to the south required In order to minimise overshadowing and visual impact to the existing 1 to 2 story buildings on the south side of Phillip Street, the proposed development should be reduced in height to 2 stories on the north side of Phillip Street.	The Design Guide provides for four storey built form transition to the Waterloo Heritage Conservation Area to the south. LAHC in their submission have requested a five storey transition which is not supported. The transition of a contemporary four storey building to a single storey Victorian residential terrace across a street is not anomalous within the surrounding locality. It is a typical transition common in the City's diverse mixed-use neighborhoods. The resultant visual impact, both from a public view and private view point, is therefore considered acceptable. In regard to overshadowing of properties on the southern side of Phillip Street, the majority of these dwellings do not meet the minimum solar access requirements in the Sydney DCP 2012. As these properties will not change, redevelopment of the subject site should not result in any additional overshadowing to properties that do not meet the minimum 2 hours of solar access. The future development will be subject to additional overshadowing analysis at detailed development application stage, post design competition. The built form may be subject to further adjustment at that stage to ensure overshadowing impacts are minimised to surrounding properties. **Recommended action: no change.**
Overshadowing to 57 Walker Street The proposed building heights constitute an unreasonable overshadowing of existing dwellings at 57 Walker Street.	To the east of the site, on Walker Street, there are 21 attached dwellings and two apartment buildings facing Walker Street. Due to the existing building design, currently 5 of the 21 dwellings on Walker Street do not meet the minimum solar requirements to their front windows. However, all dwellings receive more than 2 hours of solar access to their rear private open space. In most dwellings, the kitchen and dining room is located adjacent to the rear private open space. The dwellings have excellent solar access to their rear backyards. The focus of the Design Guide is to ensure the rear private open space and rear living spaces continue to achieve good solar access throughout the year. The Design Guide requires that at least 70% of the western face of a plane formed on the alignment of the western boundary of Walker Street receives 2 hours of sunlight on 21 June between 9am and 3pm. It is also noted that 57 Walker Street is owned by

	LAHC and could be subject to redevelopment in the future. **Recommended action: no change.**
Overshadowing to 662-664 Elizabeth Street The proposed building heights constitute an unreasonable overshadowing of existing dwellings at 662-664 Elizabeth Street.	The exhibited overshadowing analysis confirms that the existing dwellings at 662-664 Elizabeth Street retain more than 2 hours of sunlight on 21 June between 9am and 3pm in compliance with Sydney DCP 2012. **Recommended action: no change.**
Overshadowing to residents on Moorhead Road and Kettle Street	The exhibited overshadowing analysis confirms that the existing dwellings on Moorehead Road and Kettle Street retain more than 2 hours of sunlight on 21 June between 9am and 3pm in compliance with Sydney DCP 2012. **Recommended action: no change.**
Privacy impacts to 57 Walker Street The proposal will create privacy and overlooking issues for residents at 57 Walker Street, which will exacerbate existing privacy and overlooking issues.	The NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide requires 12 meter separation (up to 4 storeys), 18 meter separation (up to 8 storeys) and 24 meter separation 9+ storeys, between habitable rooms and balconies in order to achieve reasonable levels of external and internal visual privacy. Walker Street is approximately 20 meters in width, this combined with existing built form setback to 57 Walker Street and the proposed setbacks required by the Design Guide result in an appropriate separation distance. Design features incorporated at development application stage and street trees will also ensure reasonable levels of external and internal visual privacy. The proposal will not result in bult form relationship that is uncharacteristic in the City of Sydney. It will be a typical built condition common in the City's diverse mixed-use neighborhoods. **Recommended action: no change.**

