

MP 07_0166 - Wahroonga Estate Redevelopment (Council Responses)

Council	Issue	Details	Response
<p>Ku-ring-gai Council</p>	<p>Density</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development will create another town centre. ▪ Not supported by roads and public transport infrastructure. ▪ More appropriate as a neighbourhood centre. ▪ Address Council wide town centre study and any conflicts the site may have with this plan. ▪ Council supports the expansion of the hospital, not the scale of the residential surrounding it. ▪ Council has not determined and acceptable level of residential. ▪ Not clear as to what type of housing is required to sustain hospital. 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a <i>“Knowledge Asset and Key Industry”</i> and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity association with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The site is a specialised employment centre. Public transport will improve as density increases.</p> <p>The proposed residential development is required to make the hospital expansion feasible and to provide a form of affordable accommodation for onsite users and within the Ku-ring-gai LGA. A range of housing is proposed to cater for a diverse range of needs – from aged care and student accommodation to nursing accommodation and residential apartments.</p> <p>The density is appropriate for a specialised centre in the same regard as it would be in any other centre. The density is also comparable to the density and scale of development on the UTS site.</p> <p>The RTA have raised no objections to the proposal, subject to works being completed as listed in their submission to the Department of Planning. We have inserted a Statement of Commitment relating to the delivery of works scoped from this RTA submission.</p>
	<p>Hospital needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council have concerns that there is not enough detail resolving the hospital needs and uses. ▪ Unclear about the 	<p>Council should recognise that the proposal is conceptual and sets the framework for approval of a more detailed Project Application that will be lodged for the hospital.</p> <p>The proposal sets maximum GFAs in the document and maximum traffic implications have been addressed.</p>

		relationship between residential use and the hospital	<p>The hospital master plan has been deliberately separated because of its complexity. The future hospital master plan will be framed by the controls set within this Concept Plan.</p> <p>Details have been provided in this Preferred Project Report about the relationship of the residential use, the hospital and the landowner.</p>
	Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council concerned R1 Zone too broad and should be limited ▪ Residential zoning to include Special Uses. ▪ Asset Protection Zones. Council would like these as E2. 	<p>The use of the R1 zone is consistent with the recently rezoned UTS site with a similar list of permissible uses as proposed by Ku-ring-gai Council in the exhibited Town Centre LEP.</p> <p>SP2 zone has been expanded to include the residential precinct to the immediate south of the hospital precinct.</p> <p>All APZs required to be associated with new development are proposed to be zoned E3 Environmental Management. The E3 zone is considered suitable as a transition zone between environmental conservation zones and other urban or rural zones – which is the case in this instance. This E3 zone also reflects Department of Planning’s <i>Practice Note 09-002 Environmental Protection Zones</i>.</p>
	Urban design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding proposed height and bulk, overshadowing road networks and links to pedestrian. 	<p>The proposed envelopes and unit typologies have been tested against the requirements of SEPP 65 and found to comply.</p> <p>The built form parameters proposed as part of the SSS listing are considered appropriate for this specialised employment centre of State significance.</p> <p>Specific issues relating to height, bulk and overshadowing are matters that need to be considered and addressed as part of future Development Applications within the estate.</p>
	Flora and fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council’s largest concern aside from density. ▪ Residential development impacts on EECs and core habitats. ▪ LGA wide mapping study for BGHF and STIF. ▪ No attempt has been made to avoid the iron bark forest 	<p>Vegetation mapping has been reviewed. Refer to updated mapping contained in the Preferred Project Report and the attached addendum to the Flora and Fauna report.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of buildings at the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan will also retain a significant buffer to the existing powerful owl habitat.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately</p>

