

25 March 2013

Karen Jones
Director Metropolitan & Regional Projects South
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001
Attn: Matthew Rosel

Dear Ms Jones,

Marrickville Metro MP 09_0191 MOD1 – Response to Submissions

Please find attached our response to submissions following the recent exhibition of the Section 75W Application to modify Major Project 09_0191 for Marrickville Metro.

We trust that this response will assist in your assessment of the project.

Please do not hesitate to contact me on 8233 7631 should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely,



Nicholas Dowman
Consultant

COUNCIL COMMENT	PROPONENT RESPONSE
Modification 1 – support for deletion of circular ramp design and replacement with a revised vehicle ramp	Noted
Modification 2 – support extension of the building to the western boundary, replacing the vehicle ramp	Noted
Modification 3 – support increased building setback to Smidmore street at ground floor level. Encourage a set of smaller retail frontages onto Smidmore Street at the eastern end by breaking the large retail block into smaller retail pieces.	Noted Proponent supports this approach in principle, but final tenancy design is yet to be determined and will be subject to design development and leasing.
Modification 4 – support for altering and extending the double height void space internally within the building to improve amenity	Noted
Modification 5 – support for revised retail layout design to accommodate changes to the vehicle ramp, void area and public domain improvements on Smidmore Street. Council encourage smaller retail frontages onto Smidmore Street as per comments to Mod 3.	Noted Proponent supports this approach in principle, but final tenancy design is yet to be determined and will be subject to design development and leasing.
Modification 6 - a modest reduction in the scale of the approved development and parking provision Council support for revised car parking provision	Noted

COUNCIL COMMENT	PROPONENT RESPONSE
<p>Modification 7 - a new façade design and landscape treatment.</p> <p>Council agrees with the proponent that the new facade design is a significant improvement on the design as approved.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Landscape Master Plan Drawing No.100 revision B dated 13.12.12 indicates that in certain areas the proposed Council footpath is contained wholly within the development site.</p>	<p>The Council footpath is generally still maintained outside the development site boundary. The exceptions being :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> at the west end of Smidmore Street (where we propose the footpath be brought in-bound of the kerb line with a landscaped verge to improve pedestrian safety near the intersection of Smidmore St & Edinburgh Rd) at the eastern corners of the site (consistent with the approved scheme). <p>Condition E16 of the Concept Approval requires that public domain works (including footpath works) are completed satisfactorily in accordance with Council approved plans and specifications. Accordingly, this is a matter of design detail that will be addressed to Council's satisfaction at the detailed design stage of the project.</p>
<p>Landscape treatments should be designed in such way that the road reserve can be subtly delineated from the development site.</p>	<p>A subtle delineation in the form of a narrow band of different material could be used to mark the extent of the Council footpath & the Development.</p> <p>This could be addressed by way of a further</p>

COUNCIL COMMENT	PROPONENT RESPONSE
	condition of consent If required.
Additional Comments	
<p>Treatment of Smidmore Street</p> <p>Concern about the lack of clarity in the s.75W application about the Smidmore Street treatments.</p>	<p>Modification is not intended to resolve Smidmore Street treatments. Separate details will be provided as required by Condition B15 of the Project Approval, which requires approval by the Local Area Traffic Committee.</p>
<p>Footway widths in the vicinity of the development</p> <p>The s.75W plans show instances where the relocation of the footway will be necessary as a result of various changes to road layouts. Council generally does not support the narrowing of any footway or footpath. In any event, the absolute minimum width for footways (paved area of 1.8-2.0m) must be adhered to at all times.</p> <p>This matter is discussed in the following parts of the s.75W report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Appendix B, p12: The northern kerb will require relocation to ensure a minimum lane configuration consisting of two westbound lanes (3.3m and 3.0m) and two east bound lanes(3.3m and 3.0m) separated by a 0.6m central median; · Appendix B, p13: The northern kerb alignment will require relocation to ensure adequate carriageway width to accommodate bus layover and turning movements entering and departing the terminus; and · Section 2.4.2.4: The existing roundabout at Smidmore Street and Murray Street will be retained in its current format. It is proposed to adjust the kerb alignment to provide adequate carriageway width for a 14.5m bus turning from Murray Street (north bound) left into Smidmore Street (west bound). 	<p>Footpath widths to Smidmore St, Edinburgh Rd & Murray St are generally consistent with the approved scheme, currently designed at a minimum of 1.8m width.</p> <p>Increased setback with this scheme has further improved the extent of public space around the development. <i>Refer to sketch prepared by FJMT.</i></p>

COUNCIL COMMENT	PROPONENT RESPONSE
Bicycle Parking Council advises the proponent to seek the advice of an experienced bicycle planning consultant and the local bicycle user group to plan and design the bicycle parking facilities.	Noted and will be addressed as part of satisfying condition B22.
Building Code Matters No concerns raised in terms of satisfying BCA requirements	Noted
Issues Raised by Council's Tree Specialist Support to remove the 21 trees along Edinburgh Road not previously assessed.	Noted
Request that the 4 Cabbage Palms be transplanted rather than removed.	Our expert advice indicates that the cabbage palms could be transplanted locally or relocated for reuse off site. This can be addressed via a condition of consent if required.
Support the removal of the 2 eucalypts in Smidmore Street previously identified to be retained Additional conditions recommended in respect to the management of trees:	Noted
1. Transplant the four Livistona australis (cabbage tree palms) to a new location either on the subject site or elsewhere.	Noted – refer to comment above.
2. Incorporate the General Tree Protection Specification (Appendix 1, Tree iQ, 2012) into the conditions of consent. In addition, add soil moisture monitoring and maintenance throughout the project.	Addressed in Conditions D28 and D31 of the Project Approval.

COUNCIL COMMENT	PROPONENT RESPONSE
3. Include monitoring and certification by the project arborist at appropriate strategic stages, including post TPZ establishment prior to demolition, site establishment, during and following construction, completion of landscaping, and practical completion.	Addressed in Conditions D28 and D31 of the Project Approval.
4. Install permanent computerised soil moisture monitoring and irrigation for all retained and planted trees.	Consistent with the consent conditions for the approved scheme, Tree 82 will be provided with soil moisture monitoring and irrigation given that the levels surrounding are to be raised.
5. Design tree planting pits for all trees so that there is adequate soil volume to ensure the health and growth of the new trees.	Proponent supports this design approach and will be documented at the detailed design stage.
6. Ensure electrical cables will not be located above the Eucalyptus paniculata (grey ironbarks) and Fraxinus griffithii (evergreen ash).	Consistent with the consent conditions for the approved scheme (Condition D17), the overhead wires on the northern footpath of Edinburgh Road adjacent to the site curtilage will be undergrounded.

