

Winten – St Leonards Commerce Centre

Concept Plan – Response to Submissions

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|--|---|--|
| Sydney Water | | |
| 1 | The proposed development is located in the Killara water system. The water mains will need to be upsized from 150mm to 200mm because of the type and scale of the proposed development. | Winten is prepared to undertake the necessary upgrades to the potable water / wastewater systems in order to accommodate the demand generated by their development. Based on a desktop review undertaken by Hyder, the upgrades put forward in the Sydney Water submission appear to encompass a scope of works wider than that required to support the estimated demand that will be generated by the proposed development. As a result Winten commits to undertaking a Water Services study at the Development / Project Application stage to determine what upgrade works should be undertaken based on an accurate calculation of the demand generated by the final development in relation to the capacity of the existing infrastructure. It is also noted that this can only occur once the detailed design of the new civic plaza (and any necessary relocation of services) has been undertaken. |
| 2 | The current wastewater system does not have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development. A system study to define the works necessary for the proposed development would need to be undertaken at the developer's expense. | |
| 3 | All customers discharging trade waste in Sydney Water's wastewater systems must have written permission from Sydney Water. | Noted. |
| 4 | Sydney Water will further assess the impact of individual development when the proponent applies for a Section 73 Certificate. | Noted. |
| Lane Cove Council | | |
| A detailed response to Council's submission as a result of the exhibition period is located in Section 2.0 of the Preferred Project Report / Response To Submissions (RTS) document. | | |
| 1 | Council welcomes the project's potential contribution to the reinvigoration of the southern side of St Leonards commercial centre, in particular the introduction of a pedestrian retail/café precinct linking the Lithgow Street rail tunnel entry with Nicholson Street and the centre's eastern portion. | Noted. |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---------------|--|
| 2 | The proposal should be required to comply with LEP 2009. It breaches LEP 2009's development standard of a maximum of 65m height. |
| 2a | <p>The height breach is contrary to the assurance given by Winten in its submission of 9 December, which stated the proposal would be fully compliant with Council's Draft LEP 2008.</p> <p>The (revised) proposal complies with the height control at the Christie Street Elevation as proposed in the request for DGRs. The non-compliance with Council's Draft LEP 2008 came about as a result of the sloping topography of the site, which leads to a non-compliance on part of the Lithgow Street frontage. This non-compliance was only fully understood following the detailed design of the Concept Plan envelope.</p> <p>It should now be noted that the PPR scheme has reduced height by 0.7m at the northern facade, and by 1.2m at the southern facade. There is also now a 4m setback off both Lithgow Street and Christie St.</p> <p>The proposed height is not an ambit claim. The proposed 1,806m² through-site link provides for generous proportions at the ground level to provide for a superior urban design and access outcome. The through-site link's space has been redistributed and absorbed into the development envelope above as lettable floorspace, which is important to capture to ensure the viability of the proposal.</p> <p>The maximum height adopted in the LEP was driven by the shadow impacts on the surrounding areas. When it was established during the Concept Plan design stage that the non compliance would not result in any additional adverse overshadowing on the surrounding residential areas or Christie Street Park, the non-compliance which is the result of the sloping topography of the site was considered appropriate, particularly when considered in tandem with the overall strategic planning objectives of the DCP which seek to translate in broad terms the objectives of the St Leonards Strategy.</p> <p>Since exhibition of the project, and further liaison with Council on various design matters, Council has advised (see comments from letter dated 12 November 2010 below and as attached), that "Council reaffirms its view that the building should be limited to the LEP's 65 metres maximum, other than that minor variations only may be justified". This comment on minor variations, based on discussion at a meeting held with Council on 2 November 2010, relates to the upper habitable floor being both under and over the maximum height due to the site's topography.</p> |
| 2b | <p>It would set an undesirable precedent under the new LEP 2009, for future DAs to seek comparable breaches, if this application's height were approved.</p> <p>'Non-Compliance' precedents are not considered as part of a planning assessment as each proposal should be considered on its relative merits. The proposal seeks to achieve a number of strategic and environmental planning outcomes, not least new public benefits and public domain. The minor height exceedance should be balanced against the substantial merits of the scheme.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>The proposed design also responds to the area's development context in that it is unlikely that Council's envisaged new laneway would not occur in accordance with the DCP and as a result the subject site would need to provide it in the form of a new through-site link.</p> <p>The lettable space lost at the ground level to provide the link equates to 1,806m², which is approximately the same amount of GFA that is generated by the minor non-complying levels / elements of the uppermost floor of the building.</p> |
| <p>2c</p> <p>It would set an undesirable precedent under the new NSW Standard LEP if this development were not required to comply with the definition of height, especially as this is one of the new system's first LEPs. The applicant's reliance on "architectural roof features" (ARF) is not justified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprises a decorative element: the fencing around the perimeter of the roofline is not decorative and does not in any way satisfy the clause's objective. - Is not reasonably capable of modification to include floor space area: could foreseeably be modified to contain future rooms. - If including plant etc, these are to be fully integrated into the design of the roof feature. That is not the case and it is likely that they would be clearly viewed as a service box from higher apartments to the north. - Will cause minimal overshadowing: Increases shadow compared with decorative embellishments typically set on only a part of a roof. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ARF shown in the proposed Concept Plans is an 'envelope' for an ARF as part of the Concept Plan envelope. The design of the roof feature will be subject to a rigorous design process at the future application stage. Bates Smart has prepared a series of indicative ARFs at Attachment D, which demonstrate how the ARF could be designed as part of the detailed design stage to satisfy the clause's objective. If the project would have been a Part 4 DA, Winten would have formally sought an Exception to Development Standards based on the merit of the proposed variation and the substantial public benefit. - The space will only be used to accommodate the building plant. The level will not be serviced by lifts and due to the co-location with building plant would not be marketable to commercial tenants. - The plant will be fully integrated into the design of the roof feature. The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this matter. - The Concept Plan roof plant has been modelled as a 'worst case' or maximum envelope. The final design of the roof plant will be smaller and result in less overshadowing. We note that the overshadowing assessment at Sections 5.2.1 and 5.6.1 of the EAR, illustrated that the ARF will not have any adverse overshadowing impacts. New shadow modelling has revealed noticeable narrowing of the potential shadows from the envelope. Given the various height reductions, the 21 June shadow affects 11 properties (as opposed the original 13) at 9am. The revised envelopes shadowing impacts are graphically detailed in the architectural set of drawings at Attachment D of this PPR document. |
| <p>2d</p> <p>View loss should be minimised. The proposal is 18.5 storeys viewed from the Forum to the north. If the LEP's height is complied with, the building would be reduced to 15 storeys plus plant room/lift overrun. As the site is set a storey lower than the Forum due to topography, the proposal would then be in effect 14 Storeys plus plan/lift overrun viewed from the Forum.</p> | <p>Further discussion regarding view loss is located in Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submission document.</p> <p>It should be noted that storeys are not the appropriate or relevant measurement. Council has also counted the ARF as a storey, contrary to its LEP's provisions.</p> <p>Winten with Bates Smart has undertaken a revised and more detailed view analysis based on the PPR envelope (Option 7). With a reduced width of the tower envelope massing by 8m and up to 12m along the northern facade the view impacts have been lessened.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---------------|--|
