

# **Attachment A**

## **Summary of Submissions and Responses**

## Community submissions

33 individual submissions were received from the general community.

Summary of submission	Response
General support (8 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for proposed supermarket on this site.</li> <li>• Support for other retail, food and hospitality services as part of the future development of the site.</li> <li>• Support for mid-rise built form proposed on the site.</li> <li>• Support for affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted. Further detailed responses to specific matters are noted below.</p>
Mixed support for specific elements (5 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All housing on the site should be affordable or built to rent/ buy.</li> <li>• Building height should be higher to provide more homes.</li> <li>• Retail development should be prioritised over residential apartments.</li> <li>• On street parking should be reviewed and consider time restricted on-street parking.</li> <li>• The proposed development should ensure shared paths are wide enough to accommodate all users.</li> <li>• A separated bike lane should be considered for Bourke Street in future.</li> </ul>	<p>Support for these specific elements of the proposal is noted. Further detailed responses to specific matters are noted below.</p>
General opposition to the proposal and/or specific elements (20 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General opposition to the proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>Opposition to the proposal is noted. Further detailed responses to specific matters are noted below.</p>

Summary of submission	Response
Building height (15 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the proposed building height.</li> <li>• Proposed building height is not appropriate for the local area, and not consistent with buildings on nearby properties.</li> <li>• Proposed building height will result in a tower development.</li> <li>• Increasing building height control will set a precedent for area.</li> <li>• Building height will have negative social impacts such as isolation and loneliness.</li> <li>• Existing building height control should be retained or be further reduced.</li> <li>• Allowing the supermarket is the reason for increase to building height (refers to development as towers)</li> </ul>	<p>Increasing the building height allows the site to reasonably achieve the maximum FSR currently permitted on the site.</p> <p>The height increase is not needed to accommodate the proposed additional FSR for the supermarket development as this is to be provided below ground level. The supermarket will be mostly below ground level and does not add to the bulk and scale of the development that is permitted under the existing controls.</p> <p>The proposed 5 and 7 storey height in storeys controls are consistent with the height in storeys controls surrounding the site ranging from 4 storeys on the western side of Young Street to 6 and 7 storeys on the northern side of McEvoy Street and between 6 and 10 storeys on the eastern side of Bourke Street.</p> <p>The NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide (ADG) contains standards to ensure proposed development achieves acceptable levels of amenity and visual privacy for both residents and neighbours.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Amenity of neighbouring properties (8 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed development limits solar access in winter for adjacent residential properties.</li> <li>• Proposed development will block sunset views for neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Proposed development will have a visual impact on adjoining residential properties.</li> <li>• Proposed development removes trees and restrict the views of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Proposed development will create wind tunnels.</li> <li>• Proposed development will create light spill at night on adjacent residential properties.</li> </ul>	<p>The indicative reference scheme, submitted with the planning proposal, demonstrates a development can be achieved under the proposed planning controls that complies with ADG requirements. These standards ensure any new development achieves acceptable levels of amenity for residents of the development and for that of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposed built form is that of a 'mid-rise' development, and not that of a 'residential tower'.</p> <p>The proposed development will not create wind tunnels. Wind comfort or safety exceedances are not anticipated as a result of the proposed development. Wind effects generally occur where development is both more than 45m high and significantly higher than the surrounding built context and are</p>

Summary of submission	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development will result in increased noise and pollution for neighbouring properties.</li> <li>The privacy of nearby residents will be compromised by the proposed development, and this is a safety concern.</li> </ul>	<p>exacerbated in exposed locations like locations on the foreshore or the crest of a hill. These conditions are not met by the proposal.</p> <p>Residential and retail uses are the types of uses expected on the site and consistent with other uses in the neighbourhood. Light and noise from the proposed development will not have an unreasonable impact on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposed development will not result in pollution that would adversely impact neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Any specific noise, light and privacy impacts can be assessed and managed at the development application stage.</p> <p>Additional height allows for massing of the built form to minimise impact on adjacent residential buildings. It also creates a quality public realm that provides for footpath widening, landscaped setbacks, deep soil, tree retention, and space for an additional pedestrian link to support active ground floor uses within the development.</p> <p>The development retains over 80 percent of the trees on and surrounding the site contributing to green amenity, visual privacy, and a quality built environment for both residents of the development and for neighbouring properties.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
<p>Supermarket need (10 submissions)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to the proposed supermarket at this location.</li> <li>The area already has enough supermarkets in proximity to the site to service the surrounding population.</li> <li>The supermarket will negatively impact the nearby independent supermarket.</li> </ul>	<p>The City's Green Square and Southern Areas Retail Review (the Review) was undertaken to understand the changes to demand and supply of retail floorspace within Green Square town centre and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The Review identified a net shortfall in retail floor space across the City South area and found that to 2041 an additional 9,000 square metres of supermarket floor space is needed to meet demand, with most of that demand required in the Waterloo area.</p> <p>The proposed planning controls will facilitate more supermarket floor space in a location</p>

