

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
1	20/1/12	Alan Bright A/ Director, Metropolitan and Regional Projects South	DoPI	<p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised traffic study is required to address assumptions, methodologies and recommendations contained within the EA study</li> <li>Revised study should also address requirements of relevant authority submissions and matters raised by the public</li> </ul>	<p>TPA has undertaken a revised traffic study for the amended design and suggested traffic measures to potentially be implemented. This report also addresses vehicle access to the site in response to the RMS submission and the architectural plans clearly show the proposed vehicle access points. Refer to <b>Appendix 3</b> for the revised TPA report and <b>Appendix 7</b> for the architectural drawings.</p> <p>Traffic was engaged to prepare a peer review of the TPA report to ensure the assumptions, methodologies and recommendations were robust and to consider potential traffic measures to assist in reducing existing traffic impacts. The peer review concludes that the methodology was principally sound and provides traffic generation data at levels slightly above the original TPA report. It is noted that the traffic generation remains below that of the existing commercial/industrial site operations and will have negligible impacts on the level of service at intersections in the area. Traffic also reviewed the TUP report commissioned by Council and did not</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>Density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further analysis of density and built form is required and a reduction in floor space may be necessary</li> </ul> <p>SEPP 65</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended proposal to demonstrate compliance with relevant planning controls, SEPP 65 and the RFDC, particularly separation distances</li> </ul>	<p>support the methodology or conclusions of TUP.</p> <p>Refer to section 4.2 for a detailed response to the traffic and transport issues raised.</p> <p>(Refer to <b>Appendix 3</b> for the Revised Traffic Assessment).</p> <p>Cox has undertaken an analysis of the built form has been in response to the public and agency submissions and the scale of the proposal has been reduced. The proposed FSR is now 1.38:1, a reduction of 882sqm.</p> <p>Refer to section 4.1 for a detailed response to the density issues raised.</p> <p>Refer to the architectural drawings at <b>Appendix 7</b>.</p> <p>Cox has undertaken a review of the preferred project design and the proposal complies with SEPP 65, including separation distances between buildings.</p> <p>Refer to <b>section 4.1</b> for a detailed response to the density issues raised.</p> <p>Refer to the Urban Design Statement in <b>Appendix 6</b>.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of the proposed heights significantly exceed the 12m height limit</li> <li>Further justification of heights is required, particularly for buildings 2D, 2D-2 and 4B</li> </ul> <p>Open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the quality and design of open space within the development and along the foreshore, specifically Precinct 1 and 4 and the provision of a larger foreshore park or promenade</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed heights are considered appropriate in the context of surrounding development.</p> <p>However, as a result of the concerns raised in the submissions, the proposed heights have been reduced from a maximum of 9-storeys to a maximum of 6-7 storeys (as stepped building forms).</p> <p>Refer to section 4.1 of this report for more details.</p> <p>Refer to the architectural plans at <b>Appendix 7</b> and the detailed survey of building heights in the area at <b>Appendix L</b>.</p> <p>The preferred project design has been amended to increase the foreshore open space and to comply with the 12m foreshore building line under the Canada Bay LEP. The public foreshore zone has been increased in size from 2801sqm to 3395sqm, an overall increase of 594sqm.</p> <p>The design of the open space throughout the development is considered to be a good outcome for the site and area as it will provide visual</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking provision of on-site and on-street parking spaces to be clarified</li> </ul>	<p>linkages and pedestrian access to the foreshore. The open space will provide high quality public spaces and landscaped areas.</p> <p>Refer to section 4.1 for a detailed response to the open space issues raised.</p> <p>The total number of parking spaces has been increased from the previous minimum range to be 702, including 78 visitor spaces, almost a doubling of the original minimum visitor parking provision of 41 spaces. This is consistent with the recommendation from Traffix and TTPA that the rate of visitor parking should be 1 space for every 5 dwellings, which is consistent with the RMS guidelines.</p> <p>Refer to <b>section 4.2</b> for a detailed response to the parking issues raised.</p> <p>Refer to the architectural plans at <b>Appendix J</b> for the concept plan basement layouts.</p>
