

# **Attachment D**

## **Summary of Submissions and Responses**

# Summary of Submissions: Enterprise Area Review Planning Proposal and Draft Development Control Plan

## Contents

Local resident submissions .....	3
Submissions on behalf of landowners in North Alexandria precinct.....	9
Public Authority Submissions .....	18

## Local resident submissions

Submitters include:

- 1 owner’s corporation
- 4 area residents

Summary of key matters raised in submission	Officer’s response
<p><u>Full support for the planning proposal</u> (raised in 1 submission)</p>	
<p>Supports additional density in North Alexandria due to its inner-city location and access to public transport.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Support for public domain and open space improvements</u> (raised in 1 submission)</p>	
<p>Supports improving public domain and open space in the precinct to increase pedestrian mobility and amenity for workers and residents.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Proposed building height and FSR controls</u> (raised in 3 submissions)</p>	
<p>Concern about the proposed building height and FSR controls lack evidence to support the numeric controls.</p> <p>Concern about the planning proposal will lead to overdevelopment and make the suburb unpleasant.</p>	<p>The planning proposal and draft DCP is supported by a substantial evidence base, including the enterprise area review (Review), undertaken by SGS Economics and Planning, and the urban design study, undertaken by CHROFI.</p> <p>The vision and built form principles established through the proposed planning controls concentrate intensity in areas closer to Green Square Station, and where public domain improvements and new open space are identified.</p> <p>Away from the station, the envisaged built form is of a lower scale and finer grain, transitioning to the heritage conservation area to the north.</p> <p>The proposed building height and FSR controls support the capacity for new employment as well as the cost associated with dedicating land to the City for public domain improvements and new open space.</p>

Summary of key matters raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>The planning proposal does not increase the mapped FSR controls, rather it only increases the community infrastructure floorspace available when the development contributes to community infrastructure, such as dedication of land for improved public domain.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submissions.</p>
<p><u>Building height at corner McEvoy and Stokes</u> (raised in 1 submission)</p>	
<p>Concern the proposed increase to building heights on McEvoy Street, near Stokes Avenue, will impact the area's heritage character, undermine the local community 'vibe', obstruct views from Wyndham Street to Newtown and Sydney Park, and will result in further height increases, impacting the amenity of housing in the area.</p>	<p>The building height control along McEvoy Street, near the corner with Stokes Avenue is proposed to increase from 18 metres to 25 metres.</p> <p>The change to building height control are supported by a heritage impact assessment which considered the proposed building height at this location to be appropriate within the context of the surrounding heritage.</p> <p>The residential areas to the north of the precinct have building height controls of 22 metres, which is similar.</p> <p>The potential impacts on view lines at this location are a consideration during the development assessment stage of any future application. Nevertheless, private views are not protected through the planning controls.</p> <p>The precinct is primarily zoned for employment uses and there is unlikely to be any substantial effect on the amenity of housing in the area because of the planning proposal.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submission.</p>

Summary of key matters raised in submission	Officer's response
<p><u>Design excellence</u> (raised in 2 submissions)</p>	
<p>Concern the 'design excellence' provision in the Sydney LEP will become ineffective due to the mapped FSR being excessive</p> <p>Requests a 10 percent reduction to the mapped FSR across the precinct so that design excellence becomes essential for developments seeking additional FSR or building height.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not change the operation of the design excellence provisions and development will need to demonstrate design excellence through a competitive process to achieve the 10 per cent bonus.</p> <p>The planning proposal does not make any change to current mapped FSRs in the precinct, rather the community infrastructure floorspace is proposed to increase in some places. This will ensure that where landowners seek additional FSR that they must also make a commensurate contribution to community infrastructure in the area, for example, dedicating land for footpath widening.</p> <p>The FSR controls are informed by the urban design study that takes into account the future height and massing across the precinct, including the potential impacts of the development. It incorporates an understanding of additional FSR that may be achieved utilising the design excellence provisions in the Sydney LEP.</p> <p>Clause 6.21 of Sydney LEP requires design excellence for developments over 25 metres. It is also encouraged for lower scale development.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submissions.</p>
<p><u>Traffic and transport</u> (raised in 3 submissions)</p>	
<p>Concern the planning proposal lacks sufficient evaluation of the future development, that it includes optimistic assumptions for public transport, lacks plans to manage traffic and parking, and will ultimately impact on business and residents due to increased congestion.</p>	<p>Prior to public exhibition, the City prepared a traffic and transport assessment to consider the impacts of the planning proposal. This assessment is discussed further below in response to matters raised by Transport for NSW.</p> <p>The future development of the precinct will be adequately supported by public transport and other policies and interventions of the</p>