| | <p>The reduction in view loss from affected residential levels (totally 21 units) of The Forum is now 9.5% compared to the previous 12.4%. The reduction in view loss from affected residential levels (totally 7 units) of The Forum West is now 9.5% compared to the previous 11.7%.</p> <p>During this analysis, it became clear that units originally thought to be affected in The Forum West did not actually enjoy a south-facing view. This has reduced the affected units from 14 to 7 in that building.</p> |
| 2e | <p>Shadowing should be minimised by compliance with the height standard in view of the site's proximity to residential zoning and open space, including Christie Street South park, where even minor increases in sunlight are beneficial.</p> <p>The overshadowing assessment at Sections 5.2.1 and 5.6.1 of the EAR, illustrates that the non-compliance with the height standard will have no material impact on the residential areas. The assessment also demonstrates that the proposal will result in only minor additional overshadowing on Christie Street South park.</p> <p>Since exhibition and the receipt of comments / submissions, Bates Smart has also remodelled the shadow impacts of the proposed Preferred Project envelope upon the Christie Street South Park from 2:15pm to 3:00pm on 21 June. The remodelling demonstrates that a small section of the park, and particularly hard stand and walkway space in front of the cafe adjacent to the Fitness First gym will be affected after 2:30pm and through to 3:00pm. The shadow diagrams are included as part of the architectural package at Attachment D.</p> <p>The modelled overshadowing impact is considered to be minor given the very minor additional extent of shadow, its short duration (about 30 minutes), the time of day (outside of lunchtime use of the space and cafe), the time of year (worst case scenario), that the majority of the space shadowed in walkway or hard stand and not greenspace, and the fact that there is existing shadow cast over part of this open space by other existing development closer to the cafe.</p> <p>Further, there is no prohibition with respect to shadows into open space and the hard stand area under the LEP. Council's DCP (Section B.6 - 6.1 Sunlight to Public Spaces) states that sun access, especially during lunchtime hours, is desirable in all public spaces. Overshadowing should be avoided during the lunchtime period for commercial and retail centres. The section of the DCP further seeks to ensure that there is adequate sun access to publicly accessible spaces during winter at the time of day when the space is likely to have its highest use by visitors and residents.</p> <p>To meet this objective, the relevant provision is for new development to allow for a minimum of 2 hours of solar access to at least 50% of public open areas between 11am and 2pm on 21 June.</p> <p>Given the above modelling, it is clear that the proposal meets these objectives and controls as the shadowing does not occur at lunchtimes, the space itself is not a highly trafficked or major space (indeed it acts as a green passage), and the quantum of space and solar access achieved between 11am and 2pm is unaffected by the proposal.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>Furthermore it should be acknowledged that the shadow cast by the envelope into the Christie Street Park space is from the southern portion of the proposed Concept Plan envelope, which already sits well below the height limit set by the LEP. Accordingly, the shadow impact does not arise as a consequence of the minor non-compliance with the 65 metre height limit.</p> <p>Consequently, compliance with the height standard will not achieve any additional amenity benefits in terms of overshadowing.</p> |
| 2f | <p>Compliance with the height standard would not preclude the viable and economic transition of the commercial area's character.</p> <p>The gazetted height and FSR controls were based on a series of economic feasibility studies undertaken during the LEP process to determine what development standards were necessary in order stimulate development to occur on the southern side of the St Leonards Centre. A reduction in the height of the building would significantly reduce the FSR allowable under the LEP. Consequently, the provision of the through-site link is reliant on achieving the proposed building height (and thus GFA). If required to reduce the building height in order to comply with the LEP the public benefit of providing a through-site link would be challenged and at best unable to maintain the generous proportions of the link.</p> |
| 2g | <p>Council's response to the PEAR was based on compliance with the LEP height standard.</p> <p>Noted. Had Council been aware that the proposed Concept Plan not complied with the LEP height standard it is unlikely to have had any implications on the level or assessment undertaken to date. Council has been given the opportunity to comment as part of the exhibition process, and its issues and concerns have been addressed as part of this submission.</p> <p>Further, Winten and its consultants have met with Council on two separate occasions since the end of exhibition to resolve a range of issues. This PPR reflects a position based on undertaking consideration of Council's (and other parties) issues. Council's position on these design changes is reflected in the position articulated below (from the letter dated 12 November 2010 - which is also attached).</p> |
| 2h | <p>Exceeding the height standard does not satisfy the LEP's height objective of minimising overshadowing and visual impacts of development on neighbouring properties, particularly where zones meet, notwithstanding that some impact is inevitable for the upgrading of the current under-developed St Leonards Specialised Centre identified in the Metro Strategy.</p> <p>As noted by Council, considering the site's prominent location near St Leonards Station within the St Leonards Specialised Centre some overshadowing impacts are inevitable. However, as the assessment at Section 5.6.1 of the EAR illustrates that the proposed building will have no substantial adverse impact on the residential or open space areas, the proposed exceedance of the height standard is considered to satisfy the LEP's height objectives and broader strategic planning objectives.</p> <p>Indeed, the revised envelope now produces a narrower and shorter shadow, particularly at 21 June. As a result of the changes to the envelope, there is a reduction by two of the number of properties affected at 9am (the worst case scenario for the envelope). The revised shadow diagrams are included at Attachment D to this PPR document set.</p> |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---|--|--|
| 3 | Lane Cove DCP's parking rate, is under review and may be reduced. The car parking resulting from an additional storey's floor space is not justified. | <p>Winten based its proposed parking provision on the Lane Cove DCP 2010. Application of the recently adopted DCP rate was considered to be relevant and appropriate for the site.</p> <p>The Forum development, which is located above the train station within Willoughby Council, provided car parking at a rate of 1 space per 75m² which is approximately 30% more car parking than the proposed rate.</p> <p>The proposal complies with the FSR control which determines the parking provision on the site. The non-compliance with the height control has no bearing on the anticipated traffic generation of the development based on the FSR control.</p> <p>The parking allocation for the project has been reduced from 330 spaces to 294. As 110 spaces are already provided on-site, the proposal only results in a net increase of 184 spaces.</p> <p>Further detailed discussion of the parking rate is included at Section 2.3 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Issues document.</p> |
| 4 | Adequate pedestrian circulation space should be provided in accordance with the DCP's objectives and controls, by providing satisfactory setbacks around the site's perimeter as well as through the retail link. | Noted. The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this matter. |
| 5 | The proposal's sustainability measures are supported in principle but reference to 4.5/5 star ratings in the documentations should be clarified. | Winten has made a commitment to achieve a 4.5 star rating, however, the proposal is targeting to achieve a 5 star rating. |
| 6 | Council looks forward to discussing in detail with the developer the process for paying S94 contributions / undertaking a Voluntary Planning Agreement, in confirmation of previous discussion with Council. | Noted. The Statement of Commitments has been refined to include a commitment to negotiate a suitable material public benefit and/or monetary contribution based on Council's applicable s94 plan. |
| Lane Cove Council - Post-exhibition letter dated 12 November 2010 regarding the proposed PPR scheme (Response to meeting held 2 November) - see appended | | |