2	1/12/11	Gary Shiels, GSA Planning	GSA Planning on behalf of Canada Bay Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed height significantly exceeds the 12m development standard</li> </ul>	<p>The development is considered to be contextually appropriate and consistent with the height of Council approved development in the area and lower in</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed FSR significantly exceeds the 0.75:1 development standard</li> <li>Proposed setback encroaches the 12m Foreshore Building Line setback</li> <li>The proposal has issues with the SEPP 65 principles of context, scale, built form, density, amenity and social dimensions</li> <li>The impact of the proposal on the adjoining mangroves has not been specifically assessed</li> </ul>	<p>scale than Breakfast Point. Refer to the detailed discussion on height and scale in <b>section 5</b> of the report.</p> <p>The development is consistent with the density of other nearby Council approved developments and Breakfast Point. Refer to the detailed discussion in <b>Section 5</b> of the report.</p> <p>The layout of the preferred project has been amended to achieve the 12m Foreshore Building Line setback. This point is factually incorrect. Refer to the SEPP 65 statement by Cox in its Design Statement at <b>Appendix N</b> and the detailed discussion on the context of the site and the proposal's response to the existing height and density in the area in <b>Section 5</b> of the report. It is noted that Council previously received advice from Peter Stronach, of its Design Review Panel, that the development satisfied the SEPP 65 requirements and was entirely appropriate for the area.</p> <p>There are no works in the waterway or in close proximity to the mangroves. The drainage infrastructure proposed for the</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal would not meet the test under the Sydney Harbour Catchment SREP that the public good has precedent over the private good</li> </ul>	<p>site incorporates Water Sensitive Urban Design measures including bioretention and Gross Pollutant Traps to ensure that water quality of runoff is improved from the current status when leaving the site. The proposal also involves significant foreshore open space and landscaping, which will enhance the natural vegetation on site. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal will have a positive impact on the environmental aspects of the site and will not have any impacts on the mangroves.</p> <p>An assessment of the proposal against the relevant provisions of the Sydney Harbour Catchment SREP has been made and is contained in <b>section 2</b> and <b>Appendix 5</b> of this report. The proposed concept is consistent with the provisions of the SREP and will meet the test that the public good has precedence over the private good. As the proposal will result in positive environmental outcomes for the site including improved water quality of run off, remediation and public foreshore access, these benefits are considered clearly for the public good.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed exceedance of the LEP development standards is likely to have a precedent effect that will adversely impact on the future development and traffic generation of the peninsula</li> <li>Public access to the foreshore should be maximised in a similar way to Breakfast Point, which has substantial setbacks and good pedestrian access and cycle access along the foreshore</li> </ul>	<p>This is considered to be factually incorrect. It is clear from the assessment in <b>Section 5</b> of this report that other nearby Council approved developments and the Breakfast Point development have already set a precedent for the area and the proposal is consistent with these existing developments. In the case of Breakfast Point, the proposal is of a significantly lower scale. The findings of TTPA's revised report and Traffix's peer review confirm that the traffic generation of the proposal will be less than the previous uses on the site and have negligible impacts on the area. Refer to section 5 of this report and <b>Appendices C</b> and <b>D</b> for more details.</p> <p>The layout of the proposed concept has been amended to increase the size of the public foreshore open space to maximise public access with a new 3395sqm foreshore park and a 12m wide access way. Pedestrian links are being provided from surrounding areas and within the site down to the foreshore to encourage the use of this space. Cycle</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is desirable for the existing industrial buildings to be replaced with residential accommodation</li> <li>It is appropriate that the redevelopment is subject to an overall Concept Plan embracing the 3 sites</li> <li>There should be substantial justification for the variation to height and FSR</li> </ul>	<p>access is proposed in accordance with the Council's Bicycle Plan. Refer to the architectural drawings at <b>Appendix M</b> and <b>Section 5</b> for more details.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>The proposed concept is consistent with the area, local context and recently approved developments. Refer to <b>section 5</b> for a detailed discussion and justification of the height and FSR of the proposal. Additionally, an economic analysis has been undertaken for the site and concludes that an FSR of 0.75:1 does not provide an economic incentive to develop the land for residential uses due to the substantial remediation costs.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing higher densities in locations that do not have direct access to public transport is not good planning practice – results in increased traffic generation,</li> </ul>	<p>The site has direct access to public transport with bus routes to the CBD and surrounding areas commencing from the Whittaker Street bus stop, which is within 20m of the site. This is at the start of the</p>



## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>increased usage of local streets and a loss of amenity for local residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has generally been consistent in its application of the FSR control, with some exceedences</li> <li>• The proposed increased density will result in a proportional increase in traffic that will exacerbate traffic issues on the peninsula and diminish the amenity of residents</li> <li>• Previous studies by Council have indicated that the streets in the locality are currently near capacity</li> <li>• The traffic report accompanying the application is vague about</li> </ul>	<p>journey meaning services have capacity and additional capacity will be provided if needed.</p> <p>Refer to the analysis of the local context and approved development in section 5 where it is clear that there are a number of recent developments with FSRs exceeding the control approved by Council.</p> <p>This is factually incorrect. Refer to the findings of the revised TTPA report attached at <b>Appendix C</b> and the peer review undertaken by Traffix at <b>Appendix D</b>.</p> <p>Traffix undertook modelling of key intersections for access/egress for the site and discovered that these will remain at the same level of service including traffic generation from the proposal. Refer to the findings of the revised TTPA report at <b>Appendix C</b> and the peer review undertaken by Traffix at <b>Appendix D</b>.</p> <p>The original traffic report sought flexibility in the parking rates to be resolved with</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>the proposed level of car parking and identified minimum and maximum levels per unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not an accurate assessment to suggest that the traffic generation of the existing industrial and proposed residential will be the same as a number of industrial sites are vacant</li> <li>If there are substantial increases in density above Council's LEP, the amenity and level of service for the peninsula will be intolerable</li> </ul>	<p>Council at DA stage. In order to provide additional certainty around the provision of onsite car parking, it is now proposed to provide car parking for residents consistent with Council's DCP and visitor's parking at a rate of 1 space per 5 dwellings. Refer to the detailed discussion on parking in section 5 of the report.</p> <p>The existing traffic is a statement of fact and the TPA report methodology was reviewed and concluded to be sound in the peer review undertaken by Traffix. Refer to <b>Appendix D</b> for more details.</p> <p>Traffix undertook modelling of key intersections that it considered to be directly impacted by the proposal and found that the level of service will remain the same as existing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bertram/Hilly – will remain at level of service (A)</li> <li>Bertram/Tennyson – will remain at level of service (B)</li> </ul> <p>Refer to <b>Appendix D</b> for details.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed massing and built</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed concept plan as exhibited</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>form, particularly the 9 storey building has the potential to present a development that is incompatible with the character of the foreshore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The drawings do not show the mean high water mark or the 12m FBL, or setbacks from the foreshore</li> <li>The siting and orientation of buildings will result in a substantial massing of built form when viewed from Majors Bay and the public domain</li> <li>There are likely to be solar access issues for many of the proposed units and difficulties in satisfying</li> </ul>	<p>was considered to be entirely compatible with the surrounding existing approved development. The preferred project has reduced the height of the nine storey building, which will ensure the proposal is compatible with the foreshore and much lower in scale than Breakfast Point.</p> <p>The architectural drawings show the FBL and have always shown the setbacks from the foreshore. Refer to <b>Appendix M</b> for details.</p> <p>This is incorrect. A detailed view analysis has been undertaken by Cox in its design statement contained at <b>Appendix N</b>, which demonstrates that the proposal is consistent with and in many cases less than the scale of development on the peninsula and will be compatible with existing development in the area when viewed from the foreshore and the public domain.</p> <p>The proposal complies with SEPP 65, including the solar access requirements. Refer to the design statement prepared</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>SEPP 65 design principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the density of the proposed development was reduced to include single dwellings with increased setbacks, the development would have a similar character to Breakfast Point and provide usable and passive public open space</li> <li>The 9 storey building will be obvious from the foreshore and public domain</li> <li>Inconsistency in the documentation showing 380 and 402 units and developer has advised that the final numbers</li> </ul>	<p>by Cox at <b>Appendix N</b>.