

## Consideration of Assessment of Approved Concept and Consequence arising from Modification 5 against the previous key issues

KEY ISSUES CONSIDERED IN ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL CONCEPT (as reported in DG Assessment Report, July 2009)	CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM MODIFICATION 5
<p><b>Residential Use and Integrity of Tourism Use:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Important to achieve a tourist development on the subject site, particularly restaurants/function centres which adjoin the lake's foreshore and utilise the lake as an asset;</i></li> <li>• <i>Some level of permanent residential development seems appropriate;</i></li> <li>• <i>Concerns with past concepts which had &gt;70% of site set aside for residential land use and separated from tourism use, seen to undermine tourism zone</i></li> <li>• <i>Max 50% to be residential, with 100% also able to be used for tourism;</i></li> <li>• <i>No more than 50% residential accommodation on site at any one time;</i></li> <li>• <i>To maintain integrity of tourism use, conditions/tittle restrictions required to limit min of 50% accommodations to short stay terms. Conditions C4, C5 and C6 applied.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The modified concept maintains and seeks to strengthen for delivery the tourist and hospitality uses of the approved concept including the restaurant/function centre, with the proposed increase in accommodation units identified to assist in that purpose.</p> <p>The proposed increase in accommodation is proposed for both short stay <u>and</u> residential accommodation and maintains the intentions of the approved concept to apply to the modified concept by maintaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• approved ratios (up to 50% to be residential with option for those to have dual use also for tourism);</li> <li>• approved ratio of no more than 50% residential accommodation on site at any time (incl stages); and</li> <li>• the intent behind the approved conditions/titling restriction for short stay.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the modified site layout and arrangement of space, only approximately 13.5% of the site (in a footprint sense ie. buildings C, D, E, G &amp; H) is set aside for use only by residential occupants only (although even that may be used for tourism use should owners choose to). Additionally the intention for pedestrian access by all (tourists, public and residents) around all buildings is strengthened in the modified concept, as is the amenity of that space for that purpose.</p> <p>Overall the integrity of the tourist outcome on site is maintained.</p>
<p><b>Flooding and Climate Change:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All habitable floor levels to be above flood and sea level planning levels (as determined at the time being 2.82m AHD and 1.1m AHD for marina hardstand;</i></li> <li>• <i>Flood Evacuation Plan be in place for marina utility building and undercroft parking area, with evacuation to PMF level in 100 years;</i></li> <li>• <i>Principle 12 provides details of guidelines to be met</i></li> <li>• <i>Condition C21 applied requiring detailed flood study and consistency with Principle 12.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The flooding and climate change consequences of the modified concept has been considered. A replacement flooding report including comparison on flooding and climate change between the approved and proposed concept has been provided (<b>Appendix F</b>). The approved concept extends into flood planning areas with varying parts of the site affected by current flood levels, as well as projected 50 year and 100 year 1:100 year flood levels (incorporating climate change). The modified concept also extends similarly into flood planning areas.</p> <p>The intention of the approved concept, to design habitable areas above flood and sea level rise planning levels is unchanged. As an outcome of the 2012 studies by LMCC, new flood planning levels including climate change allowances has been established by Lake Macquarie City Council. The modified concept seeks to incorporate and adopt those flood planning levels into the concept via update to approved Principle 12.</p> <p>The need for a detailed flood study required by condition C21 has been superseded (or met) by studies undertaken by Lake Macquarie City Council (LMCC) in 2012.</p> <p>The intention of the approved concept to provide flood evacuation plans for certain parts of the site, with evacuation to PMF level in 100years is unchanged and will equally apply to the modified concept. The intention for consideration of broad sea level rise adaption measures is unchanged and will equally apply to the modified concept. These requirements are included in Principle 12, and are retained under the modified concept.</p> <p>One specific additional flood mitigation measure has been identified from design development, being the provision of a flood gate at one location to a pedestrian connection to the undercroft parking area in the northern precinct. This falls within the broad requirements of existing Principle 12, however, has been specifically noted in revised Principle 12.</p>
<p><b>Aboriginal and Cultural Heritage:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Principle 18 addresses all aboriginal and cultural</i></li> </ul>	<p>The intention of the approved concept to require a Cultural Heritage Management Plan and Heritage Interpretation Policy is</p>

*heritage recommendations*

- *Requirement for Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) and Heritage Interpretation Policy (HIP), prepared, and consultation with aboriginal community;*
- *Condition C22 applied requiring CHMP and HIP for whole of site to be provided and approved as part of first stage of development.*

unchanged and will equally apply to the modified concept. (note: a CHMP and HIP has been submitted to LMCC for approval as part of DA 1503/2014).

Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permits (AHIPs) will be required for each stage. This process will incorporate the same salvages as per the approved concept.

Controlling access around the south eastern immediate lake foreshore (to control access and limit damage to features sited there) has been a consistent outcome sought on aboriginal heritage grounds. As such, the modified concept (whilst seeking perimeter pathways within the public reserve elsewhere on the site ie around the northern precinct) retains the construction of a shared pathway system outside the public reserve (but retaining it for public access purposes) along the south eastern edge, consistent with the concept approval, meaning it is setback from the lake edge and clear of existing fringing vegetation along the south eastern perimeter of the site. The modified concept identifies a potential for viewing areas to be constructed at various points from the perimeter shared pathway system towards the lake views and will be subject to design development as part of development applications. It is not intended that they will extend into the tree line, nor to the lake edge or beyond. They will also be subject to AHIPs and the CHMP and HIP. The principle of controlling public access will apply specifically to discourage access down to the sensitive aboriginal sites on the immediate foreshore around the south eastern waters edge.

No modifications are proposed to Principle 18 other than

- to replace Koompahtoo LALC with the now relevant Biraban LALC;
- consistency update to replace village piazza references and to broaden rather than limit interpretation outcomes including types and their locations;
- modifications to enable some shared pathways and purpose designed viewing areas (as outlined above) to be sited within parts of the public reserve, whilst retaining the intention of controlling access relating to the south-eastern perimeter;
- update to replace earthworks monitoring with grader scraps for part of the site where salvage is not proposed to reflect current DECC policy.

It is noted that OEH has reviewed modification 5 and advised it poses no additional impacts to aboriginal cultural heritage and has no additional comments or requirements.

It is also proposed to only modify Condition C22 to correct an error of the second paragraph which should reference 'european' rather than 'aboriginal' heritage.

**Ecological Impacts:**

Saltmarsh community

- *Concerns about impacts on the water regime that supports the salt marsh community around the unnamed bay and impacts from runoff on salt marsh community;*
- *Principle 11 requires stormwater management plans to consider groundwater implications in the design and construction methodologies, noting opinion that an appropriate outcome is possible;*
- *Condition C11 requires baseline verification including mapping and survey of health and size of the salt marsh community;*
- *Conditions C19 and C20 applied that together provide future assessment on relevant matters that manage impact on water regime and runoff and the salt marsh community.*

Saltmarsh community

Condition C11 (baseline of saltmarsh community) is unaltered (note: mapping and survey of health and size of the saltmarsh community has been completed and submitted to LMCC for approval as part of DA 1503/2014).

The approved concept includes a hard stand footprint for the majority of the northern precinct which adjoins the saltmarsh community around the unnamed bay, with some filling and some excavation. The modified concept is similar in that respect regarding extent of hardstand (now carpark) and some filling and some excavation. The relevant requirements of Principle 11 and Conditions C19, C20 are retained and will equally apply to the modified concept.

It is noted that the modified concept seeks variation to building

**KEY ISSUES CONSIDERED IN ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL CONCEPT**  
(as reported in DG Assessment Report, July 2009)

**CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM MODIFICATION 5**

setbacks to the unnamed bay, but the siting of the building does not increase consequences to the salt marsh community, noting the buildings are contained within the site and separated from the salt marsh community by access driveway, hardstand areas and pathways, and are on fill, similar to the concept approval.

Removal of EEC

*Removal of EEC and reinstatement of equivalent area and additional assisted rehabilitation is adequate, with Principle 8 containing appropriate guidelines. Conditions C9 and C18 applied to guide Vegetation Management Planning.*

Removal of EEC

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5. Modification 2, recently recommended for approval, removes the need for the extent of EEC clearing as originally approved.

Principle 8 and Conditions C9 and C18 will continue to apply.

