

31 July 2018

16075

Carloyn McNally
Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
320 Pitt Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attention: Michelle Niles

Dear Michelle,

**RESPONSE TO SHELLHARBOUR COUNCIL LETTER RE SECOND RTS
SHELL COVE BOAT HARBOUR PRECINCT
SECTION 75W MODIFICATION TO MP 07_0027**

We write on behalf of the proponent Frasers Property Australia (Frasers), formerly Australand Corporation (NSW) Pty Ltd, in relation to the subject Concept Plan Modification MP 07_0027 (Mod 1) for the Shell Cove Boat Harbour Precinct.

This following table has been prepared in response to the matters raised in your email (dated 18 July 2018). A comparative traffic generation analysis, the updated Design Report and foreshore public domain plans are submitted separately.

We trust the information below is sufficient to allow the finalisation of the assessment of the Modification. Should you have any queries about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9956 6962 or jmurray@ethosurban.com.

Yours sincerely,



Jim Murray
Associate Director
9956 6962

Table 1 Responses to the matters raised by the DPE

Matters	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirm whether the street types proposed are sufficient in size and capacity to accommodate the dwelling ranges proposed. I note that the application is a concept approval only and that the detailed street design will be assessed in subsequent development applications 	<p>The street types and sizes proposed as part of the 75W are generally consistent with those proposed under the Concept Approval. CBRK have undertaken a comparative assessment of the traffic generated by the Concept Approval and the 75W to determine any likely change in traffic volumes, and any impacts on the capacity of the proposed street types and sizes. Refer to the table submitted separately.</p> <p>The table compares the traffic generated by the Concept Approval and S75W.</p> <p>The table shows that the revised dwelling cap and mix in the S75W would generate 97 additional peak hour vehicle trips compared to the Concept Approval. This is consistent with the S75W traffic assessment.</p> <p>For most Precincts, the increases are 10 vehicles per hour (two way) or less (Precincts A, B, C, D, and F/G). The biggest increase is in Precinct E – 40 vehicles per hour (two way)</p> <p>These increases in traffic by Precinct would result in only minor increases in traffic flows on the roads within each Precinct of less than 10 vehicles per hour (two way). Such minor increases would not require any change to the street types within each Precinct as set out in the Design Report.</p> <p>Therefore, CBRK can confirm that the street types proposed are sufficient in size and capacity to accommodate the increase in dwellings.</p> <p>It is noted that the total dwellings by Precinct used to calculate the traffic generation are not the maximum dwellings by Precinct identified in the Design Report. This is due to requirement to comply with the overall dwelling cap of 1,556.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the impact on traffic generation between the total dwellings by Precinct used in the table, and the maximum dwellings by Precinct identified in the Design Report is minimal. Any increase could be accommodated by the street types currently proposed within each Precinct.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirm whether the proposed street layouts are consistent with the street layouts already approved by Council as part of the UDG and subdivision DAs; 	<p>There are minor differences between the street layouts in the approved UDGs and subdivision DAs. The Street Network plan in the Cox Design Report has been updated to ensure consistency – refer to the updated Design Report, submitted separately.</p>

Matters	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify any additional changes to the maximum building height and storeys beyond that identified in Section 1.2 of the 'Response to Submissions' document dated 31 May 2018; 	<p>In addition to the changes highlighted in the Response to Submissions report, the following minor change is noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional category added in legend to cover community centre/library building – up to 3 storeys (15m) <p>It is noted that height of the mixed-use development site in the town centre was indicated as having a height of 'up to 5 storeys (20m)' in the original Design Report and the February 2018 Design Report.</p> <p>The building height was amended to 'up to 5 storeys (19m)' in the previous July 2018 Design Report.</p> <p>The updated July 2018 Design Report, submitted separately, has reverted to an indicative height of 'up to 5 storeys (20m)' to ensure the development application for the site (DA 385-2017) is consistent with the current Concept Approval and the Concept Approval (if modified).</p> <p>The 20m height is consistent with height considered in the Visual Impact Assessment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide further information on the discussions with Council concerning the dry boat storage facility/maintenance facility and adjoining residential lots, and the impact of these discussions on the Concept Approval; 	<p>The residential lots immediately adjoining the boat yard facility have been deepened to a depth of 40m to provide a greater setback to the boat yard. This provides for solar amenity to the home as well as reducing acoustic and other impacts associated with the future operations of the facility.</p> <p>Discussions between Frasers and Council are advanced in relation to any impacts between the boat yard and residential dwellings. The matters raised in Council's submission will be addressed in the UDG for this precinct which is currently under review by Council.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirm any changes to the Business Park as part of the modification; 	<p>There are no changes proposed to the Business Park as part of the modification. The current version of the Concept Plan Design Report includes the same indicative built form layout of the Business Park that was included in the indicative plans contained within the original Environmental Assessment prepared by LFA. The Business Park layout was included in response to Council's previous request to include the Business Park as part of the modification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirm if there are any changes to Precincts D and E between the June 2018 and July 2018 Design Reports; 	<p>The June 2018 Design Report includes linework indicating the proposed development superlots. The indicative superlot boundaries have been deleted from the July 2018 Design Report. Otherwise, there are no changes to Precincts D and E between the June 2018 and July 2018 Design Reports.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> identify any changes to public access to the Boat Harbour perimeter. While it is noted that the commitment contained in the SoC to provide "continuous public access to the perimeter of the harbour" is not proposed to be modified, the Public Domain Framework figure in the Design Report does not identify public access to the Boat Harbour perimeter for most of Precinct G. 	<p>The Public Domain Framework figure in the Design Report has been updated to clearly indicate that the public access will be provided to the Boat Harbour waterfront for the entirety of Precinct G.</p> <p>Detailed foreshore public domain plans are submitted separately. The plans are for information only. The plans have been prepared in consultation with Council and will be submitted as a development application to Council soon.</p>

Matters	Response
<p>In addition to the layout inconsistencies to the Design Report identified by Council, the following is also noted and should be updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Domain Framework – the street network of Precinct C2 and G has not been updated to identify the correct configuration of street type LN proposed for the Precinct Housing Typologies Plan – the orange shading (identifying townhouses) goes over the street network in the north-western boundary of the Precinct and street type LN is not identified in Precincts F and G Height Plan - street type LN is not identified in Precincts F and G Section 4.5.3 Overshadowing – Precinct A2 has a park in each image in this section, which is not identified in any other plan Section 6.4 Precinct E and G – the correct street network is not identified in the image 	<p>The Design Report has been updated to reflect these comments. The updated Design Report is submitted separately.</p>