</p> <p>The character of Breakfast Point is of a larger scale than the proposal as discussed in <b>section 5</b> of this report and single dwellings are not consistent with the character of this medium to high density residential area or any of Council's previously approved developments in the area. It is noted that the setbacks and the foreshore open space have been increased, which provides additional useable and passive public open space along the foreshore area, with good pedestrian and visual links from the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The nine storey building has been reduced in height in the preferred project design and the proposal will not create negative visual impacts when viewed from the foreshore and public domain.</p> <p>This is factually incorrect. The original EA documentation was clear in stating that the concept application was seeking approval for approximately 402 units</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>would need to be resolved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic report does not categorically state the proposed number of parking spaces relying on peak hour assessments and a survey that was challenged by Council to determine overall generation</li> <li>It is critical to know the number of parking spaces proposed in the application</li> <li>Number of car parking spaces somewhere between 483 and 865 spaces</li> <li>Lack of clarity in relation to the use, provision and maintenance of the public open space and foreshore land together with its relationship to the mangroves</li> </ul>	<p>and 39,340 sqm of GFA. The preferred project seeks approval for a total of approximately 391 units and 38,458sqm of GFA.</p> <p>Traffix concluded in its peer review that the methodology and conclusions of the TTPA are supportable and this is reflected in the minor comments raised by the RMS. Refer to <b>Appendix D</b> for details.</p> <p>The range proposed as part of the original application was between a minimum of 443 spaces to a maximum of 644 spaces. It is proposed to increase the car parking provided from the previous minimum range to a total of approximately 702 parking spaces, including 78 visitor spaces are proposed with the indicative unit mix.</p> <p>This had previously been discussed at length with Council prior to lodgement of the Part 3A application. Refer to <b>Section 5</b> for details on the use, provision and maintenance of the proposed open space.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
2A	Unknown	Unknown	Canada Bay Council – TS&O/Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding – Determination of 1 in 100 year flood levels in accordance with NSW Floodplain Manual</li> <li>Probable Maximum Flood event to be mapped for proposal area</li> <li>Basement entry is below 2100 FPL – crest level for basement driveways to be a minimum of 500mm above the 100 year rough water level for the Parramatta River               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enclosed car parking and areas require warning systems, signage and exits</li> <li>Driveway to be as high as practical and generally rising in egress direction</li> </ul> </li> <li>All basement areas to be fully waterproofed for high water table and sea level rise</li> </ul>	<p>Worley Parsons has confirmed the freeboard levels are in accordance with the NSW Floodplain Manual as the site is above the 100 year flood level of 1.5m AHD.</p> <p>Worley Parsons mapped the PMF in Figure 4 of its report dated January 2011. Refer to <b>Appendix P</b>.</p> <p>Worley Parsons report concludes that all basement levels are required to be above 2m AHD. Cox has confirmed that this is achieved in the design and this forms a Statement of Commitment in <b>Section 7</b> of this report.</p> <p>Warning systems, signage and exits will be included at the detailed design stage where necessary.</p> <p>Cox has designed the driveway entries to be above 2m AHD, which is above the PMF level of 1.5m AHD, as per the advice from Worley Parsons.</p> <p>The basement areas will be waterproofed in accordance with BCA and Australian Standards requirements</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basement areas below 100 year rough water level to be water proofed to prevent flooding as a result of groundwater transmission</li> <li>Planning considerations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Floor levels</li> <li>Building components</li> <li>Structural soundness</li> <li>Flood effects</li> <li>Car parking and driveway access</li> <li>Evacuation (for PMF)</li> <li>Management and design</li> </ul> </li> <li>Shared zone does not comply with RTA's standards</li> <li>Public open space not suitable for transfer to community ownership</li> </ul>	<p>where necessary. Details are to be provided at Construction Certificate stage.</p> <p>Noted, comment only. It is noted that all habitable floor levels are a minimum of 3.3m AHD, which is above the 2100 freeboard level of 2m AHD.</p> <p>The shared zone has been deleted and it is proposed to incorporate a paving element or line marking in order to encourage awareness of pedestrians using the link to the foreshore.</p> <p>This had previously been discussed at length with Council prior to lodgement of the Part 3A application. The public open space constitutes a substantial amount of foreshore open space and linkages thereto, which is considered to be a significant public benefit. Therefore, the dedication of this space is considered to be entirely suitable.