

MP 07_0166 - Wahroonga Estate Redevelopment (Government Department Responses)

| Agency | Date Issued | Government Response to Exhibited Plan | Preferred Project Report response (3 September 2009) |
|--|--------------|---|--|
| Roads and Traffic Authority | 18 June 2009 | <p>No objections are raised to the concept plan subject to the following conditions (as listed in the RTA letter) being incorporated should the Department grant consent to the development</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the RTA would request that a binding Deed of Agreement be entered into with the proponent to undertake these works</p> | <p>The following wording has been added to the Statement of Commitments:</p> <p><i>We commit to enter into a Voluntary Planning Agreement, Deed of Agreement of other mechanism to provide roadwork upgrades that can be reasonably demonstrated to arise from the redevelopment of the Wahroonga Estate. It is anticipated that the ultimate works would be scoped from the list of works identified in the Roads and Traffic Authority letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. Such agreement will be entered into prior to the release of the first construction certificate for development as contemplated by this Concept Plan at Wahroonga Estate</i></p> |
| Department of Environment and Climate Change | 18 June 2009 | <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>* This proposal should be considered in a strategic planning context rather than as a stand alone proposal. As it represents a major land release that is contrary to the NSS and MDP it should at least require consideration under the MDP prior to rezoning progressing</p> <p>* The hospital redevelopment component should be included in the Concept Plan at this stage of the proposal, prior to it progressing further, as it is meant to be a key part of the proposal</p> <p>* Lands should not be zoned R1 in the Mount Pleasant, eastern precinct, Precinct 'B' Central Church and Central Hospital area along the Comenarra Parkway. These areas should be low density residential in accordance with surrounding areas. Limited higher density development should only be considered in less environmentally sensitive areas that are in closer proximity to the hospital and existing denser development, with adequate setbacks included. The Department does not support a roadway in the eastern precinct</p> <p>* The mapping of ecological communities should be reviewed, taking into account more recent mapping and reclassification of ecological communities by Council and the mapping that will soon be released by the Department / Sydney Metro CMA</p> <p>* Loss of endangered and critically endangered BGHF and STIF should be avoided, particularly remnants of these communities in the eastern precinct, and/or remnants in good condition. The concept proposal clearly identifies that there will be a significant impact on these C/EECs</p> <p>* The clearing of 5.77 hectares of native vegetation on site and modification of 15.36 hectares for bushfire protection will impact on the existing bushland corridors and biodiversity of the area and should be avoided or minimised</p> <p>* The impact on habitat for the Powerful Owl is unacceptable. The proposal should be redesigned to minimise impacts on this species, with a buffer provided of at least 200 metres</p> <p>* Fragmentation and loss of habitat, especially large hollow bearing trees for threatened and other fauna species is a concern, which mitigation measures have not adequately addressed</p> | <p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "Knowledge Asset and Key Industry" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated 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>It should be recognised that the proposal is conceptual and sets the framework for approval on the site. Details of the hospital masterplan have been deliberately separated from the Concept Plan due to their complexity.</p> <p>The land zones nominated are appropriate and are consistent with other development projects recently approved by Department of Planning (namely the UTS site). The Preferred Project Plan proposes higher density development towards the centre of the site. The proposed development and roadway in the eastern precinct will be deleted and vegetation will be retained.</p> <p>Noted and completed.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan will preserve native flora and fauna and involves the retention and re-establishment of 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF due to the deletion of the proposed development and roads within the eastern precinct, relocation of the school sports field, relocation of stormwater detention structures and the retention of conservation land. Of this 4.6 ha EEC retention and re-establishment, approximately 1.4 ha involves CEEC regeneration. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>As indicated above, the Preferred Project Plan involves the retention of the existing conservation land in the eastern precinct and the retention and re-establishment of 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF (compared to 0.17ha under the exhibited plan).</p> <p>The owl habitat will be retained under the Preferred Project Plan and will comprise a significant buffer due to the deletion of the proposed residential precinct. Despite the removal of development in this precinct, we are still proposing to prepare an Owl Plan of Management. Refer Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan will preserve native flora and fauna and involves the retention and re-establishment of 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF due to the deletion of the proposed development and roads within the eastern precinct, relocation of the school sports field, relocation of stormwater detention structures and the retention of conservation land. Of this 4.6 ha EEC retention and re-establishment, approximately 1.4 ha involves CEEC regeneration. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> |