Wind The submitted wind analysis is insufficient and inaccurate. The height of the proposal will worsen wind conditions which are already frequently uncomfortable.	An Pedestrian Wind Environment Study has been submitted in support of the proposal. The Study has been reviewed and has been deemed an accurate and appropriate for assessment of the site's existing wind conditions and potential conditions when developed. The Design Guide contains development controls to appropriately manage wind conditions at detailed development application stage. **Recommended action: no change.**
Contamination and remediation Concerns over asbestos contamination and method for removal.	A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, a Stage 2 Contamination Report and a Site Audit Letter have been submitted in support of the proposal. The Site Auditor has concluded that the site is capable of being made suitable for the residential land use, providing the proposed Remedial Action Plan includes a contingency for encountering asbestos and is endorsed by an Auditor prior to commencing remediation. As such the City is satisfied that issues surrounding contamination can be appropriately dealt with at detailed development application stage. **Recommended action: no change.**
Insufficient provision for open space and tree canopy The proposal requires removal of a large number of well-established trees, but it does not leave much space to introduce new ones. This is contrary to City policy. The removal of the trees removes valuable bird habitat. The proposal does not offer 'connection to country' because it removes all green space.	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment report assesses the potential impacts of the development footprint on the tree protection zones of trees in the study area. Of a total 67 trees on the site and within the adjacent streets, 11 trees were identified as high retention value. Most of the high retention trees are street trees, identified as having high retention value due to their landscape quality. These trees are located on Walker and Kettle Streets where the Design Guide provides setbacks to ensure these trees are retained. To mitigate any potential loss of trees, the planning proposal provides for a minimum 15% tree canopy cover on the site. This improves on that required by the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) and will ensure any loss of trees is adequately offset and will improve landscape values and biodiversity outcomes with more appropriate tree plantings. One threatened flora species Syzygium paniculatum (Magenta Lilly Pilly), listed as endangered under the BC Act and vulnerable under the EPBC Act is located on the southern boundary of the site, beside the footpath. The revised scheme will not require removal of this tree. **Recommended action: no change.**
Capacity of the bus network to service additional population increase	A traffic and transport assessment prepared by Jacobs was submitted in support of the proposal and placed on public exhibition. The assessment concluded: - bus and train services accessible from the

	development are already operating close to or at capacity, and - the future Waterloo Station and potential extension of Sydney Metro West to Zetland is expected to improve public transport capacity and therefore the projected additional public transport trips generated by the development would be readily accommodated. This view was supported by the City's Transport Planner who identified broad support for the proposal in relation to potential traffic and transport impacts. Transport for NSW made a submission in relation to the proposal. They raised no objection to the proposal and noted that Bus Network 2020 for the South East was on public exhibition at the time. Bus Network 2020 is an integrated network plan for Sydney's South East to ensure capacity for customers, as well as to support existing and emerging travel patterns. Bus Network 2020 was release for public comment on Thursday 6 May 2021. Transport for NSW are currently in the process of considering all community feedback. Bus Network 2020 retains high frequency bus services on both Elizabeth and Phillip Street in Redfern. **Recommended action: no change**
Too much onsite carparking is proposed	The future redevelopment of the site could result in a maximum of 215 car parking spaces on the site. This planning proposal seeks to apply the Category B car parking rate in the LEP for determining the maximum number of car spaces. However, a broader review of LEP parking rates is currently underway which will take into account the increased accessibility of the site with Waterloo Metro station in place. This may result in a lower car parking rate being applied in a future LEP amendment. Notwithstanding, the supporting traffic analysis suggests the number of parking spaces is not anticipated to degrade the performance of the road network to an unacceptable level. The exact amount of car parking to be provided on the site will be determined as part of the detailed design phase. **Recommended action: no change**
On street carparking impacts On street car parking within the surrounding area is already in high demand. The increased density will exacerbate this issue meaning less on street parking for existing residents	A traffic, transport and parking study prepared by Jacobs was submitted in support of the proposal and placed on public exhibition. The study concluded that the traffic generated by the proposed development to the surrounding road network would have a negligible impact on road network operation. This view was supported by the City's Transport Planner who identified broad support for the proposal in relation to potential traffic, transport and parking impacts.

and those visiting the area. The proposal should accommodate more on site parking.	Traffic, transport and parking impacts will be addressed in detail at development application stage when final parking numbers and access arrangements are known. There are existing controls in relation to maximum car parking rates, restrictions on participation in on-street parking schemes, car share minimums and bike parking minimums. The City adopts maximum car parking rates to encourage alternatives to private motor vehicles, such as public transport, walking or cycling. The site is well served by Redfern train station and frequent bus services along Elizabeth and Phillip Street. Car share bays are located in close proximity to the site on Phillip Street and Morehead Street. **Recommended action: no change.**
A carpark entry should not be proposed on the Phillip Street frontage	The indicative design submitted in support of the proposal proposes basement carpark access via Kettle Street. **Recommended action: no change.**
Rubbish, dumping and the upgrade of frontages The Kettle Street frontage is one of the most unloved parts of Redfern. Poorly maintained, a dumping ground for refuse. Will the proposal improve this frontage? Is this proposed scheme going to ameliorate the use of Walker Street as a public dumping ground for commercial rubbish removalists and people unable to access tips? Or is it going to exacerbate the problem?	The proposal will include public domain upgrades to the Kettle Street and Walker Street frontages. An increase in passive surveillance of the public domain from future residents will deter dumping along these frontages. **Recommended action: no change.**