Summary of key matters raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>City, such as maximum car parking rates, that are to reduce car use in the precinct.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submissions.</p>
<p>Staging of planning controls (raised in 2 submissions)</p>	
<p>Request a staged approach to amending planning controls, where planning controls are changed for precincts one at a time. This is due to concern that proposed changes all together will negatively impact the precinct.</p>	<p>The planning proposal and the draft DCP is supported by detailed analysis which considered North Alexandria as an integrated precinct. The planning controls are required to be implemented simultaneously to facilitate the future development objectives for better accessibility through the precinct, increasing employment and improving public infrastructure. The City does not control the timing of development applications from landowners and cannot compel certain landowners to develop before others. It's unlikely all sites will develop at one time.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submissions.</p>
<p><u>Review FSR outside of study area</u> (raised in 1 submission)</p>	
<p>Supports proposed increase to FSR in the precinct and seeks similar increase for residential areas adjacent to employment precinct.</p>	<p>The planning proposal and draft DCP applies only to the enterprise area, as identified. The proposed changes to planning controls does not consider residential zoned land. The City's local strategic planning statement does not include actions to rezone land for additional residential development as there is capacity within current planning controls.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submission.</p>

Summary of key matters raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>Late night precinct controls (raised in 2 submissions)</p>	
<p>Concern about the 'Late Night Trading Area' identified in the City's planning controls, saying that it favours night-time activities at the expense of the impacts on area residents.</p> <p>Seek further measures to manage night-time activities, for crime prevention, and to improve amenity and liveability of the area residents.</p>	<p>In 2019, Council endorsed updated late-night trading planning controls to provide the foundations for growth of Sydney's night-time economy into the future. The changes included a new cultural precinct in North Alexandria which was the subject of extensive community consultation. The planning proposal and associated draft DCP does not seek to amend these recently adopted planning controls. The controls manage late night trading impacts through trial hours, plans for management and noise assessments at DA stage.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submissions.</p>
<p>Demand for commercial floor space (raised in 1 submission)</p>	
<p>Concern the planning proposal is based on assumptions about office floorspace demand based largely on pre-COVID data.</p> <p>Notes that high value knowledge economy businesses are reducing floorspace requirements, with a shift to a decentralised model with no fixed office location or a hybrid model.</p>	<p>The planning proposal and draft DCP is based on analysis of market interest in the development of business and office floor space in the precinct which was completed during 2020. The analysis considers the proximity of the business precinct to densely populated residential areas and its strategic position close to the broader southern enterprise area, Sydney Airport, and the Sydney CBD. The enterprise area review identified demand for additional business and office floor space in the precinct, but which could be for a diverse range of business and enterprise activities.</p> <p>The long-term effect of the pandemic on traditional office space is unknown at this stage as health orders have only recently been removed. While there is a shift to more flexible and remote working, which reduces the number of people in a traditional office, there is also a move to provide more space for collaboration and other activities to make working in an office more effective and desirable. Despite the short term effects of the pandemic on</p>

Summary of key matters raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>demand for traditional office space, landowners in the precinct continue to report market demand for space for businesses. The ongoing impacts of the pandemic may affect the timing of floor space delivery as the market will only deliver new floor space when there is demand.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submission</p>
<p>Public domain (raised in 2 submissions)</p>	
<p>Refer to the proposed public domain improvements to prioritise pedestrian amenity.</p> <p>Seek the interim improvements for traffic calming on Loveridge Street and Brennan Street be made permanent, and further suggest that there is potential for Brennan Street to be turned into a small pocket park at its interface with McEvoy Street.</p>	<p>These streets noted are outside of the precinct and are not considered as part of this planning proposal.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submissions.</p>