| 1 | <p>Preferred Options</p> <p>Council appreciates your having produced a series of (eight) potential design options to enable staff and Councillors to address some of the broad urban design issues.</p> <p>Council's preferred option is Option 7 in its modified form received today (letter dated 12 November 2010), due to its increased setbacks reducing bulk and related impacts, subject to any variations in the south-eastern corner complying with appropriate requirements in building separation from future redevelopments adjacent. We appreciate this involves a reduction in floor area for the proposal.</p> | <p>Noted - Council acknowledges that a serious effort has been made to reduce the proposed bulk of the Concept Plan envelope and its related impacts, and to increase setbacks. To that end, Council has endorsed the proposed PPR Concept Plan envelope subject to "any variations in the south-eastern corner complying with appropriate requirements in building separation from future redevelopments adjacent".</p> <p>It is considered that the 6 metre building separation, which assumes a 3 metre setback for development on either side of the boundary, is appropriate and satisfactory with respect to the setback objectives of Council's DCP relating to tower forms and amenity.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|--|--|
| <p>In relation to height, Council reaffirms its view that the building should be limited to the LEP's 65 metres maximum, other than that minor variations only may be justified.</p> | <p>Specifically, the following is noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The south-eastern face of the proposed PPR building envelope cannot be viewed from any street, and therefore building separation could only be required to satisfy BCA purposes. Accordingly, a 3 metre setback as proposed is appropriate at this facade. - The Dental Association site off Lithgow Street is designated as the new or future through-road so no building separation is required under the adopted DCP in relation to this frontage of the proposed building. <p>Whilst the Dental Association site has a 65 metre height limit under the LEP, the Club to its south has a 25 metre height. The Dental Association site has a narrow 14 metre frontage to Lithgow Street and its potential to be developed to the permissible height with or without the Club will not be possible with a full 6m to 9m setback. It will not be viable for the Dental Association to redevelop on its own and if it goes with the Club it will in all likelihood be built to 25 metres (as detailed in the original Concept Plan EA at Figures 26 and 27).</p> <p>The Winten podium is at around 18 metres in height, and the Dental Association / Club redevelopment would also have an 18 metre podium. To achieve the 25m height, there would only be a further 2 storeys in height above the respective podiums. A building separation of 12 metres for 2 storeys above an 18m podium would not serve any reasonable BCA, urban design or architectural purpose, particularly given a general principle of promoting a street and built-edge along Lithgow Street. Most critically, a maximum setback would diminish development opportunity without any clear tangible public benefit. Whilst the Winten site can absorb a setback(as proposed at 3 to 4.09 metres in this location), any further setbacks beyond that required under the BCA (3.0m) would severely diminish the opportunities of the Dental Association / Club.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The common boundary with the Pharmacy Guild off Christie Street. These same manifestations occur at the Winten Christie Street interface with the Pharmacy Guild building. The Pharmacy Guild has a 17 metre frontage and its southern neighbour a 10m frontage. Both properties have a 65 metre height limit under the LEP. In our EA and response to public submissions we showed a scenario to demonstrate that the Pharmacy Guild could release its height though redevelopment with the Pharmaceutical Society Building and the Club (assuming that the new road does not happen). Our submission was based on a 3m setback each side of the boundary (being the BCA requirement). In reality the Pharmacy Guild would more likely have a lower height in a redevelopment. A 6 metre setback to the common boundary will have a significant negative impact on the Pharmacy Guild (much like for the Dental Association) and with little, if any, benefit to overall design merit. |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p>It is our view that with a frontage of the proposed development to Christie Street of some 27m and a depth along the common boundary with the Pharmacy Guild of about the same, that a shared 6 metre separation for the 27m length is more than adequate and appropriate from an urban design and amenity perspective, given that the only visible element within this gap would be the south-east wall of the Winten envelope/ building. There is no vista, no through link, and hence no amenity issue with regard to wind or the like. To impose a shared 12m setback would again impose difficulties in achieving a suitable footprint of development, impinge on development opportunity, and be of very little material benefit to the public in terms of views, vistas, amenity, or consistent street edges and urban design outcomes.</p> |
| <p>2</p> | <p>Voluntary Planning Agreement</p> <p>Council is to undertake public domain and traffic studies, supplementing those done to date, in particular in relation to public domain and parking rates.</p> <p>In relation to Lithgow Street, the meeting discussed a potential open space area extending along your western frontage with vehicle access underneath. This area (approx 1,000m²) need not be dependent upon inclusion of the space over the rail corridor, over which additional open area could be added at a later date, although preferably it would be incorporated in a unified development at this stage.</p> <p>We request that you investigate this concept while finalising the lower levels of the design, in liaison with Council and the relevant NSW authorities, and prior to a voluntary planning agreement being prepared. We will talk to the Department of Planning about the timeframe involved in the proposal's progress under Part 3A and would welcome your comments on this.</p> <p>Without wishing to unnecessarily inhibit the project's progress, there is the potential for such an open space with separation of pedestrians and vehicles to significantly add to the amenity of the centre and of your development.</p> <p>We understand that Council is seeking to prepare a new DCP or revision to its adopted DCP to cater for major public domain and public and private infrastructure works to bridge the railway cutting to provide a substantial new public square to the south of the Pacific Highway.</p> <p>This involves amongst other things, a grade-separated pedestrian area and vehicular accessway as well as civil works in, around, and over the current State Rail corridor as well as the potentially new and expanded CBDRL rail corridor.</p> <p>As seen below in Transport NSW / Rail Corp's submission, even relatively simple basement excavations require detailed consideration and negotiation. Furthermore, we do not believe that the engineered outcomes desired by Council can be simply achieved, even without RailCorp's corridor being impacted. Winten's architects met with Council on 18 November to review Council's vision and assist in reviewing options. At the meeting it was agreed between the parties that Council's initial ideas were not the best way forward, but that possible other options could be further investigated.</p> <p>We do not wish to see the subject project delayed by ongoing and potentially protracted studies, negotiation and planning, particularly as Council's vision is only embryonic at this stage.</p> <p>The Winten Concept Plan's lower levels can be incorporated into a future public domain treatment at the Lithgow Street edge at a future point. There is a flexibility in the scheme, given it is a Concept Plan at this stage. We acknowledge that a public domain improvement at this edge is desirable and will allow for improved use of the space, including the through-site link.</p> <p>At this stage, the Statement of Commitments have been refined to include a commitment to negotiate a suitable material public benefit and/or monetary contribution based on Council's applicable s94 plan once a detail future application is lodged for the building to fill the proposed envelope.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|---|
| <p>3 Other Urban Design Matters</p> <p>Council reiterates the importance of minimising overshadowing of residential properties to the south-west and view loss from the north, and consideration of other amenity issues including solar access and wind impact for the public domain.</p> | <p>As previously discussed in Section 5.6 of the exhibited EA for this project and again above and in the PPR, the overshadowing impacts of the proposal are minor and allow for residential dwellings to the south-west to enjoy solar access at levels recommended by SEPP65 and the DCP. The maximum LEP height was driven by these considerations and the minor additional shadows have no material amenity impact given the time of day, year, their duration, and where they fall on property.</p> <p>Indeed, the revised envelope now produces a narrower and shorter shadow, particularly at 21 June. As a result of the changes to the envelope, there is a reduction by two of the number of properties affected at 9am (the worst case scenario for the envelope). The revised shadow diagrams are included at Attachment D to this PPR document set.</p> <p>Since exhibition and the receipt of comments / submissions, Bates Smart has also remodelled the shadow impacts of the proposed Preferred Project envelope upon the Christie Street South Park from 2:15pm to 3:00pm on 21 June. The remodelling demonstrates that a small section of the park, and particularly hard stand and walkway space in front of the cafe adjacent to the Fitness First gym will be affected after 2:30pm and through to 3:00pm. The shadow diagrams are included as part of the architectural package at Attachment D.