Marine Turtles

*Marina related impacts and conditions for responsible boating handbook*

Marine Turtles

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5

**Foreshore Recession:**

- *Vegetation Management Plans provide opportunity to consider foreshore stabilisation, noting that there is adequate room between the development and waters edge to implement strategies if required to protect against long term foreshore recession.*
- *Notes that marina unlikely to exacerbate process.*

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5

**Visual Impact:**

Land Based Component

- *Setback and heights of accommodation reduces visual impact to eastern and southern edges of site, with buildings not exceeding crown height of foreshore vegetation, with acceptable visibility of development to the east and south;*
- *Residential land to west has limited views of the water and scale of accommodation does not present adverse visual impact;*
- *Site is visually exposed to the north and any development will have an impact. Notes that vegetation to n-w around site limits views from that direction and views limited to approximately 50 dwellings at a distance of between 600-800m across the bay (which have extensive panoramic views).*
  - *Notes that village piazza precinct achieves views out to lake and marina*
  - *Notes that accommodation precincts (central and southern parts of site), extent of impact to north reduced in approved concept from original proposals, noting central north-south roads, east-west connections and setbacks from foreshore provide break in built form and opportunities for landscaping*
  - *Concludes that introduction of built form as proposed will alter the view, but not considered an unreasonable impost on the overall view from those dwellings and not a reason to refuse proposal.*
  - *Impact of view considered reasonable, additional measures can be undertaken to further reduce impact from lake, ultimately as applied via Condition B5 amendments to principles 5 (accommodation precinct façade articulation, recessed facades and planting of native trees) and principle 8 (substantial replanting in front of workshop areas and where practical, in front of piazza).*

Land Based Component

The visual consequences of the modified concept has been comprehensively assessed and included within the EA. An addendum visual assessment providing specific comparison on visual effects between the approved and proposed concept has also been provided (*Appendix D*). That assessment reveals:

- The modified concept would be no more visible or prominent than the Concept Approval.
- Most public domain views other than close views from the water are in the Low sensitivity zone.
- The modified concept would cause no greater impact on view through the site from the waterway and foreshores to the north east than the Concept Approval.
- The overall rating of the visual effects of the modified concept on its total visual catchment was assessed to be low to medium, the same as for the Concept Approval.
- The modified concept would provide a high level of view accessibility and be significantly better in that regard than the Concept Approval.
- The Physical Absorption Capacity (PAC) for the modified concept was rated the same as for the Concept Approval, as was the visual compatibility.
- Overall, in comparison to the Concept Approval, the visual impacts of modified concept are considered to be either neutral (no different) or superior (less).
- Considers modified concept provides a higher degree of accessibility to view, a more equitable distribution of view sharing, a higher proportion of perceived public to private space and a more spacious, inviting and engaging environment.

Marina

*Not summarised here*

Marina

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5

Urban Design Issues:

The urban design justifications for and consequences of the modified concept has been comprehensively assessed and included within the EA, and specifically within the Design, Justification and Comparison Report (*Appendix B*).

Detailed justification is provided on modified setbacks, heights, density, permeability/legibility and public domain outcomes which are not repeated in this table. The modification is an alternative approach on setbacks, heights and density to achieving the same key principles and objectives of those, and the legibility, permeability and public domain outcomes sought to be achieved.

Setbacks

- Overall setbacks are acceptable.
- Notes no DCP requirements other than 6m setback from public reserve
- 20m setback around public reserve in accommodation precinct exceeds 6m, and up to 45m setback to Bluff Point provides curtilage around cultural features;
- 15m building separation as extension of Celestial Drive allows east/west vista and complies within minimum building separation requirements of DCP 1 and RFDC;
- 8m building separation along alignment of southern most road extension from residential subdivision allows east/west vista
- 4m setback along Trinity Point Drive (with some opportunity to build to boundary to provide variation and character)
- 15m building separation internal to site allows north-south views and connects Bluff Point to piazza.
- 6m setback within piazza area to public reserve east, but generally 8-15m
- 30m setback to unnamed bay, exceeds 6m.

Setbacks

- Modified setbacks will still provide curtilage and publicly accessible space at Bluff Point
- Modified building separations will still provide east/west vista as extension to Celestial Drive. It is noted that notwithstanding the southern road in the adjoining residential estate identified at the time has since been removed from the approved residential structure, other east/west vistas are proposed.
- Modified building separation and connected internal access way (north/south) still provides a north/south break in built form and connectivity north/south;
- Setback to Trinity Point Drive has been retained;
- Modified setbacks to the east will still provide space for publicly accessible shared perimeter pathway and space;
- Modified setback to the public reserve to the east of marina/tourism/hospitality precinct justified, with shift in shared perimeter pathway into reserve for this precinct;
- Modified building setback to unnamed bay is justified and without impact to the saltmarsh community.

