



Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Attn: Amy Watson

19 June 2012

Re: Preferred Project Report – Summer Hill Flour Mills site (MP10_0155)

Dear Amy,

We refer to the Preferred Project Report (PPR) lodged for the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mills site and your request for clarification on matters relating to:

- Flooding / stormwater;
- Traffic / car parking;
- Open space;
- VPA; and
- Additional information / amended plans.

These matters have been addressed in the attached package of information provided for your information. Since the receipt of this request we have also received the comments from Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) requesting further review of the TRANSYT model analysis. This is currently being undertaken by ARUP and will be provided to you as soon as the requested review has been completed.

In relation to the request to clarify the proposed dwelling yield, we can confirm that the target dwelling yield derived from the revised building envelopes will fall within a range between 280–300 dwellings. This yield is specified in the PPR and architectural drawing package. The reference to 267 dwellings tested in the traffic analysis stems from an early, conservative test of dwelling yield from the revised building envelopes lodged as the PPR concept plan, and was an impossibly specific estimate for the current stage of design development.

The final dwelling numbers yielded by the project will depend on detailed design and the final mix of apartment sizes. The target remains a range between 280 and 300 dwellings and the traffic analysis, as detailed in the attached package has considered the upper and lower dwelling yield range.

The additional submissions received in response to the PPR are not considered to raise further matters that have not been previously addressed, with the exception of the dedication of the open space. The application, as detailed in the accompanying information (Attachment 4), now proposes the dedication of the landscaped open space and pedestrian linkage to the proposed light rail stop.

Should you wish to discuss any aspect of this submission please do not hesitate to contact me on (02) 9380 9911 or by email at sbarwick@sjb.com.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scott Barwick'.

Scott Barwick
Associate Director

Encl.

- Attachment 1 – Overview of additional information
- Attachment 2 – NPC letter 8 May 2012
- Attachment 3 – ARUP response to traffic analysis clarification request
- Attachment 4 – PPR Concept Plan revisions prepared by Hassell
- Attachment 5 – Amended Masterplan prepared by Hassell
- Attachment 6 – Additional calculation and layout plans
- Attachment 7 – Building ID Plan and area calculations
- Attachment 8 – Revised Statement of Commitments



Attachments

Attachment 1: Overview of additional information

1. Flooding / Stormwater

The matters raised by Sydney Water Corporation (SWC) have been considered in the preparation of the Concept Plan and PPR as detailed in the letter from the project hydrology consultant, NPC (Attachment 2).

(Note: The original hydrology report was prepared by APP; the principal responsible for the report is now with NPC.)

The concerns from SWC focus upon the potential impacts of flood waters from the light rail corridor entering the subject site and the SWC canal. The potential impacts from stormwater raised by SWC arise from water potentially entering the flour mill site rather than water exiting from the flour mill site.

Of relevance in this consideration is the Project Approval for the light rail extension (MP10_0111) which at conditions B28 and B29 requires detailed flood and drainage studies to be undertaken to ensure that the construction of the light rail does not worsen existing flood characteristics.

A concern of SWC is that the development of the flour mill site could limit the range of potential design solutions to manage stormwater from within the light rail corridor. Two (2) potential solutions are possible to conveying the water from within the light rail corridor. These are:

1. Pipe the water to the north of Longport Street along the light rail corridor, which would not impact upon the flour mill site; or
2. Pipe the water from the light rail corridor across the location of proposed building 1A.

Neither solution has been finally tested or decided upon. To avoid the concerns raised by SWC that the approval of building 1A would limit the range of flood management solutions available, an additional Statement of Commitment has been proposed that provides for a box culvert in the basement of building 1A that would facilitate a future connection to the SWC canal should this be the flood management solution derived for the light rail corridor.

The second main concern from SWC is the potential for water from the light rail corridor to enter the flour mill site in the vicinity of the Mungo Scott building. The advice from NPC is that this could be readily managed through the design height of the wall adjacent to building 2A (Mungo Scott building) being at a height to prevent overtopping of water from within the light rail corridor.

The additional Statement of Commitments prepared therefore now includes:

- Provision of a box culvert in the basement of building 1A that could allow connection to the SWC canal;
- Design height of the wall adjacent to building 2A (Mungo Scott building) to manage inflows from the rail corridor; and
- That detailed design of the flood management measures will be undertaken in liaison with Transport NSW to coordinate with potential impacts arising from the light rail corridor.