## Submissions on behalf of landowners in North Alexandria precinct

Submitters include:

- 10 precinct landowners

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>Consultant representing 126-130 McEvoy Street and 4-6 Bowden Street, Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Broadly supports planning proposal.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Seeks an increase to the building height and FSR without specifying the exact amount being sought.</p> <p>Refers to an earlier concept by the landowners for a mixed-use proposal which sought a 2.2:1 FSR and 23 metre building height control.</p> <p>The change is proposed in the broader context of the precinct and refers to examples where the planning controls are to change. It also asserts the increase would support the intent of the planning proposal in that it would provide more floor space for employment uses in an area located close to Sydney CBD and public transport.</p> <p>No urban design analysis provided in support of the submission.</p>	<p>The planning proposal, as exhibited, makes no changes to the current planning controls for the site that allow a maximum building height of 18 metres and FSR of 1:1.</p> <p>The opportunities to increase the building height and FSR on this site were considered in the urban design study. The urban design study found that the existing height and floor space ratio was suitable for this site given its size and the scale of neighbouring development. Insufficient justification was provided to demonstrate why increased height and floor space ratio would deliver an improved urban design outcome and therefore no change is supported.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
<p>Consultant representing 20-26 Bourke Road and 9-13 O'Riordan Street, Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Broadly supports planning proposal.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Seeks increases to the maximum building height and FSR controls for the sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20-26 Bourke Road, to increase the FSR from 2:1 to 5:1; and</li> <li>• 9-13 O'Riordan Street, to increase the building height from 33 metres to 45 - 60 metres and FSR from 2:1 to 4.9.</li> </ul> <p>Includes concept schemes for the two sites and analysis of the planning controls to</p>	<p>The planning proposal, as exhibited, makes no change to the current FSR or building height controls for the sites.</p> <p>City staff met with the landowner about the submission to understand the matters raised and their submitted scheme.</p> <p>The submission was carefully considered against the urban design study. It is that the proposed changes by the landowner do not have strategic and site-specific merit to justify amending the planning controls for the two sites beyond what was exhibited.</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>examine the opportunities available for the collective sites.</p>	<p>The 45 metre maximum height profile along Bourke Road as proposed within the planning proposal is appropriate for the width of the street. Increasing the height would reduce the prominence of taller buildings that define the intersection between Bourke Road and Botany Road.</p> <p>Given the above, the proposed floor space ratio is appropriate and creates an appropriate relationship with the potential envelope that allows for building articulation and large tree planting in deep soil.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
<p>Consultant representing 112-122B McEvoy Street, Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Concern about the land dedication and setback requirements for the site and says that it will reduce its ability to achieve its existing FSR.</p> <p>Seeks a commensurate increase to the building height control, up to 25 metres or 5 storeys to achieve the FSR.</p> <p>Includes analysis of site massing options to demonstrate increasing the building height control up to 25 metres on the site to achieve a higher standard of design, stating it is consistent with the surrounding developments which will achieve similar or greater building heights.</p>	<p>The planning proposal makes no change to the current FSR or building height controls for the sites, though the draft DCP has proposed a small increase to the dedication requirements for streets and lanes.</p> <p>City staff met with the landowner about the submission to understand the matters raised and their submitted scheme.</p> <p>The landowner has misunderstood the setback requirement in the draft DCP that allows a nil setback where an office building of three storeys or more is proposed. The submission interpreted the control as requiring a six metre setback.</p> <p>The concept scheme provided in the submission demonstrates the maximum FSR of 1.5:1 can be achieved under the existing building height control within the buildable area, with a nil setback as identified in the draft DCP.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
<p>Consultant representing 56-64 Macauley Street, Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Concern that the proposed reduction of the maximum building height control for the site does not consider that it is located in between north-block and south-block, and</p>	<p>The planning proposal, as exhibited, makes no change to the FSR for the site. The building height control is proposed to decrease from 18 metres to 15 metres. The</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>that reducing the building height will impact the site's development potential.</p> <p>Does not considers the urban design study informing the proposed controls is adequate, and states that there has not been specific testing, or economic assessment of the current FSR, and that an increase in FSR to a maximum of 2:1 (including community infrastructure floorspace) is more appropriate for the site to match the existing building height control.</p> <p>Build form analysis did not accompany the submission.</p>	<p>site is located within a heritage conservation area. The intent of the building height reduction is to reflect the low-scale built form character of the north-block sub-area of North Alexandria.</p> <p>The site consists of contributory buildings and is on the edge of the north-block precinct, which is dominated by a heritage conservation area and heritage items. The height reduction for this site is to better align with heritage and other contributory buildings in the area.</p> <p>The planning proposal and draft DCP does not envisage increased density or height in this location as it is located within a heritage conservation area and has a number of heritage items. The controls, which align with the low-scale built form character, support adaptive reuse of existing space. No additional building height or FSR is required to facilitate the outcome envisaged in the proposed planning controls. The proposed floor space ratio and height of building controls have been reviewed and it is considered that the floor space can be achieved.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