Heights

- Notes no DCP height requirements
- Heights of 3-5 storey with pitched roof form, maximum heights approx. 16m AHD.
- Acceptable, addressed as part of visual impact, noting also that vegetation along eastern edge of site and south is taller and provides backdrop to ensure buildings do not protrude above tree line. Heights of masts in marina also provide scale.
- Accommodation section lower (1-3 storeys plus pitched roof form, with rows facing Trinity Point Drive partially exposed parking structure) and includes landscaped areas that can contain vegetation to provide backdrop to piazza area;

Heights

- Modified heights meet approved principles taking into account context and site analysis, and visual impact analysis, in combination with siting of building envelopes and creation of meaningful spaces at ground plane.

Density

- Acknowledges significant concern in submissions
- Density resolved in context of resolving built form outcomes, carparking, services, landscaping and building/open space and ecological setbacks
- Future applications will need to demonstrate acceptable amenity;
- Traffic generation acceptable, all other impacts have been considered and acceptable offsite impacts, an indication that density is acceptable.

Density

- Similar approach as per approved concept in determining density arising as a result of other considerations and off site impacts.
- Doubling of accommodation numbers does not equate to doubling of accommodation floor space (only 16% increase, or additional 4300m<sup>2</sup>), nor a doubling in population density (only 4% increase in number of bedrooms).

Permeability and Legibility

- Well defined accessways (east-west) that improve legibility of site and terminated with views and obviously public

Permeability and Legibility

- East west access ways legible, obviously public and terminated with views;
- North south access way retained to provide additional



**KEY ISSUES CONSIDERED IN ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL CONCEPT**  
*(as reported in DG Assessment Report, July 2009)*

**CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM MODIFICATION 5**

- *Permeability increased with width in foreshore setback to east and introduction of north-south road*
- *Village piazza open in some sections to invite public in*
- *Public spaces have adequate width and separation from built form*
- *Combined urban design principles and conditions C3, C10 and C26 facilitate outcome.*

- permeability;
- Variable width to eastern foreshore will still provide perimeter permeability, obviously public and with high amenity
  - Public spaces of eastern and southern perimeter, Bluff Point and multiple east/west connections have adequate width and separation from built form.

Public Domain

- *Setback allows adequate space for pedestrian spaces to be obviously public*
- *Principle 3 seeks edges of undercroft areas in northern precinct to not be sheer unarticulated nor present as a single vertical face, but integrated into architecture of the site*
- *Café to interact with boardwalk*
- *Piazza includes adequate separations to create an invitation into the space, with views into piazza provided.*
- *Concept includes improved public space, pedestrian access and adequate room for spaces to be embellished to achieve high quality public domain for the area.*
- *Principles 4,5 and 7 and condition C3, C10 and C26 facilitate appropriate outcome,*

Public Domain

- Pedestrian spaces remain obviously public with adequate room to be embellished to achieve quality public domain.
- Undercroft parking in northern precinct concealed and integrated into site planning;

SEPP 65

- *Initial concerns of Panel predominantly resolved*
- *Condition C3 applied requiring residential buildings to demonstrate compliance or satisfactorily justify any non-compliance with SEPP 65.*

SEPP 65

- Condition C3 will continue to apply
- Review against SEPP 65 design principles and RFDC (**Appendix E**) has demonstrated that building envelopes and modified concept are capable of compliance or satisfactory justification.

Additionally a design review by the Lake Macquarie City Council SEPP 65 Panel has determined that the revised modified concept presents an appropriate concept response to the SEPP 65 Design principles subject to ongoing design development.