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>that has been identified as having a shortfall of supermarket floor space and where it is close to dense residential communities. A supermarket in this location ensures the community has access to adequate retail and will encourage residents and workers close by to walk or cycle for their day-to-day retail needs.</p> <p>It is generally accepted that an impact is acceptable if turnover reduction for the centre as a whole is below 10%. From a retail market perspective, this is deemed acceptable. The estimated impact of only - 4.7% on turnover suggests that the impacts of the proposed supermarket are dispersed through the system and that there is sufficient demand within the retail network to absorb the new supermarket without significantly impacting on existing retail centres. No change recommended.</p>
Traffic (13 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about traffic impacts of proposed development on local road network.</li> <li>• There will be increased congestion and disruption to local area due to the development site location at a busy intersection.</li> <li>• Data used for traffic assessment is outdated.</li> <li>• There will be increased noise and pollution due to the traffic associated with proposed development.</li> <li>• Traffic issues for area will be exacerbated due to lack of public transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety will be affected due to increased traffic associated with proposed development.</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed traffic and transport assessment was undertaken to support the changes to the planning controls. The assessment methodology and data sets were endorsed by Transport for NSW (TfNSW).</p> <p>Assessment of the proposed development demonstrated an acceptable level of impact on the existing road network. Limiting vehicular access for the site and limits on car parking spaces for supermarket and other retail uses will further manage impacts on local roads.</p> <p>The site is within a walkable catchment close to existing residential populations. The pedestrian environment includes footpaths on both sides of all surrounding streets, and controlled pedestrian crossings at the intersections of Bourke Street with Danks Street, Potter Street, Lachlan Street and McEvoy Street.</p> <p>TfNSW noted the proposed development is in a highly accessible area to serve local needs and reduce private vehicle dependence. The authority noted the proposal objectives to support “thriving and</p>

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>healthy 15-minute neighbourhoods and encourage sustainable travel behaviour”.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Public transport (2 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is not supported by adequate public transport infrastructure.</li> <li>Some bus routes in the area are no longer running (such Green Square/Botany).</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is supported by a detailed assessment of transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The assessment found the site is in a highly accessible by public transport, located close to bus services (M20, 301, 302, 303, 304, 343, and 355) and within walking distance of Green Square railway station (900m), and the new Waterloo Metro station (1.2 kilometres).</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Car parking (3 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The limited car parking for the proposed retail development will force cars onto the streets and will negatively impact the surroundings area.</li> <li>The proposed supermarket will attract additional traffic to the area and create additional demand for car parking.</li> <li>The car parking controls on adjacent streets need to be reviewed as on-street parking is currently unrestricted / untimed.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed supermarket/retail development is intended to service the local area residential catchment. Retail car parking provision is consistent with the City’s Retail Review. The car parking rates do not encourage convenience parking, and instead are intended to encourage other travel modes such as active and public transport to the site.</p> <p>Any potential on street parking impacts that from the future development of the site can be satisfactorily addressed at the detailed DA stage.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the lack of available on-street parking due to unrestricted parking have been forwarded to Council’s Transport Planning team for consideration as part of the City’s on street parking policy review.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Overdevelopment (3 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area already has been planned for too much development.</li> <li>Increased density will lead to loss of local character, reduced amenity, and increased congestion.</li> <li>There are not enough green spaces to support high density developments.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is located within the Green Square urban renewal area, which has been planned to support significant growth.</p> <p>Significant infrastructure has been provided in the area, including an extensive network of open space, public transport and community facilities.</p>