</p> <p>The modelled overshadowing impact is considered to be minor given the very minor additional extent of shadow, its short duration (about 30 minutes), the time of day (outside of lunchtime use of the space and cafe), the time of year (worst case scenario), that the majority of the space shadowed in walkway or hard stand and not greenspace, and the fact that there is existing shadow cast over part of this open space by other existing development closer to the cafe.</p> <p>Further, there is no prohibition with respect to shadows into open space and the hard stand area under the LEP. Council's DCP (Section B.6 - 6.1 Sunlight to Public Spaces) states that sun access, especially during lunchtime hours, is desirable in all public spaces. Overshadowing should be avoided during the lunchtime period for commercial and retail centres. The section of the DCP further seeks to ensure that there is adequate sun access to publicly accessible spaces during winter at the time of day when the space is likely to have its highest use by visitors and residents.</p> <p>To meet this objective, the relevant provision is for new development to allow for a minimum of 2 hours of solar access to at least 50% of public open areas between 11am and 2pm on 21 June.</p> <p>Given the above modelling, it is clear that the proposal meets these objectives and controls as the shadowing does not occur at lunchtimes, the space itself is not a highly trafficked or major space (indeed it acts as a green passage), and the quantum of space and solar access achieved between 11am and 2pm is unaffected by the proposal.</p> |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Furthermore it should be acknowledged that the shadow cast by the envelope into the Christie Street Park space is from the southern portion of the proposed Concept Plan envelope, which already sits well below the height limit set by the LEP. Accordingly, the shadow impact does not arise as a consequence of the minor non-compliance with the 65 metre height limit.</p> <p>Consequently, compliance with the height standard will not achieve any additional amenity benefits in terms of overshadowing.</p> |
| North Sydney Council | | |
| 1 | It is required that the construction management program related to the proposal be submitted to North Sydney and Lane Cove Councils for approval by their respective traffic committees prior to the issue of a construction certificate. | Noted. The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this matter. |
| 2 | It is required that the Department require details of car share schemes and workplace travel plans to be submitted to the Department for consideration during the assessment stage of the proposal. | Details regarding car share schemes and workplace travel plans will be addresses as part of the Project / Development Application stage. |
| Transport NSW – RailCorp | | |
| 1 | <p>RailCorp are concerned about the potential impacts of the proposed project on the future construction, operation and maintenance of the CBDRL, as the proposed project adjoins the CBDRL tunnel.</p> <p>The placing of any foundations, other structure and building loads in or near the proposed rail alignment would affect the practicability of the CBDRL, its construction cost and the capacity to design it to meet railway operational needs. Accordingly, RailCorp Requests that any approval given by the Minister for Planning include conditions to protect the corridor.</p> | <p>The original submission made by Transport NSW - Rail Corp includes comments based on a lack of information within that organisation at the time of drafting. As the project has proceeded it has become apparent that only part of Rail Corp had received and reviewed the exhibited Environmental Assessment and that a wider commentary was not forthcoming as other parts of Rail Corp were not aware of the project.</p> <p>This has since been remedied by Winten's engineering consultants (Parsons Brinckerhoff) liaising directly with the relevant Rail Corp officers and providing additional material for review. This liaison has demonstrated that all technical areas of Rail Corp's interest in protecting the existing and potential future rail corridors (as raised in the submission) can be suitably satisfied at the next stage of the development and design process. This will include liaison with relevant sections within Rail Corp about detailing planning near the existing and potential future rail corridors and will include such matters as acoustic impacts of the rail corridors upon the development, electrolysis impacts of the future construction and design, and any other matters as required at that stage. This is represented in the final Statement of Commitments.</p> |
| | | All outstanding Rail Corp issues have now been satisfied with respect to the Concept Plan design. |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|---|
| Transport NSW | |
| <p>1</p> <p>Transport NSW is concerned with the level of car parking provided in the proposal, given the site's proximity to public transport.</p> | <p>The proposed development complies with the parking rate in Council's recently adopted Lane Cove DCP 2010. The previous DCP required car parking to be provided at a rate of 1 space per 40m². The change represents a large shift in car parking provision in the area.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the site is located next to good public transport, car parking rates must be reduced in a measured manner over time. By reducing rates too quickly it significantly disadvantages new developments which are attempting to compete with other recently constructed developments and even older commercial buildings which have significantly more parking which was approved under the previous rates. Further, a measured reduction to accommodate a changing shift in the nature of users of the office space in the area must be considered.</p> <p>There is anecdotal and documented evidence that commercial tenants will secure additional car parking where adopted rates do not satisfy the business model of the occupier. Vodafone's move to North Sydney's ARK building is a recent documented case, where the company leased 11,700m² of GFA and was allocated 30 parking spaces (approx 1:400m²). This did not meet its car parking demand or expectation and the company immediately further leased an additional 200 spaces in a nearby public parking station, resulting in 230 spaces on aggregate resulting in an effective parking rate of 1:50m².</p> <p>Further detailed discussion of the parking rate is included at Section 2.3 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Issues document.</p> |
| <p>2</p> <p>Transport NSW recommends the Workplace Travel Plan (WTP) address means to reduce parking demand by promoting public transport, walking and cycling. Other travel demand measures, such as car share schemes, should also be considered. It is required that the WTP be prepared prior to occupation of the building as part of the Conditions of Consent.</p> | <p>The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this matter to meet the specific needs of the site, future tenants and employees.</p> |
| <p>3</p> <p>The provision of bicycle parking and staff amenities in the first basement level is supported. Additional visitor bicycle parking is requested near the external entrances to the building in accordance with the Planning guidelines for Walking and Cycling 2004.</p> | <p>The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this matter. This will be further considered at the Development / Project Application stage.</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>The inconsistency between the Traffic Study and the EA regarding proposed changes to Christie Lane should be further addressed to ensure traffic and pedestrian impacts are adequately addressed.</p> | <p>CBHK has confirmed that its traffic assessment was undertaken with the assumption / position that closure of Christie Lane would not occur until other trafficable alternatives would be in place. This is now further reflected in the updated traffic assessment that is appended and forms part of this PPR package.</p> |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---|--|--|
| 5 | The Construction Management Plan should include measures to encourage construction workers to travel to the site by public transport whenever possible. | The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this matter. |
| RTA / Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee | | |
| 1 | The proposed development is likely to generate significant public transport trips during peak periods. Further information and/or analysis shall be provided to the satisfaction of the DoP and Transport NSW that the existing transport system can cope with the increase in public transport demand. | <p>It is unreasonable and inappropriate to require the proponent to demonstrate that the public transport system can cope with the increase in trips generated by its development within 'Global Sydney', particularly as the NSW Transport Plan and Metropolitan Strategy envisage employment growth in centres and require developments to utilise public transport and rely less on private vehicles.</p> <p>Council and Transport NSW have not raised any concern that the existing public transport system would not be able to cope with the increase in trips. It is noted that the recent St Leonards Station upgrade was undertaken in order to increase the efficiency of Station in order to allow for a larger number of patrons to use the Station. Whilst the development, in conjunction with the other recent approvals in the Centre, will increase the number of people using public transport, it is anticipated that RailCorp and Sydney Buses will make the necessary increases to the services operating to North Sydney in line with demand.</p> <p>It is our view that the potential mode split for the building strikes the right balance between car and public transport usage that fosters growth of the centre and utilisation of the State's rail infrastructure upgrades.</p> |