MP 07_0166 - Wahroonga Estate Redevelopment (Government Department Responses)

| Agency | Date Issued | Government Response to Exhibited Plan | Preferred Project Report response (3 September 2009) |
|---|---|--|---|
| Department of Environment and Climate Change | | <p>* The proposed offsetting of C/EECs, particularly BGHF, as a mitigation measure would be very hard to attain as these communities are so endangered and there are so few remnants of any size which could provide a viable offset. It will also be difficult to locate a site which adequately compensates for the proposed loss of corridor values on site. A full offsetting plan would need to be detailed and negotiated with the Department prior to any approvals</p> | <p>Native flora and fauna will be preserved under the Preferred Project Plan. The proposal has been revised to retain and/or re-establish 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF (compared to 0.17 ha under the exhibited plan) due to the deletion of the proposed development and roads within the eastern precinct, relocation of the school sports field, relocation of stormwater detention structures and the retention of conservation land. Of this 4.6 ha EEC retention and re-establishment, approximately 1.4 ha involves CEEC regeneration. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> |
| | | <p>* Any proposal on the site should take into consideration the NSW Government's air quality targets in the State Plan</p> | <p>The proposal will employ a number of sustainability measures to ensure relevant sustainable targets are met.</p> |
| | | <p>* Any AHIMS site at the San should remain undeveloped</p> <p>* Given that a number of environmental management issues have not been addressed at this stage, if the proposal is approved, plans to address these issues will need to be prepared under separate project approvals and using the guidelines suggested (in DECC letter). These include Construction Noise and Vibration Plans, Erosion and Sediment Control Plans, further contamination investigations, Waste Management Plans and integrated Environmental Management Plans</p> | <p>All AHIMS sites will be protected.</p> <p>Noted. All details to be addressed as part of further application.</p> |
| Rural Fire Service | 8 July 2009 | <p>All Precincts:</p> | |
| | | <p>* In order for existing development to gain compliance with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>, a better bush fire outcome needs to be provided as part of the development. On the information provided, the RFS is not satisfied that this is occurring in all precincts of the development.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> |
| | | <p>* The proposed riparian buffers around the core riparian zones (CRZs) have been proposed to be utilised as part of the APZs for development in proximity to these vegetated areas. On the information provided, the RFS is not satisfied that the requirement for a riparian buffer zone will not conflict with the requirements of the APZ. This will need to be clarified before the proposed APZs can be approved for this development.</p> | <p>The Preferred Project Plan involves the reduction of urban zoning as it applied to APZ and is to be zoned E3 - transitional zone between urban zones and conservation zones as outlined in the DoP Guidelines. Vegetation and Riparian zones will be managed in accordance with biodiversity management plan. As mentioned, environmental conservation has been significantly increased with the retention of the eastern precinct.</p> |
| | | <p>Precinct A (Mt Pleasant Precinct):</p> | |
| | | <p>* All new residential development will require a 20 metre APZ to the forest hazard on the neighboring school grounds to the north. The RFS is not satisfied from the concept plan as to whether this requirement has been incorporated into the design.</p> | <p>As mentioned above, urban zones have been reduced. Refer to Bushfire Report dated</p> |
| | | <p>* The proposed CRZ and buffer for the stream linking the forest hazard to the west may cause a greater bush fire threat than what is depicted on the concept plan. Details as to how this hazard will be revegetated and how this hazard will act in a bush fire situation will need to be provided. This in turn may impact on the APZ requirements for the surrounding development.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> |
| | | <p>* The new development proposes to increase the population density of this precinct while depending on the existing road infrastructure. Adequacy of the access into and within this precinct will need to be provided in accordance with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> |
| | | <p>Precinct B (Central Church Precinct):</p> | |
| | | <p>* The concept plan is unclear as to whether the proposed school can provide and maintain the required APZs from the riparian corridor and buffer zones to the west. This will need to be resolved in order to gain compliance with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> |
| | | <p>* Extensions to the existing church are to occur closer to the bush fire hazard to the west. The RFS is not satisfied that a better bush fire outcome will be created by permitting this development. Clarification of this proposed development will be required before this development is approved.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> |
| <p>Precinct C (Hospital Precinct):</p> | | | |
| <p>* New hospital buildings are proposed to be built closer to the bush fire hazard. These buildings are proposed to exist in the flame zone and do not meet the required APZs of <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006</i>. The use of these buildings and the required setbacks will need to be clarified.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> | | |
| <p>* The concept plan is unclear as to whether the proposed faculty of nursing to the south of the precinct achieves the required APZs for a Special Fire Protection Purpose development from the hazard to the east as outlined in <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>.</p> | <p>Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert.</p> | | |
| <p>Precinct D (Fox Valley Road East):</p> | | | |