<p>Consultant representing 50-54 Macauley Street, Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Broadly supports planning proposal.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Supports the vision for the area bound by McEvoy Street, Stokes Avenue and Hiles Street as a Cultural and Creative Precinct and the designation of this sub-precinct as a 24-hour trading 'Late Night Management Area', however raises concern the proposed reduction of building heights in selected areas of McCauley Street and Hiles Street will lead to a poor urban design outcome.</p> <p>Requests a review of the land dedication requirements for the McCauley Street extension to allow for a full-width extension to Mandible Street it is proposed that</p>	<p>Support for the Cultural and Creative Precinct is noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal makes no change to the current FSR permitted on the site. The building height control is proposed to decrease from 18 metres to 15 metres. The site is located within a heritage conservation area. The intent of the building height reduction is to reflect the low-scale built form character of the north-block sub-area of North Alexandria.</p> <p>Building heights in the areas of McCauley Street and Hiles Street were informed by the urban design study. It is essential that</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>Council acquire land at 23 Mandible Street and 66 McCauley Street to make extend the width of the McCauley Street southern extension to allowing it to a consistent and continuous form as vehicular and pedestrian thoroughfare, with the character of street trees intact.</p> <p>Built form or urban design analysis did not accompany this submission.</p>	<p>lower heights are maintained given the heritage conservation and heritage items within the north-block and that heights would transition higher to the south of the proposed liveable green network towards the Green Square Town Centre.</p> <p>The proposal for the future McCauley Street extension will be delivered via the council owned site next door, currently occupied by a concrete batching facility. While the concept suggested in the submission may deliver a marginally better public domain outcome, it relies upon further acquisition of private land at substantial cost to Council.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
<p>Consultant representing 30-32 Bowden Street, Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Seeks increases to the proposed maximum building height beyond 35 metres (up to 48.4 metres), and the maximum FSR to 2.5:1.</p> <p>Concern about development feasibility due to the dedication and embellishment required for streets and laneways.</p> <p>Requests confirmation on Councils' position on the employment zones reform and implications for the site.</p> <p>A built form analysis accompanying this submission contained options which explored height in storeys and FSR controls beyond what is contained in the planning proposal.</p>	<p>The planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, makes changes to the FSR and building height controls for the site.</p> <p>The proposed maximum FSR for the site is 2:1 (including community infrastructure floor space). The maximum building height control is proposed to increase from 18 metres to between 22 metres and 35 metres.</p> <p>Part of the site is situated partially within the low-scale character area of north-block and part of the site is situated in the transition area where the building heights and development typologies transition to more of an industrial/urban services character rather than the office/mixed-employment typologies, closer to Green Square Station.</p> <p>The height and massing options outlined in the submission (which showed a built form at 2.9:1) indicated the development will result in significant overshadowing of the public domain. Development of this scale is not appropriate in this location.</p> <p>The dedication of land for the construction of streets and lanes are to be addressed at a development application stage. The controls for building height and FSR in the planning proposal are based on the urban</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>design review that complements the strategic intent of the area, considered the built form impacts on surrounding areas.</p> <p>While there is a quantum of land proposed for dedication to Council, the FSR from this land can be transferred to the developable parts of the site before the land is dedicated.</p> <p>Council's response to the employment zones reform was detailed in the report to Council on February 2022. The Department of Planning and Environment is proposing to convert the B7 zone to the E3 Productivity Support Zone. In its submission to the Department, the City requested additional provisions to ensure affordable housing and other bespoke provisions continue to apply.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
<p>Consultant representing 5-7 Bourke Road Alexandria (precinct landowner)</p>	
<p>Seeks to increase the building height control on the site from 35 metres to 45 metres for the properties between Bourke Road and Sheas Creek, up to the future alignment of the McCauley Street extension. The rationale given is to increase the flexibility of built form outcomes for these sites to better interface with the liveable green network and the new open space that will be delivered in future.</p> <p>Requests consideration for the impact of the placement of public domain at 189 Wyndham Street on the approved development application at 5-7 Bourke Road, which was based on having no open space interface to the east of the site.</p> <p>Architects that prepared the previous development application for the site have reviewed the planning proposal on behalf of the landowner and provided feedback on the planning proposal and draft DCP.</p>	<p>The planning proposal, as exhibited, retained the maximum building height of 35 metres.</p> <p>The exhibited draft DCP proposes a small area of open space to the east, at 189 Wyndham.</p> <p>This is a change to the context that the competition winning scheme for 5-7 Bourke was designed to respond to.</p> <p>City staff met with the landowner about the submission to understand the matters raised.</p> <p>In response to the submission, an amendment has been made to the draft planning proposal to increase the building height control from 35 metres to 45 metres for both 5-7 Bourke Road and 11-13 Bourke Road.</p> <p>With a different boundary condition, the building at 5-7 Bourke could be designed with three open sides, and a better interface with the new open space at the eastern boundary.</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>The additional building height to 5-7 Bourke was requested to provide for access to a roof terrace, and to allow floor space to be reconfigured to provide internal voids within the building, or increased setback from the eastern boundary.</p> <p>An increase in building height as requested would match the maximum height proposed to the opposite side of Bourke Road, to the south, and the adjacent site to the east, at 189 Wyndham.</p> <p>An increase in building height as requested would not increase overshadowing to residential buildings or public open space.</p> <p>The maximum building height control for 11-13 Bourke Road, the neighbouring site to the west is proposed to also increase to align with 5-7 Bourke, as the two sites are separated from other sites in the precinct, by existing and proposed roads, and the liveable green network to the north.</p> <p>The increase in height of building controls, from 35 metres to 45 metres to match the maximum height on the south side of Bourke Road, is not considered to have unreasonable additional impact. The properties are situated to the north of Bourke Road and any additional overshadowing will fall on the road and the commercial development opposite. No additional unfavourable wind conditions are likely to result. The sites are separated from neighbours on all other sides, to the north by the liveable green network, west by a proposed street and open space and east by a proposed open space. The increase in height of building control will not create significant additional building bulk and is envisaged to be used mainly to allow lifts and stairs to provide access to the roof of the future buildings.</p>
Consultant representing 12-18 Stokes Avenue Alexandria (precinct landowner)	
Support for proposed height controls on the site	Noted
Request an amendment to the 'Building street frontage height in storeys' map in the	The planning proposal makes no change to the current FSR controls for the site.