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council requires 3m lanes and 3.25m lanes where buses travel</li> <li>Parking lanes to be 2.3m wide with a 0.5m clearance width for car door opening</li> <li>Internal drainage system to ensure no detrimental impact to receiving waterway and adjoining properties in terms of quantity and quality</li> </ul>	<p>3m lanes are achieved on all roads and 3.25m lanes are achieved on all roads where buses travel, with the exception of Bennett Street where the existing road reserve only allows for 5500mm for two lanes. This is an existing road reserve and the site does not have a full frontage to both sides where it is being upgraded. Therefore, 3m lane widths in both directions cannot be achieved on Bennett Street. Refer to the architectural drawings at <b>Appendix 7</b>.</p> <p>TTPA has advised that the minimum dimension for parking lanes is 2100mm and that no requirement for a 0.5m clearance for car door opening exists. It is noted that 2300mm has been achieved where possible, being on Hilly Street. The existing Northcote and Bennett Street road reserves provide sufficient width for parking lanes of 2100mm.</p> <p>The drainage infrastructure proposed for the site incorporates Water Sensitive Urban Design measures including bioretention and Gross Pollutant Traps to ensure that water quality of runoff is</p>



## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External drainage system to be upgraded to meet demand of development to minimise nuisance flooding and meet current standards</li> <li>All utilities and kiosks to be recessed in private property or as not to create trip hazard and obstruction</li> <li>Either seawall to be reconstructed to achieve a 100 year design life or an easement for public access to be provided along the foreshore and ownership to remain with developer</li> <li>Public infrastructure to be designed and constructed to Council's satisfaction</li> <li>Plans, specifications and supporting information to be submitted for Council's acceptance prior to commencement of work to be transferred to Council</li> </ul>	<p>improved from the current status when leaving the site. The proposal also involves significant foreshore open space and landscaping, which will enhance the natural vegetation on site.</p> <p>Noted and agreed, subject to meeting the relevant authority requirements for location and access.</p> <p>The Draft Statement of Commitments has been amended to include sea wall repairs/works where relevant as part of the relevant VPAs. Detailed studies will be undertaken at the DA stage to determine any required upgrade works. It is anticipated this will form a condition of consent following discussions and negotiations with Council.</p> <p>All infrastructure will be designed and constructed in accordance with Council's requirements and specifications. As per the Statement of Commitments, further approvals under s68 of the Local Government Act and s138 of the Roads Act are also required.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S138 (Roads Act) approval required from Council prior to works within the road reserve</li> </ul>	
3	27/10/11	Chris Gaudanas	RMS (former RTA) - SRDAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic report requires further detail in relation to proposed access to site</li> <li>Requirement to install/provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No stopping signs near driveways</li> <li>Construction Traffic Management Plan prior to CC</li> <li>All signposting at no cost to RTA</li> </ul> </li> <li>Development shall comply with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Swept paths for vehicles entering, exiting and travelling through the site</li> <li>Layout of basement parking to comply with Australian Standards</li> <li>Gradients to comply with Australian Standards</li> <li>Clear sight lines for vehicles leaving the car park to comply with AS</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The proposed vehicular access to the site is shown on the architectural plans prepared by Cox found at Appendix M and addressed in the revised traffic report by TTPA found at Appendix C.</p> <p>Noted and agreed, subject to agreement from Council.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of parking spaces to be provided to DoPI's satisfaction</li> <li>Consideration to be given to the provision of pedestrian and cyclist facilities as part of the DA</li> <li>Strongly recommended that sustainable initiatives are provided to encourage increased use of sustainable travel and reduced car dependency</li> <li>Strongly recommended to consult with Transport NSW and STA on whether additional bus services can be provided/rerouted</li> <li>All vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward direction and be wholly contained within the site before being required to stop</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and agreed. The proposed level of resident's parking in accordance with Council's DCP and visitors parking at a rate of 1 space per 5 dwellings is understood to be to DPI's satisfaction. The proposal includes shared pedestrian and cycle paths in accordance with Council's Bicycle Plan and bicycle storage will be provided for each unit in the development.</p> <p>Agreed. It is proposed to provide a GoGet carshare service on the site, provide a Transport and Accessibility Guide for residents and provide all dwellings with 2 bedrooms or more with a bicycle to promote less use of private vehicles.</p> <p>Agreed. The project team has liaised with and will continue to liaise with TfNSW on an ongoing basis and this forms a Statement of Commitment.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