MP 07_0166 - Wahroonga Estate Redevelopment (Government Department Responses)

| Agency | Date Issued | Government Response to Exhibited Plan | Preferred Project Report response (3 September 2009) |
|--|----------------|---|--|
| Rural Fire Service | | <p>* The proposed ecological corridor identified to be retained as not been classified as a bush fire threat. From the information provided, the RFS is not satisfied that this vegetation will not be a bush fire hazard and that adequate APZs have been provided to surrounding development.</p> | Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert. |
| | | <p>* There is evidence of a hostel / student accommodation building in this precinct. It is unclear whether this is the current use of this building or a change of use is proposed to the existing building. Clarification of this is to be provided in order to determine whether or not this building is considered infill development as determined under <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>.</p> | Precise detail of the proposed use of the buildings on the site is listed in the Executive Summary and Section 8 of the Preferred Project Report. |
| | | <p>* New access roads will be required to comply with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>.</p> | Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert. |
| | | <p>Precinct E (Residential East Precinct):</p> <p>* It is proposed to increase the number of dwellings in the south east of this precinct. This proposal has been classified by the applicant as infill. Due to the increase in density and dwelling numbers, the RTA is not satisfied that this proposal is indeed infill in accordance with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>, based on the information provided.</p> | The Preferred Project Plan has been revised and involves the deletion of the proposed development and road in the East Precinct and retention of the conservation land. The revised scheme will reduce density and dwelling numbers. Refer to attached correspondence from Bushfire expert. |
| | | <p>* The new residential development has not provided any APZs from the proposed ecological corridor to the west of this precinct. From the information provided, the RFS is not satisfied that this vegetation will not be a bush fire hazard and in turn these dwellings may require APZs from this hazard</p> | The Preferred Project Plan involves the reduction of urban zoning as it applied to APZ and is to be zoned E3 - transitional zone between urban zones and conservation zones as outlined in the DoP Guidelines. Vegetation and Riparian zones will be managed in accordance with Biodiversity Management plan. As mentioned, environmental conservation has been significantly increased with the retention of the eastern precinct. |
| | 14 August 2009 | <p>* New access roads will be required to comply with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>.</p> | A Statement of Commitment has been provided to confirm that, during detailed design for each precinct, roads are to be designed to comply with the requirements of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> |
| Northern Sydney Central Coast NSW Health | 28 May 2009 | <p>In regard to the letter from ABPP dated 20 July 2009 in relation to bush fire issues raised in our correspondence dated 8 July 2009, the RFS is supportive of the amended concept plan and recommendations for bush fire as proposed by ABPP in their amended response, notwithstanding the following issue will still need to be addressed.</p> | Noted. |
| | | <p>* The revised concept plan shows Asset Protection Zones (APZs) to the north through to the North West of the proposed school that vary from the original report. These calculations are also not consistent with the APZs prescribed by Table A2.6 of <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006</i>. Evidence is to be provided that the proposed APZs comply with the performance requirements of section 4.2.7 or alternatively the APZs need to be revised to comply with Table 2.6</p> | ABPP checked their calculations as follows: 1) the Vegetation in the Coups Creek riparian corridor is "Forest"; 2) The effective slope of the land within the CRZ, at this section of the Coups Creek corridor, is 7 degrees downslope; 3) The required APZ for the School is 77 metres; 4) The required APZ for residential development is 28 metres; 5) these setback widths are as shown in the APZ figure attached to the Concept Plan |
| Ministry of Transport | | <p>The current concept plan outlines a potential increase in floor space for the hospital of an additional 28,000sqm bringing the total floor space to 94,000sqm. The details of this forty-two percent increase are not outlined and will be subject to a separate application. Northern Sydney Central Coast Area Health Service has a good working relationship with Sydney Adventist Hospital and early consultation with the Area is encouraged in the next stage of planning.</p> | Noted. As indicated above, the proposal is a conceptual plan for the site. Details of the hospital masterplan have been deliberately separated from the Concept Plan due to its complexity. |
| | | <p>The Ministry supports the efforts made in preparing the TMAP but notes that it does not adequately address those matters addressed in the Ministry's initial advice with regard to:</p> | |
| | | <p>* the preparation of an implementation strategy</p> <p>* the preparation of a transport access guide (TAG)</p> | Refer Statement of Commitments |
| | | <p>* The identification of all possible options for pedestrian and cycle connections through the subject site and adjoining neighbourhood, including the provision of bicycle storage facilities.</p> <p>Consistent with the requirements of the draft Interim TMAP Guidelines, the proposal requires a specific package of transport measures to ensure a targeted mode share to public transport. This package of transport measures should form part of an overall implementation strategy as initially requested by the Ministry.</p> | Refer to pedestrian cycle path movement plan. The proposed density is appropriate for any specialised centre which is a hub of employment. Public transport will improve overtime as density increases. |