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>draft DCP to change the frontage along Balaclava Lane from two storeys to three storeys. The landowner considers that a better built form outcome can be achieved with a change to the street wall height.</p> <p>Concern raised that in the event of a dedication of land for the future Stokes Avenue extension, the existing proposed street alignment will isolate a portion of the site, rendering it unusable.</p> <p>An urban design analysis accompanied the submission for 12-18 Stokes Avenue, which contained detailed built form modelling, including options analysis to support the requests made.</p>	<p>Amendments to the building height control from 18 metres to 22 metres and an increase from 4-storeys to 5-storeys for Height in Storeys are proposed.</p> <p>There is currently no street wall frontage height in storeys and the draft DCP proposes introduction of a two-storey street wall frontage height along Balaclava Lane.</p> <p>The request for a three-storey street wall to Balaclava Lane is not supported as the two-storey street wall with a third storey setback, as exhibited in the draft DCP, provides for better daylight to the lane and properties on opposite side of the lane.</p> <p>A two-storey street wall will also minimise impacts on the adjacent heritage listed property.</p> <p>The existing built form interfacing Balaclava Lane is primarily made up of street walls of one and two storeys. It is considered that the introduction of three storey street walls on this narrow lane would have a negative impact on the existing street scape.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
Consultant representing Ausgrid site in Alexandria (precinct landowner)	
<p>Notes a deferred commencement development approval (DA) for D/2019/732 on 11 March 2020, for construction of Ausgrid network management facility.</p> <p>Seeks to maintain ongoing dialogue with Council to ensure the site is appropriately planned for, particularly in the context of the changing circumstances due to COVID-19.</p>	<p>City staff met with the landowner about the submission and to better understand the longer term aspirations for the site.</p> <p>The submission is noted. No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission</p>
City of Sydney (precinct landowner)	