| 2 | It is estimated that the proposed development would generate 600 pedestrian movements from the train station to the site in the AM peak period and reverse in the PM peak period. The EA report indicates that pedestrian movements across the Pacific Hwy would be primary movements. The impact of additional pedestrian movements at these intersections should be assessed in full detail. | <p>As noted in CBH + K's report submitted with the exhibited Part 3A application, there is a pedestrian connection under the Pacific Highway at Lithgow Street to connect to the railway station. This would be the primary connection for pedestrians between the site and the railway station.</p> <p>If however, would they not use the underpass / link, CBH + K notes that 600 pedestrians is equivalent to an average of some six pedestrians per cycle at the traffic signals at Pacific Highway/Christie Street and Pacific Highway/Herbert Street over a two hour period. Such low pedestrian flows would not have significant implications on the operations of these intersections.</p> |
| 3 | It is unclear from the traffic report and the EA Report whether a link between Christie Street and Lithgow Street south of the site will be provided. The RTA would need this clarified prior to providing comments regarding the shared zone proposals on Albert Street and Christie Lane | <p>Council's proposed link between Christie Street and Lithgow Street does not form part of the subject site. It is anticipated that this link will be provided in association with the redevelopment of a site to the south.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no Albert Street in St Leonards.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|--|
| <p>4 The traffic report indicates a traffic generation rate of 0.2 to 0.4 vehicles / space. From the RTA's understanding these rates are based on surveys of existing sites in North Sydney and not St Leonards. Further justification should be provided why North Sydney rates can be adopted for St Leonards. Alternatively, revised traffic generation rates based on surveys of existing sites in St Leonards can be adopted for the analysis.</p> | <p>The traffic report conservatively assessed 0.4 vehicles per hour per space during peak hours, at the upper end of the range. There are likely to be a number of reasons that commercial development can have a lower traffic generation per parking space since the RTA surveys were undertaken in 1990. However, these would also new contributing factors such as increased flexibility in working hours since that time as well as that buildings with constrained parking provision (such as in North Sydney and St Leonards) a proportion of spaces are likely to be allocated to senior personnel who don't necessarily travel during peak hours. Furthermore, the RTA rate of 0.8 vehicles per hour per space during peak hours is based on data (from 1990) for the whole of the Sydney Metropolitan Area, not just areas with superior public transport access, such as North Sydney or St Leonards.</p> |
| <p>5 Further clarification should be provided explaining why more traffic would be arriving from Oxley Street than the Pacific Hwy in the AM peak.</p> | <p>As vehicles cannot turn right into Christie Street or Oxley Street from Pacific Highway (southbound on the Pacific Hwy), Christie Lane is one-way eastbound and Lithgow Street is one-way northbound along the site frontage, all vehicles southbound accessing the development will use Oxley Street and Lithgow Street.</p> <p>In other words, the majority of traffic to the site in the AM peak will arrive via Oxley and Lithgow Streets as all southbound traffic (on the Pacific Highway) must use this option, plus a proportion of northbound trips will use this option.</p> |
| <p>6 It is understood that Lithgow St and Christie Lane are proposed to operate as shared zones. The proposed access driveway on Lithgow St will increase traffic on both Lithgow St and Christie Lane. To minimise traffic on these roads and improve pedestrian safety, consideration should be given to relocating the access driveway to Christie Street to the satisfaction of Council and DoP.</p> | <p>Lithgow Street provides the lowest point of the site and is the most logical location, from this perspective, for the access location. There is no space to accommodate a through-site link, foyer and access point in this location. Indeed, this would merely act to transfer the perceived issue from one frontage to another.</p> <p>The timing of the implementation of the shared zone in the northern part of Lithgow Street will be a matter for Council. However, it is anticipated that the shared zone would be implemented in association with the new lane and the closure of Christie Lane to vehicle traffic. Therefore, alternative routes would be available for traffic once the shared zone is introduced.</p> |
| <p>7 All vehicles should enter and exit the site in a forward direction.</p> <p>To satisfy this, a swept path analysis should be provided to DoP and Council demonstrating that cars (B99) and largest trucks can enter the site in a forward direction; turn around on-site on the allocated manoeuvring area while all spaces are occupied; and exit the site in a forward direction.</p> | <p>We agree that vehicles should enter and exit the site in a forward direction. A condition of approval could be included to this effect, including the requirement for vehicle swept paths at the future (project) application stage.</p> |
| <p>8 Car parking provisions, loading bays and bicycle facilities should be provided to Council's satisfaction.</p> | <p>Noted, noting that this is a Concept Plan only at this stage. Appropriate documentation to address this requirement can be provided at the project's next stage.</p> |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|--|--|--|
| 9 | The access driveway, off street parking and loading areas associated with the proposed development (including driveways, grades, parking aisle widths and lengths, turning paths, sight distance requirements, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS2890.1 - 2004, AS2890.2 - 2002 for Heavy Vehicles and Council requirement. | These matters are noted and could be included as conditions of approval. |
| 10 | A loading dock management plan should be prepared to DoP and Council's satisfaction. The plan shall implement appropriate measures to prevent more than one vehicle accessing the loading dock at any one time. The plan shall be submitted for approval prior to the release of the Occupation Certificate. | Noted, noting that this is a Concept Plan only at this stage. Appropriate documentation to address this requirement can be provided at the project's next stage. As noted in CBH + K's previous report, the proposed loading dock will provide for a range of service vehicles, including vans and courier-sized vehicles, as well as small and medium rigid trucks. Five bays will be provided for trucks and five bays for vans and courier sized vehicles. There does not appear to be a need to restrict the number of service vehicles to one at a time. |
| 11 | A Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicles routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council, for approval prior to issue of the CC. | Noted, noting that this is a Concept Plan only at this stage. Appropriate documentation to address this requirement can be provided at the project's next stage. |
| 12 | All demolition and construction vehicles and activities are to be contained wholly within the site or the local road network (subject to Council's approval) as a work zone permit will not be approved on the Pacific Hwy. | Noted, noting that this is a Concept Plan only at this stage. Appropriate documentation to address this requirement can be provided at the project's next stage. |
| 13 | All works / regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to the RTA | Noted, noting that this is a Concept Plan only at this stage. |
| Australian Dental Association and NSW Pharmacy Guild (ADA and PG) | | |
| 1 | The proposal would dramatically alter the urban character on the southern side of the Pacific Highway and is out of context with the locality. | The proposal will alter the existing character of the southern side of the Pacific Highway. This is considered to be a positive change which is consistent with both Lane Cove Council and the State government's vision for the area. |
| 2 | The proposal will create an over bearing building presence when viewed from the street and from the ADA and PG properties. | The proposed building will not be visible from within the ADA or PG properties. As demonstrated in Section 5.2.2 the proposal will not create an overbearing building presence when viewed from the street. Furthermore the proposal will provide significant public domain upgrades which will enhance the amenity of both the ADA and PG properties in the form of a new plaza and through-site link. |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|--|---|