2. Traffic and Car Parking

The PPR seeks consent for a range of dwellings between 280 and 300 dwellings. The attached submission from ARUP (Attachment 3) confirms that the traffic assessment has reviewed traffic generation rates at the lower end range of 280 dwellings and at the upper end range of 300 dwellings. The upper level of 300 dwellings generates an additional 38 vehicle trips/hours over the analyses submitted with the PPR.

It is also noted that the traffic generation analyses has been based upon full car parking rate provisions based upon the relevant Council DCPs and not the reduced parking rates for retail and commercial uses proposed as part of the Statement of Commitments to respond to issues raised by Transport NSW.

ARUP's assessment is that these reduced car parking rates more than off-set the variations in the traffic volumes that have been modelled.

In relation to staging, the provision of traffic upgrades for the development proposed in the Statement of Commitments is based upon the analysis undertaken by ARUP and is accurate.

In relation to the consideration of cumulative traffic generation with the McGill Street precinct development, the traffic generation identified in the PPR assumed the yields from the Traffix report. The Traffix report indicated peak vehicle generation of 332 vehicles per hour and the Halcrow review concluded a peak generation of 337 vehicles per hour. This is a difference of only five (5) vehicles per hour.

Confirmation was also sought on the number of car parking spaces provided. The Concept Plans prepared by Hassell confirm that 63 on-street car spaces is proposed as well as 373-401 spaces within the proposed basements. The range of car parking spaces accounts for upper range of 300 dwellings and the lower range of 280 dwellings.

The car parking spaces would be accommodated in one and two level basements. The areas where two level basements would be provided if required are below buildings 1A, 3A, 3B, 5B, 5C and 5D.

The attached revised Statement of Commitments (Attachment 8) confirms that a minimum of two (2) car share spaces will be provided within the on-street car parking provision.

3. Open Space

The area of open space in the north-west portion of the site that also provides access to the new light rail station will now be dedicated to Ashfield Council.

The dedication will occur in two (2) stages, as detailed in the Dedication Plan (Attachment 4) prepared for the project.

With the development of Stage 1, the new streets and access paths to the light rail stop will be dedicated, and thus comprise predominantly new streets and paved access paths.

The “soft” landscaped open space located between the light rail access path and Smith Street will be dedicated with the development of Stage 2. This area of dedication will comprise predominantly landscaped open space areas.

4. Voluntary Planning Agreement

The Statement of Commitments offers to pay the applicable s94 contributions to both Marrickville and Ashfield Council as applicable. In addition to the payment of these monetary contributions the proponent has committed to:

- The undertaking of traffic management upgrades;
- Dedicate open space to Ashfield Council, and
- Undertake pedestrian upgrade works in the local area.

It is considered that the range of matters identified are all matters that can be required to be undertaken consistent with the requirements s80A (1) (f) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* via *conditions of development consent*. That is, the demand and need for the undertaking of the works arises from the undertaking of the development.

The imposition of conditions requiring the undertaking of these works consistent with the Statement of Commitments would be an appropriate mechanism to deliver the facilities.

There is considered to be no reason to prepare a VPA when in this circumstance the legislation has in place an appropriate mechanism to require the delivery of these works as a condition of development consent.

5. Additional/amended plans

The plans prepared by Hassell have been amended to address the matters raised including:

- RL heights on each building noted (Attachments 4 and 5);
- The extent of potential basement car parking areas are delineated (Attachments 4 and 5);
- The 1.5m setback of the basement to Edward Street is shown on page 38 of the PPR Concept Plan lodged;
- An indicative dwelling layout for the six (6) pack silo building (5A) and building 3A is shown and confirms that only the ground floor level is potentially to be utilised for retail commercial uses with residential uses in the floors above (Attachment 6); and
- Provision of detailed floor area calculations, open space and deep soil landscaping (Attachments 6 and 7).

Attachment 2: NPC letter dated 8 May 2012

Attachment 3: ARUP response to traffic analysis clarification request

Attachment 4: PPR Concept Plan revisions prepared by Hassell

Attachment 5: Amended Masterplan prepared by Hassell

Attachment 6: Additional calculation and layout plans

Attachment 7: Building ID plan and area calculations

Attachment 8: Revised Statement of Commitments