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>Requests changes to the zoning of two portions of land from B7 - Business Park to SP2 - Infrastructure, with corresponding amendments to the land reservation acquisition map and amendments to clauses within Sydney LEP to enable the zoning change. The purpose of this change would be to facilitate a future land acquisition to enable delivery of the east-west connector road.</p> <p>Requests changes to maps in the planning proposal and draft DCP to reflect changes to the alignment of the east-west connector road. The new alignments are to be based on a draft subdivision plan of land in this area.</p>	<p>The request to amend the planning proposal to reflect a rezoning of land and its associated amendments is not supported. Such a change would require a re-exhibition of the planning proposal to ensure affected landowners have adequate opportunity to consider the proposal and respond to it.</p> <p>It is noted the City is currently preparing its comprehensive review of the planning controls, which will be reported to Council in mid-2022. This matter has been referred for consideration in preparing that planning proposal. If changes to zoning of the subject sites are recommended to, and endorsed by Council, it is likely to be exhibited later this year.</p> <p>The draft subdivision plan for the east-west connector road does not align with the exhibited draft DCP maps. It is proposed to amend this alignment in the maps to show the correct location of the road.</p> <p>On the publicly exhibited maximum height of buildings map in the planning proposal, the alignment of the road is also proposed to be corrected. The heights on the surrounding properties are to remain as shown in the body of the planning proposal report (see Figure 5 of this report). This is consistent with the urban design study that was exhibited with the planning proposal.</p> <p>On the FSR map, the alignment of the road is not needed to be shown. However, it is the northern boundary of the road that delineates where Area 9 (that allows for an additional 1.5:1 community infrastructure floor space) and Area 6 (that allows for an additional 0.5:1 community infrastructure floor space) applies to land.</p> <p>The exhibited FSR map showed the full alignment of the road in error, creating confusion as to what community infrastructure floorspace area applied.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the FSR map to correct the northern boundary so it shows the correct alignment in the draft subdivision plan, and remove the southern boundary. The FSRs on the surrounding</p>



<b>Summary of key matter raised in submission</b>	<b>Officer's response</b>
	properties are to remain as shown in the body of the planning proposal report (see Figure 6 of this report). This is consistent with the urban design study that was exhibited with the planning proposal.