Inequitable density Why is this block being singled out for such high density development, when just a few blocks away in Zetland there has been much recent development that allowed for generous open green space between buildings, ample sunshine and public space that is inviting.	The City supports calls for the NSW Government to publish clear targets for social and affordable dwelling increases (net) across the City of Sydney, Greater Sydney and NSW. In the absence of a coordinated and transparent approach from LAHC and the NSW Government, the City has a responsibility to assess LAHC planning proposals on a site-by-site basis as they are lodged. The City's proposal for the subject site is a significant improvement on the proposal originally lodged by LAHC. It secures a significant increase in social and affordable housing in a way that maximises amenity for future and existing populations. **Recommended action: no change.**
Visual privacy issues for park users The proposal will create privacy issues for park users, with future residents overlooking the park.	An increase in passive surveillance of Redfern Park and Oval from future residents is considered a positive in line with accepted crime prevention through environmental design principles. **Recommended action: no change.**
Noise impacts for park users Noise from future residents will impact on the public's peaceful enjoyment of the park.	Any noise associated with the future development is considered to be acceptable noise consistent with the site's current residential zoning and diverse mixed-use setting. Any offensive noise can be manage by way of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act (POEO Act) 1997. **Recommended action: no change.**
Community facility design Any replacement PCYC should include areas for outdoor play.	The City encourages the future owner/operator of the community facility to actively engage local residents in the design and specification of the new community facility. This engagement will be determined at development application stage once an owner/operator is determined. **Recommended action: no change.**
Additional retail not required Additional retail is not needed in this area. There are many empty shops already and more than enough cafes.	The proposal provides for commercial, community and/or retail uses along the Elizabeth Street frontage at ground level. This location is unsuitable for residential uses due to potential noise and flooding and impacts. Non-residential uses are also considered to better activate this important north-south street. The provision of non-residential uses within the development is considered to be consistent with the site's zoning objectives to enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents. **Recommended action: no change.**

Failure to address the long-term impacts of Covid 19 How does this proposal respond to the long term impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic? In particular, does it take into account the changes to work practices i.e., the decrease of demand for workers in the CBD and the increase in working from home? Could the housing needs of the City be better served by developing housing within disused office space in the city rather than over-developing this site?	At a time when the wait list for social housing in NSW is almost 60,000 people, the demand for social housing has never been greater. Combined with a five to 10 year waiting period for social housing in our area, and the extra demand that will be created by the health, social and economic impacts of Covid-19, there is a critical need to deliver social and affordable housing. The proposal optimises NSW Government owned land to deliver new social and affordable housing on a site that is predominately vacant and extremely accessible to a range of public transport infrastructure, jobs and services. **Recommended action: no change.**
Construction noise and dust Construction noise will be unbearable, particularly with so many people working from home. Dust during construction will unreasonable impact on existing residents, including those with medical conditions. The dust may also impact resident's pets.	Any future development application will need to address the issue of demolition, excavation, construction management and construction noise and the preparation of a demolition, excavation and construction noise management plan. The plan(s) will need to include provisions for dust management and noise management in compliance with Australian Standards, the WHS Act and Regulation and Council policies and Council conditions of consent. **Recommended action: no change.**
Building maintenance Maintenance for tall blocks in social housing is always an issue. In this location lack of maintenance will be an increased eyesore.	The future maintenance of the building will be the responsibility of the future building owner and is beyond the scope of this proposal to manage. **Recommended action: no change.**
No images of the proposal from street level There are no images showing the impact of this development at street level, which would show the true impact.	The information contained within the exhibition material is considered to be sufficient for the community to make an assessment of the proposed to change to planning controls. The City has also undertaken community briefings to take the community through the proposal and answer any questions. Further details will be available for community comment when a detailed development application is lodged and exhibited. **Recommended action: no change.**
Error in construction date for 57 Walker Street	Noted. The date of construction of the 57 Walker Street development is not considered to be of material impact in regards to considering the proposal. **Recommended action: no change.**

No more social housing. It promotes public intoxication, drug abuse, violence, public disorder and reduces land values. The concentration of social housing tenants in one development will give rise to anti-social behavior, drug use and crime. NSW Land and Housing Corporation does not exercise enough due diligence on its tenants and the placement and mix of tenants in this area. This is incredibly unfair to private landholders who take pride in their suburb. Will NSW LHC take responsibility for the character of their tenants. Such high densities will promote the spread of disease.	At a time when the wait list for social housing in NSW is almost 60,000 people, the demand has never been greater. Combined with a five to 10 year waiting period for social housing in the city, and the extra demand that will be created by the health, social and economic impacts of Covid-19, there is a critical need to deliver more social housing. This is especially the case in the city where additional social housing will contribute to increasing housing diversity and providing homes for essential workers. The proposal facilitates the redevelopment of the site consistent with crime prevention through environmental design principles and contemporary apartment design standards, in terms of acoustic privacy and waste management. Any other associated social impacts of the proposal are considered to be manageable. Any impact the property values in the area is not a planning consideration. **Recommended action: no change**