**Public Access:**

Land Based

- *20m setback provides for landscaping, path and be able to inviting and useable by the public, with reduced heights*
- *Amenity internal to site doesn't 'borrow' from the amenity of the reserve;*
- *Access through site improved with accessways on grid ensuring these spaces look and feel public and will operate as intended.*
- *Piazza softened with split level café to transition from piazza level down to pathway, with landscaping to edge and large stairs.*
- *Access considerations arising from marina boat lift*
- *Condition C26 applied referencing Principle 4 and restating key requirements including village piazza, setbacks to reserve, setback to Bluff Point to create a publicly accessible open space, publicly accessible pathway around southern and eastern edge of development, east-west publicly accessible pathways from Trinity Point Drive, public access to breakwater, not impeding access to northern part of site and pedestrian pathway along western edge.*
- *Condition C10 applied referencing landscape plan for each relevant stage referencing Principle 9 and stating key requirements including species lists, surface areas, fencing and works in public domain, landscape interface between private/public domain, landscape treatment for parking areas, cultural landscape planting retention*

Land Based

The urban design justifications for and consequences of the modified concept has been comprehensively assessed and included within the EA, and specifically within the Design, Justification and Comparison Report (**Appendix B**).

Detailed justification is provided on land based public access and public domain outcomes which are not repeated in this table. The modification is an alternative approach on space creation to achieve the same key principles and objectives for public access and public domain outcomes being spaces that are inviting and useable by the public, with appropriate interfaces to private domain with good landscaping and embellishment.

Water

- Not summarised here

Water

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5

**KEY ISSUES CONSIDERED IN ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL CONCEPT**  
*(as reported in DG Assessment Report, July 2009)*

**CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM MODIFICATION 5**

**Marina Development and Potential Impacts:**

- *Not summarised here*

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5

**Helipad and Acoustic Issues:**

- *Not summarised here*

No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5

**Other Acoustic Issues:**

- *Identifies noise criterion to apply to the development including road traffic and during operations;*
- *Identifies that construction noise management may require extensive noise control measures throughout the construction stage with ongoing noise and vibration monitoring and provision of dedicated noise complaint hotline*
- *Marina to have a noise management plan (operations);*
- *Identifies development has potential to create significant acoustic impact on existing residents but with appropriate planning and design can reduce such impacts to achieve acceptable limits*
- *Acknowledges that whilst preliminary acoustic concepts provided, actual controls that will be incorporated into the development have yet to be finalised, due to concept nature.*
- *Requires all future applications to have full and proper acoustic assessment, and identifies acoustic requirements to be met prior to CC and prior to OC.*
- *Condition C25 applied requiring detailed acoustic assessment for each relevant stage of the development, including construction noise management plan, road traffic noise plan and operational noise management plan, and consistent with Principle 16 (as updated by terms of Condition B5).*

Refer Section 3.6.

**Water Cycle Management:**

- *Principle 11 includes requirement for all future applications to include stormwater management plans.*
- *At concept plan stage, exact nature and suitability of plan is not available, however based on Principle 11, opinion that an appropriate outcome is possible.*
- *Condition C19 applied requiring stormwater management plans that align with Principle 11 and address water sensitive design, measures to not impact on water quality of Bardens Bay and riparian vegetation, treatment train controls, specific requirements related to marina, vessel hardstand and workshop and marina construction and water quality monitoring system.*
- *Condition C23 and C24 applied for erosion and sediment control plans and construction management plans.*

The water cycle management justifications for and consequences of the modified concept has been comprehensively assessed and included within the EA, and specifically within the Stormwater Report (*Appendix F*).

Detailed assessment is provided on stormwater management of the modified concept.

The same water quality targets from the concept approval are applied to the modified concept and it is demonstrated that appropriate stormwater management measures can be incorporated to meet those targets.

The modified concept does not identify any new sources of potential water quality impact. The modified concept, consistent with the concept approval, requires appropriate erosion and sediment control during construction. The modified concept (with reduced pervious area and increased pervious areas) includes minor adjustments to the treatment train (deletion of permeable pavers and roof top gardens, inclusion of GPTs and reduced volume for rainwater tanks and reduced filter area for bioretention basins), with adequate space available for the adjusted treatment train requirements.

Minor amendment is proposed to Principle 11 and C19 to reflect updated treatment measures and consistency detail, and condition C19 along with C23 and C24 will continue to apply.

**Traffic and Access:**

- *RTA advised will comment at DA stage and no significant objection to Concept Plan;*
- *Existing road system is adequate to cater for increased demand from the development subject to some intersection upgrades;*
- *Identifies intersections that require upgrading as a result of other traffic growth, other anticipated growth*

A comprehensive traffic and access assessment for the modified concept, including the traffic consequences of the modified concept is included in Appendix F of the submitted EA, and has not needed to be updated as part of this RTS.