## Public Authority Submissions

Submitters include:

- Transport for NSW
- Heritage NSW

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
Heritage NSW	
<p>Notes precinct contains local heritage items and a heritage conservation area.</p> <p>Notes precinct is adjacent to the State Heritage listed 'Yiu Ming Temple' located at 16-22 Retreat Street, Alexandria, but that there are no identifiable impacts.</p>	<p>Prior to public exhibition, and in accordance with the requirement of the gateway determination, the City prepared a heritage impact assessment to consider the impacts of the planning proposal.</p> <p>The submission is noted. No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to this submission.</p>
Transport for NSW	
<p>Noted the traffic and transport assessment attached to the planning proposal did not provide a quantitative assessment of the increase in travel demand on the transport network associated with the planning proposal.</p> <p>Stated that measures to support future transport mode use had not been considered.</p> <p>Key elements of the submission include assessing the cumulative impacts, details on how local parking provisions would support the mode share targets identified in the City's transport assessment, and developing further recommendations that will support the area to achieve the City's targets for future transport mode use.</p>	<p>Prior to public exhibition, and in accordance with the requirement of the gateway determination, the City prepared a traffic and transport assessment to consider the impacts of the planning proposal.</p> <p>City staff met with Transport for NSW and the Department on 7 April 2022 to discuss the matters raised in the submission and to question the need for additional traffic and transport analysis, noting additional studies will be undertaken as successive sites lodge development applications to ascertain any impact on intersections arising as a result of the development.</p> <p>The planning proposal and draft DCP allows additional density in an area located close to public transport, with the precinct being mostly within 400 metres of Green Square Train Station and within 800 metres of the future metro station at Waterloo.</p> <p>The planning proposal and draft DCP make significant improvement to accessibility across the precinct, which is currently highly constrained. These improvements include more through site links that connect people to public transport at Waterloo Metro and</p>

	<p>the Green Square Train Station, and to recreation opportunities and services being provided in the Green Square Town Centre and the surrounding areas outside the precinct.</p> <p>The City and Transport for NSW together have a significant plan of projects and actions to improve connectivity in and around this precinct and to promote sustainable transport use, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Square and Waterloo Transport Action Plan – Transport for NSW and the City jointly engaged a consultant to undertake a review of connectivity in the area of Green Square and Waterloo and develop an action plan up to 2024 and the opening of the metro;</li> <li>• speed reduction – Transport for NSW and the City have been working together on a plan to reduce the majority of roads within the City area to 40km/h;</li> <li>• cycleways – Transport for NSW will roll out major cycle links across the local government area, with the City continuing to plan and implement local connections. Key routes affecting this precinct include Bowden Street and some of McEvoy Street;</li> <li>• behaviour change – Transport for NSW and the City have recently prepared a behaviour change campaign in Green Square and the surrounding area. This is aimed at getting people to travel by more sustainable methods. This is an example of the sort of programs that the City commonly run in urban renewal precincts;</li> <li>• maximum parking rates - in its planning controls the City establishes a maximum parking rate based on the accessibility of a site to public transport and service. The approach is intended to promote public transport use in favour of driving and parking to a destination. It is noted the City is currently preparing updated parking controls for the local government area as part of its comprehensive review of the planning controls, which will be reported to Council in mid-2022. These controls will be an evolution of the existing land use and transport</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>integration maps that are currently in Sydney LEP;</p> <p>While there will be some additional vehicle trips associated with the precinct, this is expected to be offset by additional capacity for traffic due to the Westconnex project and new bus routes created by the east-west connector road.</p> <p>The City's initiatives to support traffic and transport in the area are not static or focussed around one precinct. As movement patterns adapt to the completion of significant infrastructure in the area, current initiatives will be reviewed and updated to ensure they are most effective at supporting future transport mode use.</p> <p>The City wrote to Transport for NSW on 12 April 2022, noting the above and seeking clarification on whether additional traffic and transport analysis is required. Transport for NSW responded with an update to their submission on 27 April 2022, recognising the work of the City and TFNSW to implement improvements to the pedestrian and active transport network around the subject site and make a positive contribution to mode-share targets. TFNSW state that they have no further comments on this planning proposal.</p> <p>No changes to the planning proposal and draft DCP, as exhibited, are recommended in response to the submission.</p>
--	--