Summary of submission	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about allowing additional development on top of the supermarket.</li> <li>Concerns about the safety and quality of high-rise buildings, refers to example of Mascot Towers.</li> </ul>	<p>The changes to the planning controls facilitate additional FSR for the supermarket development which is to be provided below ground level.</p> <p>The proposed building heights are consistent with the existing or planned heights of buildings in the neighbourhood which range from 4 to 7 storeys on sites across Bourke Road, McEvoy Street and Young Street.</p> <p>Renewal of the site will create a quality public realm that provides for footpath widening, landscaped setbacks, deep soil, tree retention, and space for an additional pedestrian link to support active ground floor uses within the development. The new built environment will improve the amenity for the surrounding area and is consistent with the planning objectives for the Green Square urban renewal area.</p> <p>Development in Green Square is provided to high design standard. Development will be subject to design excellence requirements. The building quality of buildings is dealt by specific building regulations which are not affected by this planning proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Neighbourhood character (4 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is not compatible with surrounding neighbourhood and will adversely impact the character of the local area.</li> <li>Proposed development will create more safety issues impacting Waterloo's reputation (but no details given as to how).</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal is supported by detailed built form and urban design analysis. The analysis demonstrates the future development will be consistent with the character of the surrounding urban renewal area.</p> <p>The urban renewal area is in transition and developments include existing urban service/ industrial units and older terrace homes, as well as a variety of more recent low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise residential and mixed-use buildings. The proposed mixed-use development renews a strategic site that is consistent with the planning objectives for the urban renewal area.</p> <p>Renewal of the site will create a quality public realm that provides for footpath widening, landscaped setbacks, deep soil, tree retention, and space for an additional</p>

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>pedestrian link to support active ground floor uses within the development. The new built environment improve the amenity for the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
<p>Planning controls (2 submissions)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site-specific proposal undermines the local planning framework for orderly development.</li> <li>• Existing planning controls were put in place for a reason and properties were developed based on endorsed framework.</li> <li>• Council should prepare a new plan for entire precinct area, rather than taking a piecemeal approach.</li> <li>• The changes to the planning controls will result in 'double dipping' and that the calculation for building height and FSR are being incorrectly applied.</li> <li>• Proposed development should be excluded from the 10% bonus FSR for design excellence, referring to Danks Street South proposal as example.</li> <li>• Concerns that proposed development is not required to contribute to the Green Square Community Floor Space.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is located within the Green Square Urban Renewal Area, which has been planned to support significant growth.</p> <p>The site is consistent with the MU1 – Mixed Use zoning, that allows for residential development. There is no increase in residential FSR, only additional FSR to facilitate an underground supermarket to serve the local community.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the recommendations of the Green Square and Southern Areas Retail Review (the Review).</p> <p>The Review identified there is already an undersupply of supermarket floor space in the area due to population growth, and that this demand will increase with the planned growth for Green Square and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The City endorsed the Review recommendations to change the planning controls to expand the provision of supermarket floor space, including for Waterloo.</p> <p>The proposal facilitates a larger supermarket in a strategic location, as part of a mixed-use development that will support the growth in the local area.</p> <p>The changes to the planning controls do not allow for 'double dipping'. The additional FSR for the below ground supermarket and the increase to the building height control are exempted from seeking the 10% bonus FSR for design excellence.</p> <p>The proposal is not exempted from the Green Square Community Floor Space contribution which is linked to the provision of public domain which includes footpath widening and a through site link. An additional 0.5:1 FSR is available for the</p>



Summary of submission	Response
	<p>development where community infrastructure is provided.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Electric vehicle charging (3 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of publicly accessible electric vehicle charging stations within the proposed development is not a public benefit.</li> <li>Surrounding areas have sufficient electric vehicle charging facilities, and it is not necessary to support proposal to obtain more vehicle charging facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>As well as providing access for the residents of the future development, the proposal facilitates publicly accessible electric vehicle charging facilities in the retail and commercial car parking areas.</p> <p>The local government area has limited publicly accessible charging facilities, and the demand will only increase with more electric vehicles entering the market.</p> <p>The proposal secures vehicle charging facilities as a public benefit for the broader local community.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Affordable Housing (5 submissions)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing commitments in the proposal will not be delivered or will in fact not be 'affordable' housing.</li> <li>Affordable housing is being used to increase the developer's profits.</li> <li>What is affordable housing?</li> </ul>	<p>The planning agreement in support of the proposal commits the developer to providing affordable housing on the site.</p> <p>The agreement requires the affordable housing dwellings to be built by the developer as part of the overall development mix and given to a community housing provider at no cost.</p> <p>The community housing provider will own the properties outright and must manage them in perpetuity for affordable housing. This means the apartments must be rented to very low, low or moderate income households for no more than 30% of gross household income.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
Flooding (1 submission)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is susceptible to flooding.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning controls ensure the proposed development uses passive design, finished floor levels are above flood levels, and the</p>