| 3 The proposal does not comply with the height limit contained in the Lane Cove LEP and built form objectives in the DCP. | Further discussion regarding the non-compliance with the height limit is located in Section 2.1 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document. |
| 4 It does not provide an appropriate transition between the proposed high rise development and the medium scale commercial development and low scale residential development to the south of the subject site. | <p>The proposed Concept Plan will be the first development to occur in the St Leonard's Centre under Lane Cove's LEP. The proposal is in the most appropriate location in the centre to accommodate a development of the height proposed. The Lane Cove LEP factored in the transition between the areas as part of their LEP height maps. As a result the transition will be provided as redevelopment occurs under the LEP on the sites to the south.</p> <p>It is also noted that the proposed envelope steps at its upper levels to provide a further transition with the land to the south.</p> |
| 5 The proposal does not respond to the topography of the site. | In response to the topography of the site the proposed envelope steps down at its upper levels towards the ADA and PG sites. Further discussion regarding the non-compliance with the height limit on Lithgow Street, which is a result of the topography, is located in Section 2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document. |
| 6 The development of a 16 storey building would significantly extend the expected construction time compared with a building that is consistent with the existing surrounding development of 2 – 4 storeys. | Noted. |
| <p>7 The proposal is contrary to the DCP and does not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comprise a podium and tower built form; - comply with the setbacks; or - the maximum tower floorplate of 1,600m² | <p>An assessment of the proposed non-compliances with the subject DCP controls is located in Section 5.2 of the EAR. The EAR demonstrates that whilst the proposal does not comply with these controls, the proposed envelope, which was developed after a detailed site analysis, will achieve a better urban design outcome on the streetscape whilst still being capable of achieving the objective of the DCP controls.</p> <p>The PPR envelope (through liaison with the DoP and Council) has resulted in a modulated form that includes a 12m reduction in the north facade width, an overall 8m reduction in total tower width, inclusion of a 4m setback off the Christie Street frontage, a podium aligned to the Lithgow Street frontage and a 4m setback off Lithgow Street at the southern face of that facade above the podium.</p> <p>It should be noted that the DCP allows / provides for flexibility for superior planning outcomes in relation to floorspace.</p> |
| 8 If developed in accordance with the DCP Block Diagrams the ADA and PG sites would be significantly impacted on in order to provide a new laneway. Given that the buildings are reasonably new and have no way reached the end of their economic life the offers made by Winten to amalgamate the sites have been unreasonable and inappropriate. | The proposed design recognises that the laneway envisaged under the DCP will not be achievable in the short to medium term as a result of the current landownership and consequently has provided a new through-site link. The offers made to the ADA and PG were based on the commercial value of those properties and their contribution to the development scheme. |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|--|
| 9 The proposal provides an indicative podium and tower floor plan for the sites to the south and states that if these properties were amalgamated in a similar fashion to the subject site they could realise their development potential under the LEP. The proposal does not address the potential of individual allotment's to realise their maximum development outcome. | The need to amalgamate with adjoining land owners as envisaged in the DCP and through the height and FSRs proposed in the LEP is not unreasonable. In order to develop the subject site to its development potential Winten has had to amalgamate 4 separate properties. It is noted that in order to achieve the envisaged built form under the LEP, a site of the size of the ADA or PG properties individually would not be considered appropriate. |
| 10 As the proposal does not provide the 12m tower setback (and any new development undertaken by the PG or ADA would be required to). The proposal will reduce the permissible floorplate on the adjoining sites and impact their building viability. | <p>The DCP presents a desired development outcome but also states up front that:</p> <p><i>“Block Plan Controls will be applied with flexibility based on achievement of objectives”</i></p> <p>The DCP provides for 12m tower separation which is shared off a common boundary. As discussed elsewhere in the summary and the PPR document proper, a shared 6m setback / separation (equating to a 12m separation) is unreasonable for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Any future DA on the ADA/PG site would be required to respond to the surrounding context. Much like the subject development, if their proposal can demonstrate that it achieves the objectives of the DCP, they too will be able to achieve a viable floorplate.</p> |
| 11 The proposal will result in a significant increase in traffic over and above that being generated by the existing development on the site. | <p>Whilst the proposal will generate additional traffic above that being generated by the existing 2 storey development on the site, the Traffic Assessment prepared with the EAR demonstrates that the proposal will not result in any impacts on the levels of service provided at the key surrounding intersections.</p> <p>CBH + K has advised in its revised traffic report to support the PPR that the key intersections around, and servicing, the site continue to operate at a Level of Service of between A/B and C as documented in Section 5.5.2 of the exhibited EAR as a result of a 16% reduction in new traffic generation (184 new parking spaces instead of the originally planned 220 new parking spaces).</p> |
| 12 It is likely that the parking demand in surrounding streets will increase as a result of the development. | On-street parking in the area is time-limited and is suited primarily for visitors to the area and not commuters who require all day parking. The site's location in relation to existing regular bus and rail services provides the opportunity for employees to travel to the site by modes other than car. Please see the appended CBH + K traffic assessment. |
| 13 The desirability of a significant traffic generator in a less intense commercial area is questionable. | The development envelopes provided for under LEP 2009 envisage a more intense commercial area. The proposed commercial building is entirely consistent with both Lane Cove Council and the State's vision for development on the southern side of the Lane Cove Strategic Centre. |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---|---|---|
| Challenger Submission (201 – 203 Pacific Highway) | | |
| 1 | <p>Challenger's properties direct views of the City and Harbour Bridge will be largely blocked by the proposed development. Accordingly, this will impact on the ability to lease tenancies within the buildings and diminish our client's property value (current market value in excess of \$160 million), potentially resulting in considerable financial loss.</p> <p>If the proposed development was to comply with the setbacks contained within the DCP (particularly the 18m tower setback to Lithgow Street) that these impacts would be significantly reduced.</p> <p>View sharing is a relevant consideration to the assessment of buildings. This is an explicit objective (B4) in the Lane Cove DCP, and NSLEP 2001 at s19(1), 18(1)(c) and 18(5)(c), (noting that whilst the NSLEP 2001 is not directly relevant, the North Sydney LGA surrounds the site to the north, east and south) as well as a well established planning principle adopted by the NSW Land and Environment Court.</p> <p>In this case, the views of an icon (the Harbour Bridge), from the front boundary, that results in a severe loss of view (noting that some CBD views are retained), due to a development that breaches planning controls, would appear to be a classic case of an unreasonable view loss.</p> | <p>An assessment of the proposed development's impact on views from the commercial offices owned by Challenger is located at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document.</p> <p>Photomontages have been prepared showing the potential impact of the PPR envelope upon Levels 4 and 9 of the commercial element of The Forum development at the western end, centrally and the eastern end of the floorspace facing south. This demonstrates that skyline or horizon views to the CBD (where they can presently be discerned) can largely be retained where they now exist, over a large portion of the floor. It should be noted that any compliant scheme would similarly affect the views presently enjoyed towards the CBD where those views may be affected.</p> <p>The LEP and DCP both promote substantial growth and tall buildings (not only on this site alone) but other sites and land to the south of the Pacific Highway. In some cases these are taller than as proposed in this Concept Plan. The combined effect of all these envelopes and buildings is certain view loss. The DCP therefore does not imply view sharing.