4	2/11/11	Wayne Kennedy	Sydney Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed 9 storey building requires a 200mm drinking water main extension to connect to the existing 150mm main</li> <li>Existing 150mm main in Bennett Street needs to be extended</li> <li>Other parts of the site have access to existing 150mm mains that may require extension depending on the location of connection points</li> <li>Existing 100mm main in Northcote Street has sufficient capacity for Precinct 1</li> <li>Development exceeds wastewater capacity upstream and downstream of SP 090 and requires amplification of these sewer pipelines and dry weather storage at SP 090</li> <li>Section 73 certificate will be required where specific works will be identified at developer's cost</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and agreed. The development will comply with all Sydney Water requirements at detailed design/CC stage.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>
5	17/11/11	Mohini Nair	Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should not impact on continued safe and efficient operation of buses in the area</li> </ul>	Noted and agreed. It is anticipated that future construction works will be undertaken with appropriate consultation with TfNSW.

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any changes to onstreet traffic and parking arrangements needs to accommodate parking, manoeuvring and turning requirements of buses and any new works need to provide sufficient clearance</li> <li>Operational impacts such as noise should be expected by future residents and noise mitigation measures should be incorporated in the development where required</li> <li>Any formal requests for changes to services needs to be made to TfNSW. An earlier trial of the extension of route 460 was unviable and discontinued</li> <li>The assessment of bus services in the environmental assessment and the traffic report are out of date as bus services changed in March 2010</li> <li>Draft Statement of Commitments should be amended to require future project applications to</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. It is proposed to incorporate details on this in the Transport and Accessibility Guide.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. It is proposed to liaise with TfNSW on an ongoing basis in relation to increasing bus services in the area. It is noted that this development will contribute to the viability of additional services to the benefit of existing and future residents.</p> <p>Noted. TTPA has reviewed the current bus services to the area and updated its report accordingly.</p> <p>Agreed. The Statement of Commitments has been amended to include the provision of car parking provision in</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>provide car parking in accordance with the minimum and maximum rates in the traffic report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Statement of Commitments should be amended to require proposed cycle routes adjoining the development to be consistent with relevant documents and standards and provided at developer's cost</li> <li>TfNSW also supports the provision of bicycle parking spaces in weather protected areas at grade, near building entrances as well as within buildings, and the Draft Statement of Commitments should be updated to reflect this</li> </ul>	<p>accordance with the rates identified in the traffic report.</p> <p>Agreed. The Statement of Commitments has been amended to include the provision of the bicycle routes in accordance with relevant standards at the proponent's cost.</p> <p>Agreed. The Statement of Commitments has been amended to include the provision of bicycle parking spaces in weather protected areas at grade where possible at the development application stage.</p>
6	24/11/11	Niall Johnson	DECCW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No site auditor to review the investigations in the Environmental Site Assessment report has been engaged and no commitment has been made as to when this will occur</li> <li>Recommends that a site auditor is engaged to prepare a site audit statement on the adequacy of the investigations to date</li> <li>Any additional requirements</li> </ul>	<p>A site auditor will be engaged at the relevant stage, which is anticipated to form a condition of consent at the relevant development application stage.</p> <p>Refer to above comment.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>

## Review of Agency submissions for Majors Bay, Mortlake

No	Date	Author	Agency	Issues raised	Comments
				<p>arising from the audit process are to be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following any additional investigations and preparation of remediation action plans, a site auditor is to prepare a site audit statement confirming the site can be made suitable, with another site audit statement following the remediation and validation works</li> <li>• Investigations and remediation works to be in accordance with relevant guidelines</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>