Summary of submission	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks clarification on how the proposal will manage overland flow.</li> </ul>	<p>through site link on the south boundary of the site is free of any development to provide for an overland flow path across the site.</p> <p>The planning controls are supported by a preliminary flood assessment which determined minimum finished floor level to comply with the City's Interim Floodplain Management Policy.</p> <p>Further assessment for the redevelopment of site will be undertaken at the detailed DA stage, including detailed requirements to manage overland flow.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

## Landowner submission

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<b>Consultant representing 923-935 Bourke Street, Waterloo (Landowner)</b>	
<p><i>DCP Active Frontages Map</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States mapped active frontage does not align with reference scheme in planning proposal.</li> <li>• States loading vehicle access from Bourke Street is necessary due to unsuitability of Young Street, as a local road with residential character.</li> <li>• Proposes southern section along Bourke Street be excluded from mapped active frontages to accommodate loading dock entry and other building services.</li> <li>• Proposes alternative mapping reflecting reference scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>Active frontages were included in the draft DCP to limit development from providing blank facades and to encourage visual interest and activity on busy roads such as Bourke Street, that is a key active movement corridor (shared path for pedestrians and cyclists).</p> <p>Opposite development on Bourke Street has similar mapped active frontage. It is noted that active frontage requirements are also proposed in the LEP, though they are focussed on land use rather than building design requirements.</p> <p>The DCP does not identify the location of driveways in the development. These will be the subject of a future development application and the active frontages requirement in the draft DCP will be considered in that context.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a minor amendment to the draft DCP is supported to provide clarity that driveways and service entries may be located on active frontages where other options are not available.</p> <p>Recommend amendment to the draft DCP control:</p> <p>6.3X1(1) Active street frontages are to be provided in accordance with the Active Frontages Map. <b><i>Driveways and service entries may be provided on active street frontages where other options cannot be reasonably achieved and where they are minimised in width.</i></b></p>
<p><i>6.3.X1 (3) Building services are not to be provided on Bourke Street.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft control is not consistent with reference scheme in planning proposal that demonstrated a limited amount of building services was required along Bourke Street due to development scale and complexity.</li> </ul>	<p>The DCP is not intended to strictly facilitate the reference scheme provided with the planning proposal request. The role of the DCP is to establish an acceptable outcome on the site in the wider context of the LEP controls. The design of the development will be subject first a design competition, followed by detailed design lodged as part of a development application where detailed design matters can be resolved.</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes to amend controls to allow limited building services on Bourke Street as far as practical.</li> </ul>	<p>Notwithstanding the above, a minor amendment to the draft DCP is supported to clarify that building services may be considered on Bourke Street with appropriate mitigation such as providing screening and facade relief, including varying detail and material in the development design.</p> <p>Recommend amendment to the draft DCP control:</p> <p><b>6.3.X1 (3): Building services are <del>not</del> to be <del>provided</del> <b>avoided</b> on Bourke Street- <i>where possible, with building services arrangement, materials and details to be seamlessly integrated into the ground level design.</i></b></p>
<p><i>6.3.X.1(6) Retail, and other commercial and community uses are to be provided on north-east corner of the site. Residential uses in this location are not appropriate.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States clause to restrict residential uses from the north-eastern corner of site is unreasonable.</li> <li>Proposes draft control be amended to allow investigation of residential uses within this area, subject to technical assessment that ensures acceptable residential amenity can be achieved.</li> </ul>	<p>The City acknowledges the site was not envisaged to support significant employment uses in the local strategic planning framework. It also notes the proposed LEP does not generally seek to limit the amount of residential floor space on the site and that residential development has not been constrained at other parts of the intersection.</p> <p>It is agreed the draft DCP requirement that identifies residential development as being inappropriate on the McEvoy Street / Bourke Street corner could be removed.</p> <p>It is noted however this change impacts on the draft planning agreement that was publicly exhibited with the planning proposal. The draft planning agreement included 742 square metres of gross floor area from the development (based on the exhibited use mix) to be dedicated for affordable housing.</p> <p>To support the change to the draft DCP, a corresponding amendment has been made to the planning agreement, based on a formula that will secure an increase in the gross floor area to be dedicated for affordable housing if the commercial floorspace is reduced.</p> <p>Recommend amendment to the draft DCP control:</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