</p> <p>Relative to the development controls and the strategic planning objectives, the proposed envelope has struck an appropriate balance to ensure a high environmental amenity and suitable opportunity for job growth and renewal of the Lane Cove portion of the St Leonards Centre.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Challenger and other landowners in the immediate area affected by the proposal, were not consulted by the applicant in accordance with the Department's Major Project Community Consultation Guidelines (October 2007).</p> <p>In light of the proposal's potential impacts to various nearby properties, the potential level of such impacts, and that limited applicant consultation and public notification that has occurred, resulting in the inability for nearby affected landowners to properly assess impacts and make an informed submission, the Department is requested to re- notify the proposal. This re-notification should occur to a broader landowner group, appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal and occur for the full statutory period.</p> | <p>The number of submissions indicates that community was aware of the proposed development. It is unlikely that there are any issues that weren't raised as part of the exhibition process which would prevent the DoP from a full assessment of the project.</p> <p>Objectors were provided with an additional time period up to 10 days to lodge submissions.</p> <p>It is also noted that Challenger was still able to make two professional planning submissions supported by legal advice and a traffic submission during the exhibition period demonstrating that the submission time was more than adequate opportunity to make an informed submission.</p> <p>In light of the above, re-notification of the project is not considered appropriate.</p> |
| 3 | <p>The applicant has presented a scheme which is at complete odds with the form and layout of the development encouraged within the DCP. The proposal:</p> | <p>Council indicated in the meeting on the 24 June 2010 that the architect appears to have "taken on board the urban design objectives of the DCP". Whilst the DCP presents a desired development outcome, it also states up front that:</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents numerous and significant departures from the 'brand new' DCP that applies to the site. - Introduces various impacts arising from these departures to adjoining and nearby properties - Prohibits the ability for the future development of Block 2 to be designed in the manner set out in the DCP. - Is inconsistent with the broader urban design principles established within the DCP relating to the future development of the SLSC. | <p><i>"Block Plan Controls will be applied with flexibility based on achievement of objectives"</i></p> <p>Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the EAR demonstrated that the proposal is entirely consistent with the DCP objectives for Block 2.</p> <p>If redevelopment can only occur in accordance with the DCP block diagram (which requires amalgamation of 13 lots) then it is unlikely that any development will occur on the southern side of the St Leonards Centre in the foreseeable future. Indeed, these are unrealistic amalgamation plans with others as these parties are on the record as indicating that the inherent value of the sites is not enough to allow participation in the planning exercise. Accordingly, there would be no release of sites.</p> <p>During consultation prior to exhibition, Lane Cove Council acknowledged that the proposal was the best resolution of the issues created by land ownership around the site in the foreseeable future. In Council's formal submission to the Department no objection to the non-compliances with the DCP were raised.</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>The inability to achieve amalgamation should not necessarily allow the applicant to dismiss the intent of the design controls for the site and the broader locality, and should not allow the applicant to construct a development form that would prohibit any prospect of this design outcome being achieved in the future. The applicant should consider a re-design option that better reflects the objectives for the site and broader area.</p> | <p>Whilst the proposal does not fully comply with some of the numeric controls, Section 5.2 of the EAR demonstrates that the proposal does reflect the intent of the design controls for the site. Council indicated in the meeting on the 24 June 2010 that the architect appears to have "taken on board the urban design objectives of the DCP". The provision of a high quality office space next to a Station, a through site link and new public plaza are considered to be more aligned with the objectives of the broader area than the retention of views from Challenger's land holdings, which are largely maintained from the majority of space within their building.</p> <p>Since exhibition, Winten and its consultants have twice met with Council to resolve various design-based issues. The current PPR scheme is the culmination of this post-exhibition process.</p> |
| <p>5</p> <p>The proposal fails to 'promote the desired urban design outcomes' and specifically fails to provide the new laneway required by the objectives relating to Block 2.</p> | <p>The new laneway proposed in the DCP is not part of the subject site and therefore can not be provided as part of the Concept Plan. In acknowledgement of the unlikely redevelopment of the adjoining land to the south in the short to medium term (based on correspondence and their submission indicating they do not wish to redevelop), the Concept Plan will retain the existing laneway to the north of the site. The proposal presents the possible best outcome for the area in light of the likelihood of the other sites to the south being developed.</p> |
| <p>6</p> <p>In the absence of an amalgamated site, the proposal has departed from the DCP objectives and controls in order to ensure it takes full benefit from the FSR and height controls of the LEP. This is not considered appropriate and defeats the purpose of the DCP's intent to promote commercial development in the area in a manner which provides a positive design outcome and minimises adverse impacts.</p> | <p>As demonstrated in Sections 5.2 and 5.6 of the EAR and elsewhere in this response, the proposal will still achieve a positive design outcome and minimises adverse impacts.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|--|---|
| <p>7</p> <p>The impact of most concern to Challenger is that of view loss. Other impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solar access (relating to sites to the south) - Local traffic impacts (separate traffic study to be submitted) - Building bulk and its impact upon the public domain - Broader urban design issues, including building form and townscape - Economic impacts (relating to the adjoining sites to the south given their reduced ability to achieve any real development potential) <p>It is relevant to note that all of these issues (i.e. the issues of concern to Challenger, and those directly affecting other property owners) are caused by the type of development proposed- being the 'inverted podium' or 'sheer tower' format. If the scheme was to be re-designed in a manner involving a podium and a more slender tower setback from the Lithgow Street frontage, then all of these impacts could be reduced.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The overshadowing assessment at Section 5.6.1 of the EAR (and as part of this PPR) demonstrates that the solar access impacts on the sites to the south are minimal. No objections were received from the sites to the south in regards to solar access impacts. - A separate traffic response by CBH + K addressing the concerns raised by Challenger is located at Attachment C. - Section 5.2.2 of the EAR demonstrated that the bulk of the building is an appropriate built form outcome on the site. The development will also greatly enhance the public domain. No other submissions, including Council, have raised issue with the bulk of the building. - Section 5.3 of the EAR demonstrated that the sites to the south are still capable of achieving their development potential under the LEP. <p>The PPR envelope (through liaison with the DoP and Council) has resulted in a modulated form that includes a 12m reduction in the north facade width, an overall 8m reduction in total tower width, inclusion of a 4m setback off the Christie Street frontage, a podium aligned to the Lithgow Street frontage and a 4m setback off Lithgow Street at the southern face of that facade above the podium.</p> |