MP 07_0166 - Wahroonga Estate Redevelopment (Government Department Responses)

| Agency | Date Issued | Government Response to Exhibited Plan | Preferred Project Report response (3 September 2009) |
|--|--------------|---|---|
| Ministry of Transport | 26 June 2009 | The proposal and the Mt Pleasant precinct are not adequately connected, having only a single point of vehicle access. The needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users require greater consideration in terms of access with the Mt Pleasant precinct. In this regard, the Ministry encourages the provision of cycle and pedestrian links (shared paths) through the proposed riparian corridors. Furthermore, the internal roads and intersections should be designed to accommodate potential future bus movements. | Refer to pedestrian cycle path movement plan. |
| | | The Ministry supports a minimalist approach to car parking based on research undertaken by the Ministry's Transport Data Centre which has established a casual link between increased care parking provision and reduced public transport usage. Whilst the Ministry supports the proposed removal of on-street parking in Fox Valley Road and the introduction of a formal car sharing scheme, these initiatives should form part of an overall car parking management strategy to reduce provision in favour of public transport use together with walking and cycling. | Refer to Traffic Report dated 21 July 2009. |
| NSW Department of Primary Industries | 8 May 2009 | The degradation of native riparian vegetation along New South Wales watercourses is listed as a Key Threatening Process under the <i>Fisheries Management Act</i> . It is important that vegetated riparian zones are maintained in the development of this site | Vegetation and Riparian zones along the watercourses will be managed in accordance with the Biodiversity Management Plan. Amount of environmental conservation has been significantly increased with the retention of the eastern precinct. |
| | | Also, to minimise local and downstream impacts on water quality it is important that the Water Management Plan for this site incorporates Water Sensitive Water Design Principles. There should be no significant increase in the volume of stormwater discharging to adjacent streams and the water quality of these systems should not be reduced as a result of this proposal. | The proposal is committed to employing best practice water sensitive urban design measures. |
| | | Provided that the above mentioned measures will be included in the development of this site, the Department has no objections to the listing of the site in Schedule 3 of the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Projects) 2005</i> | Noted. |
| NSW Department of Education and Training | 13 May 2009 | DET presumes that because of the expansion of the Adventist Primary/High School facilities and additional residential development, that most new residents school aged children will primarily be attending the Adventist education facilities. However, if this assumption is not correct, then there will be an impact on DET school facilities, both primary and high school. Turramurra High School could accommodate additional students within existing accommodation. However, Warrawee Public School may require up to two additional classrooms | The Concept Plan has been modelled on anticipated demand for school facilities and infrastructure. |
| | | The Department's other concerns centre on increased traffic from the proposed developments, and noise and disruption during the construction phase of the various developments. These issues should be addressed within the Consent Conditions for the Major Project | Noted. Refer to Traffic Report dated 21 July 2009. |
| Energy Australia | 14 May 2009 | With the initial information provided several new electrical substations on the property and at least one high voltage underground cable back to Energy Australia's Turramurra Zone substation maybe required to supply the site at the developer's cost. | New electrical substations will be considered part of subsequent applications. |
| | | In this regard, should the re-development be approved, the developer will be responsible for submitting an Application for Connection form with electrical load details and any final design plans. | Noted. |
| | | Energy Australia does not have any objections associated with the environmental considerations applicable to this application. | Noted. |
| Sydney Water | 21 May 2009 | Sydney Water will assess the impact of the proposed development when the proponent applies for a Section 73 Certificate. | Noted. Relevant upgrades will be dealt with subsequent applications and funding will be suitably addressed. |
| | | The developer must fund any adjustments needed to Sydney Water Infrastructure as a result of any development. The developer should engage a Water Servicing Coordinator to get a Section 73 Certificate and manage the servicing aspects of the development. | The proposal is a concept plan only and implications of Sydney Water infrastructure will be considered in subsequent applications. |
| | | All customers discharging trade waste into Sydney Water's wastewater systems much have written permission from Sydney Water. Sydney Water will either issue the customer a trade waste permit or enter into a trade waste agreement. A trade waste permit must be obtained before any discharge can be made to the sewer system. The permit is also needed for site remediation purposes. | The proposal is a concept plan only and implications of Sydney Water infrastructure will be considered in subsequent applications. |