	<p>6.3.X.1(6): Retail, and other commercial and community uses are to be provided on north-east corner of the site. <b>Where</b> Residential uses <b>proposed</b> in this location <b>appropriate residential amenity must be demonstrated are not appropriate.</b></p>
<p>6.3.X.2 (5) <i>Overhead power lines, communication cables and utility services are to be undergrounded within all streets servicing the site. All services are to be designed and installed in a manner that does not restrict future tree planting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with undergrounding of cabling, but only as far as practical.</li> <li>• Proposes draft controls be amended allowing undergrounding of power lines and communication cables in a manner that does not conflict with existing trees required to be retained, with evidence from arborist.</li> </ul>	<p>The City has given consideration that any future works for the undergrounding of powerlines, communications cables and utility services will be required to provide expert technical assessment of the proposed work, including potential impacts on trees that are identified to be retained in the draft DCP.</p> <p>It is also noted that the DCP controls should be updated to reference both future tree plantings and the trees that are identified to be retained in the DCP.</p> <p>Recommend amendment to the draft DCP control:</p> <p>6.3.X.2 (5): Overhead power lines, communication cables and utility services are to be undergrounded within all streets servicing the site. All services are to be designed and installed in a manner that does not restrict <b>the health of trees on the site and the surrounding street trees that are to be retained and</b> future tree planting. <b>An assessment report prepared by a qualified arborist is to be provided to support any future development application, and the associated works that may impact trees.</b></p>
<p>6.3.X.3 (1) <i>Retain and protect trees, both on the site, and the surrounding street trees, in accordance with Figure X.X: Tree Retention and Protection.</i></p> <p>6.3.X.3 (2) <i>Trees identified in Figure X.X: Tree Retention and Protection must be retained and protected. Trees that may be removed or significantly pruned (numbers) are 05, 07, 20, 21, 22, 23.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States draft controls present an inflexible approach to retaining trees on and surrounding the site.</li> <li>• States detailed arborist report in support of planning proposal identified several</li> </ul>	<p>Retention of the existing tree canopy on and surrounding the site is a key outcome for the planning proposal. The strategy informing retention of trees align with the City's 2050 target to increase tree canopy cover.</p> <p>The arborist report provided with the planning proposal request was based on a hypothetical development outcome on the site (the reference scheme). It is noted that the actual development outcome on the site is subject to a future design competition and development application/s.</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>trees that were not able to be retained due to impact of proposed built form, driveways and loading dock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes amending draft controls to include additional trees not currently identified that may be removed or significantly pruned to facilitate the future development.</li> <li>Also proposes amending draft controls to include a review process if a tree that was to be retained is identified for removal due to the detailed design at the development application stage.</li> </ul>	<p>While the reference scheme is indicative of the development outcomes on the site, refinements are likely in the detailed design process.</p> <p>The draft DCP controls should not prematurely commit to the removal of trees that that may be retained subject to careful design and treatment throughout the demolition and construction process. Where additional trees may be proposed for removal, there is sufficient capacity in the planning process to consider the particular merits in the wider context of the development application.</p> <p>The draft DCP identifies six trees that can be removed or significantly pruned (numbered 05, 07, 20, 21, 22, 23). This allows the proposed built form and driveway access from Young Street as envisaged in the reference scheme. However, service and loading access from Bourke Street is expected to require more detailed consideration in the development application process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the City supports the addition of tree 32 for removal (located along Bourke Street near the driveway proposed in the reference scheme), noting a high probability that this tree could interrupt reasonable access from Bourke Street.</p> <p>Recommend amendment to the draft DCP control:</p> <p><i>6.3.X.3 (2): Trees identified in Figure X.X: Tree Retention and Protection must be retained and protected. Trees that may be removed or significantly pruned (numbers) are 05, 07, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 32.</i></p>
<p><i>6.3.X.6 (3) The scale and budget of the public art is to be commensurate with the scale of development.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States due to significant site constraints, opportunities for a true public, and or precinct approach for public art are generally not realistic with future redevelopment, and that budget for site</li> </ul>	<p>The draft DCP is consistent with City of Sydney Guidelines for Public Art in Private Development and the Public Art Policy.</p> <p>Any future development value greater than \$10M is required to yield publicly accessible spaces where public art can be provided.</p> <p>The landowner's Public Art Statement confirmed delivery of public art on the site.</p>