Whilst the modification increases traffic generations arising from both the increased accommodation and more specific particulars for the tourism and hospitality uses (whilst also

**KEY ISSUES CONSIDERED IN ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL CONCEPT**  
(as reported in DG Assessment Report, July 2009)

**CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM MODIFICATION 5**

<p><i>and in some cases a component of traffic arising from concept.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Principle 10 notes agreement to be reached with relevant road authorities regarding external road upgrades.</i></li> <li>• <i>Condition C7 applied.</i></li> </ul>	<p>potentially facilitating higher on site cross use), the assessment determines that the intersection upgrades identified in the concept approval (and as subsequently identified by LMCC through updated section 94 planning to include traffic within the catchment in 2012) will adequately cater for the modified concept. The assessment also determines that the existing road system remains adequate to cater for the modified concept.</p> <p>Condition C7 continues to apply, and Principle 10 has been updated to reflect the revised layout and access outcomes.</p>
<p><b>Waste Management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Adequate on site storage for waste and recycling streams intended, and waste management plans to be prepared for construction and operational phases.</i></li> </ul>	<p>No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5</p> <p>Waste Management Plans will accompany each stage development applications to show adequate on site storage for waste streams of all uses.</p>
<p><b>Groundwater:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Likely to intercept groundwater, with dewatering anticipated with strategies to manage the effects on groundwater quality</i></li> <li>• <i>DWE satisfied adequate measures can ensure minimal environmental impact, with permit required.</i></li> <li>• <i>Condition C20 applied relating to management of groundwater</i></li> </ul>	<p>The modified concept is also likely to intercept groundwater with dewatering during construction of certain components anticipated. Geotechnical assessment (<b>Appendix H</b>) identifies that sump and pump methods are likely workable for undercroft parking area and services, with temporary dewatering during construction of deeper excavations (such as underground fuel tanks associated with the marina). The report identifies that the need for dewatering after the construction period is not anticipated.</p> <p>Condition C20 will continue to apply, and permit will be required relating to intercepting groundwater.</p>
<p><b>Natural Hazards:</b> <u>Contamination</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Site has been remediated and audited</i></li> </ul>	<p>No change of consequence applicable to Modification 5 relating to contamination or geotechnical assessment.</p>
<p><u>Acid Sulphate Soils</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Acid Sulphate Soils and potential Acid Sulphate Soils identified</i></li> <li>• <i>ASS Management Plan required, as noted in Principle 11.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Whilst the modified concept has additional excavation that may increase additional volume of soil that may require management of acid sulphate soils, geotechnical advise is that no additional management measures for ASS are required to apply to the modified concept beyond those identified in the 2007 ASSMP, which remains valid. Principle 11 requiring ASS management will continue to apply to the modified concept.</p>
<p><u>Geotechnical Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Notes geotechnical characteristics on site and that suitable engineering outcomes will be available and site suitable for development in regards to geotechnical issues.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 94 and other contributions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Residential components will be levied in accordance with s94 plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>Notes that s94 plan excludes traffic management scheme and therefore traffic requirements may need a VPA;</i></li> <li>• <i>Notes that s94 plan excludes stormwater and drainage, to be provided on site;</i></li> <li>• <i>Notes that no specific levy for tourism development and need or otherwise for condition or VPA to be determined.</i></li> <li>• <i>Condition C7 applied relating to reaching agreement with relevant road authorities for identified intersection works.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Since 2009, LMCC has updated its section 94 planning which includes the site.</p> <p>The 2012 Section 94 plan now includes traffic management and requirements, as well as levies for residential and non-residential land uses, including tourist uses, commercial/retail uses and others. It is anticipated that section 94 contributions will be levied as conditions of consent on each stage development application, commensurate with the provisions of the plan. That will include contributions arising from peak vehicle trips towards traffic requirements including intersection upgrades. It is not anticipated that any other contributions will be required.</p> <p>Condition C7 will continue to apply.</p>
<p><b>Sustainability :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Principle 17 meets sustainability objective and Condition C8 applied for future applications to address solar access, energy and water efficiency and meet (where applicable) BASIX requirements.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Principle 17 and Condition C8 will continue to apply to the modified concept. The modified concept proposes residential building envelopes that are capable of complying with (or exceeding) solar access and other sustainability requirements of SEPP 65, and water and energy requirements of BASIX.</p>