		<p>from the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal effectively isolates a narrow selection of iron bark forest that currently enjoys good connectivity. ▪ Impacts on powerful owl habitat. 	<p>1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In regard to the Powerful Owl habitat, we are still proposing to produce a Powerful Owl Management Plan even though development has been removed from the majority of the Residential East Precinct.</p>
	Bushfire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No Asset Protection Zone map in report ▪ Not enough information on fire management plan. ▪ No relationship with bushfire flora and fauna studies. ▪ Concerns regarding the way the outcomes have been calculated. ▪ No consideration of APZ on EECs. ▪ Evacuation issues (SEPP 53 dual occupancy and SEPP Seniors) ▪ Risk management standards not addressed. ▪ DoP will look at RFS comments. 	<p>An asset protection map has been inserted in both the PPR and the Bushfire addendum report.</p> <p>A comprehensive response to these issues is included in the attached letter from bushfire expert Australian Bushfire Protection Planners.</p>

	Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact of discounting on housing allocated to staff, students on traffic generation and parking. ▪ No figures on car pooling and car sharing schemes cited. ▪ Bus transport – there is no evidence that uses will mode shift even when services are extended. ▪ Highlighting potential required expansion of Fox Valley Road, not just intersection upgrades. ▪ Need to correspond with local road upgrades, not just RTA on regional. Need confidence on issue of upgrades. 	<p>A comprehensive response to these issues is included in the attached addendum to the Traffic Report by Halcrow.</p> <p>We also note that the RTA have considered the exhibited proposal and have raised no objections to the exhibited proposal, subject to works being completed as listed in their submission to Department of Planning. We have inserted a Statement of Commitment relating to the delivery of works.</p>
	Suitability of the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council does not feel the site is suitable for apartment housing for strata subdivision, particularly those close to the hospital. 	<p>Site should be treated as a specialised centre which is characterised by an employment hub. The proposed residential development is required to make the hospital feasible. The residential density is appropriate for a specialised centre in the same regard as any other centre. The density is also comparable to the density and scale of development on the UTS site.</p>
Hornsby Council	Traffic and Road Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient information has been provided regarding the proposed traffic 	<p>Osborn Road link has been deleted and additional traffic modelling has been undertaken and submitted to the DoP and RTA since exhibition. No objection is raised to the revised traffic arrangements.</p>

		<p>changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to removal of right turn bay into Parkes Street. ▪ Connection between Mount Pleasant Avenue and Osborne Road and vehicular access across Coups Creek is not supported and any links should be restricted to bicycles and pedestrians only. ▪ F3-M2 link should not be considered when modelling intersections. 	<p>In relation to the restriction on the right turn movements into Parkes Street from Pennant Hills Road, our traffic surveys found that only 11 vehicles turned right in the morning peak hour and 7 in the evening peak hour. The redirection of such small traffic volumes is unlikely to have any significant impact based on these small movements but is considered to have more positive advantages in terms of maximizing the capacity of intersection movements through this intersection. It is considered that the redistribution will not cause any impact in relation to other intersections that would cater for this small movement. We deem that modeling of such small volumes is not warranted.</p> <p>Refer also to addendum to Traffic Report by Halcrow.</p> <p>We also note that the RTA have considered the exhibited proposal and have raised no objections to the exhibited proposal, subject to works being completed as listed in their submission to Department of Planning. We have inserted a Statement of Commitment relating to the delivery of works.</p>
	Hornsby Shire Draft Housing Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal must address HSDHS and impacts from Wahroonga Estate. 	<p>Only a small number of allotments are located within the Hornsby Local Government Area and these are not proposed to change. All other potential impacts on regional aspect such as traffic have been addressed separately and found to be satisfactory subject to additional measures.</p>
	Removal of vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss of BGHF and STIF unacceptable and will have regional and local implications. ▪ Clearing of 5.77 ha of native vegetation and modification of 15.36 ha for bushfire protection will impact on existing bushland corridors and is 	<p>Vegetation mapping has been reviewed. Refer to updated mapping contained in the Preferred Project Report and the attached addendum to the Flora and Fauna report.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct and redesign of the school.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed as exhibited). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed as exhibited).</p>

		<p>not acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Impact on Blackbutt Turpentine Community is also identified as local conservation.▪ Loss of habitat a large concern where mitigation measures have not been addressed.▪ Species impact statement has not been undertaken for the site.▪ Offsetting of BGHF as a mitigation measure would be very hard to attain.	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--