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<p>be clarified at 0.5% of future construction cost.</p>	<p>The value of the public art to be provided on the site will be determined in accordance with City policies, on merit at the detailed development application stage.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
<p><i>6.3.X.7 (2) Access for service and loading may be permitted from Bourke Street, subject to a detailed assessment of the impact on Bourke Street, including pedestrian safety.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes a concept plan be included to illustrate appropriate vehicular access points along Bourke Street, a specific graphic demarking location on southern edge, adjacent the proposed through-site link.</li> </ul>	<p>The City does not support the inclusion of further provisions in the draft DCP regarding vehicle access and loading.</p> <p>While the reference scheme provided with the planning proposal request included indicative locations, these are not supported ahead of consideration of detailed design in the development application process.</p> <p>The draft DCP requires detailed assessment of service and loading impacts for any access proposed from Bourke Street, including on pedestrian safety.</p> <p>In addition, a Traffic Management Plan is required to accompany the future development application.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
<p><i>6.3.X.10 (8)(e) at least two (2) Level 3 or Level 4 rapid chargers publicly accessible 24 hours a day, with at least one charger using the Combined Charging System (CCS) standard and the other preferably using a different standard.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes clause be amended to limit public access to chargers during retail trading hours only due to retail parking level being closed after hours for security purposes.</li> <li>States is consistent with corresponding draft VPA in support of planning proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>The City agrees the draft DCP should be amended to be consistent with the draft VPA requirement that stipulates electric vehicle chargers must be provided that are publicly accessible during supermarket or retail and commercial operating hours (whichever is the greater).</p> <p>Recommend amendment to the draft DCP control:</p> <p><b>6.3.X.10 (8)(e): at least two (2) Level 3 or Level 4 rapid chargers publicly accessible <i>during supermarket or retail and commercial operating hours (whichever is the greater) 24 hours a day</i>, with at least one charger using the Combined Charging System (CCS) standard and the other preferably using a different standard.</b></p>

## Public Authority Submissions

The Gateway determination provided by the Department of Planning and Environment required consultation with the following public authorities:

- Heritage NSW
- Transport for NSW

Summary of key matter raised in submission	Officer's response
<b>Transport for New South Wales</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public authority supports the intent of this proposal as it is consistent with 'Future Transport Strategy' to support thriving and healthy 15-minute neighbourhoods and encourage sustainable travel behaviour.</li> <li>• The submission recommended the draft DCP consider the future design of driveway crossovers to sufficiently manage conflict between vehicle and footpath users and to ensure safe pedestrian and cyclist crossing due to the proposed location of the through-site link, and Bourke Street being identified as a 'Shared Path' where higher footpath users are expected.</li> <li>• This may include implementing continuous footpath at the same level as the driveway rather than being ramped between the kerb line and the property line.</li> <li>• The submission also noted the loading dock provision from Bourke Street to create separation from general access and residential streets and recommended that flexibility be provided to enable loading dock provisions from Young Street should direct to book/ click and collect services be removed at detailed design stage.</li> </ul>	<p>The submission is noted.</p> <p>The exhibited draft DCP does not expressly restrict the future development from providing access for service and loading from Young Street. Any access for service vehicles, whether from Bourke Street or alternatively from Young Street will be subject to detailed assessment of the traffic and safety measures required at the development application stage.</p> <p>In response to this submission, recommend amendment to the draft DCP controls, to include:</p> <p><b>6.3.X.7 (b) Driveway crossovers manage conflict between vehicle and footpath users and ensure safe pedestrian and cyclist crossing.</b></p> <p><b>6.3X.7 (3) Continuous footpaths are to be provided at the same level as the driveway. Ramped footpaths between the kerb line and the property line are not acceptable.</b></p>
<b>Heritage New South Wales</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public authority did not raise any objections to the proposed changes to planning controls.</li> <li>• The site is not understood to have aboriginal objects and is not identified</li> </ul>	<p>The submission is noted.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>



<p>as a place protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site is not listed for protection as a heritage item on the State Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1977.</li><li>• Any consideration given to local heritage impacts arising from the future development of the site will be addressed at the detailed development application stage.</li></ul>	
---	--