| <p>8</p> <p>The protection and sharing of views is an important theme within the DCP, as well as other planning instruments applicable within the LGAs that surround the site. The sheer tower form blocks a primary view corridor from Challenger's assets towards the Sydney Harbour Bridge and CBD skyline. This is of particular economic value to Challenger. The proposal also blocks views from other adjoining commercial and residential buildings as part of the Forum development.</p> <p>This impact would be substantially reduced if the proposal were to comply with the required setbacks that seem to specifically provide for the retention of a view corridor for the Forum development towards the south.</p> | <p>There are no objectives or controls relating to the protection and sharing of views in DCP for the St Leonards Specialised Centre. The absence of any controls or objectives to preserves views within the centre acknowledges that it would not be possible to achieve Lane Cove Council or the Department of Planning's desired built form outcome in the Centre and preserve views from existing commercial developments. It is also noted that the Willoughby DCP states that "'View Sharing' is encouraged whilst not restricting the reasonable development potential of a site."</p> <p>A response regarding view loss is located at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document.</p> <p>The detailed view analysis demonstrates that the impact on Challenger's views are misleading and overstated in their submission. The detailed analysis illustrates that the proposed envelope will only obstruct part of their views over part of their floorplate, and that compliance with the DCP setback would only result in a minor reduction in view impact.</p> <p>The LEP and DCP both promote substantial growth and tall buildings (not only on this site alone) but other sites and land to the south of the Pacific Highway. In some cases these are taller than as proposed in this Concept Plan. The combined effect of all these envelopes and buildings is certain view loss. The DCP therefore does not imply view sharing.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---------------|--|
| | Relative to the development controls and the strategic planning objectives, the proposed envelope has struck an appropriate balance to ensure a high environmental amenity and suitable opportunity for job growth and renewal of the Lane Cove portion of the St Leonards Centre. |
| 9 | <p>Under Lane Cove Council's DCP the development attracts a maximum allowable parking rate of 1 space/110m² of GFA, resulting in 333 spaces as an upper limit. These rates have been adopted without question on the basis that it is a "comparatively low rate". In this regard, it is not comparatively low compared with (for example) the North Sydney Council's controls which would permit a rate of only 1 space/400m². Public transport availability is comparable to the North Sydney CBD (with excellent exposure to both rail and bus services). While we do not recommend that North Sydney's controls should necessarily be adopted, the report provides insufficient justification for the adoption of the maximum rates under Council's DCP and does not therefore respond adequately to the Director General's Requirements (DGR's). Importantly, these aim to reduce parking and increase non car travel modes, so that it is concluded that the development, in its present form, is contrary to current State Government policy.</p> <p>The proposed development complies with the parking rate in Council's recently adopted Lane Cove DCP 2010. The previous DCP required car parking to be provided at a rate of 1 space per 40m². The change represents a large shift in car parking provision in the area.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the site is located next to good public transport, car parking rates must be reduced slowly over time. By reducing rates too quickly it significantly disadvantages new developments which are attempting to compete with other recently constructed developments and even older commercial buildings which have significantly more parking which was approved under the previous rates.</p> <p>Further detailed discussion of the parking rate is included at Section 2.3 of the Preferred Project</p> <p>Please see Section 2.3 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Issues document.</p> |
| 10 | <p>The maximum rate of 1 space/110m² GFA as set out in Clause 1.3.1(a) of Part D of Council's DCP relates to commercial developments within an 800 metre radius of St. Leonards Railway Station. It is reasonable in our view that within this radius, those sites furthest away would tend towards the maximum level of provision; while sites closer to the station would tend towards a lower rate. The subject site is directly opposite the station entrance and in our view this warrants parking at rates below the maximum. This position is strengthened by the fact that there are potential unacceptable impacts arising from the higher traffic levels that will result from parking at the maximum levels permitted and these impacts are unnecessary and avoidable.</p> <p>Noted. Please see above and Section 2.3 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Issues document.</p> |
| 11 | <p>The traffic report has assessed the traffic generation of the site based on a trip per parking spaces assessment which is considered appropriate. However, the report adopts a trip rate of 0.4 trips/hr/ space which is significantly less than the rate published in the RTA's Guide to Traffic Generating Developments which adopts a rate of 0.8 trips/hr/space during peak periods. It is also lower than surveys previously reported upon by CBHK at comparable sites in North Sydney, which have adopted 0.6 trips/space/hr.</p> <p>The traffic report conservatively assessed 0.4 vehicles per hour per space during peak hours, at the upper end of the range. There are likely to be a number of reasons that commercial development can have a lower traffic generation per parking space since the RTA surveys were undertaken in 1990. However, these would also new contributing factors such as increased flexibility in working hours since that time as well as that buildings with constrained parking provision (such as in North Sydney and St Leonards) a proportion of spaces are likely to be allocated to senior personnel who don't necessarily travel during peak hours.</p> |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---------------|--|--|
| | | Furthermore, the RTA rate of 0.8 vehicles per hour per space during peak hours is based on data (from 1990) for the whole of the Sydney Metropolitan Area, not just areas with superior public transport access, such as North Sydney or St Leonards. |
| 12 | No surveys have been undertaken to establish the existing site generation which has been discounted from future traffic volumes by applying assumed trip rates. This is considered unreliable and introduces an unnecessary potential for errors in the calculations which need to be reliable given the implications of increased traffic volumes in this sensitive locality. | As above. |
| 13 | The report makes no assessment of the environmental amenity of local residential streets; and how the current amenity of residents will be impacted by the proposed development. | <p>CBH + K has applied the RTA's "Guide to Traffic Generating Developments" which defines the following environmental capacity performance standards for local residential streets:</p> <p>Local Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Environmental goal – 200 vehicles per hour in the peak hour; and</i> - <i>Maximum flow – 300 vehicles per hour in the peak hour.</i> <p>Lithgow Street and Oxley Street provide access to residential development. However, they also provide access to and from commercial development, being important roads in the St Leonards CBD. For these reasons, it is considered that the RTA's maximum flow is appropriate to apply. With the proposed development, traffic flows in these streets would remain less than the RTA's maximum flow for a local road. These flows are anticipated to be marginally lower as a result of a 10% reduction in GFA in the PPR scheme / envelope.</p> |
| 14 | The traffic report correctly identifies Council's intention to close Christie Lane to permit pedestrian use only, as expressed in the "St. Leonards Block 2 Plan" within the Lithgow-Christie Precinct. If this is to occur, then all traffic exiting the subject site will need to turn right into Lithgow Street, then left into the Highway from Lithgow Street (Refer to Figure 2 attached). This will have local impacts that have not been addressed, including the need for the 55 veh/hr that need to travel to/from the south (assuming the adopted trip rate), to re-route via the local road network. | We envisage Christie Lane will remain open to traffic until an alternative access arrangement is in place to replace it. |
| 15 | The report correctly identifies Council's intention to introduce a shared zone in Lithgow Street between the 'new laneway' and the Highway. This section of road is expected to carry 235 veh/hr in the PM peak, of which 90 veh/hr will be associated with the subject site. This is substantially higher than can be considered for a shared zone and in our view the development in its current form will not be able to co-exist with a shared zone. | <p>It is anticipated that the introduction of a shared zone in the northern part of Lithgow Street would occur in conjunction with the introduction of the new lane and the closure of Christie Lane to vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Therefore, alternative routes would be available for this traffic once the shared zone is introduced. In association with the development, a pedestrian crossing could be provided across Lithgow Street at Pacific Highway, if considered appropriate by Council.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|--|
| <p>16 The provision of a single access driveway serving cars and trucks is supported in principle as these classes of vehicles are separated internally (setting aside the issue of compatibility with the shared zone). However, no swept path analysis has been provided to demonstrate satisfactory manoeuvring by an 8.8m MRV.</p> | <p>CBH + K has reviewed this issue and agrees that the design of the access driveway, ramps and internal circulation should appropriately provide for cars and service vehicles. The current proposal is a concept plan for which a further detailed project application will be required. These matters would therefore be most appropriately addressed at the time that a project application is made for the development.</p> |
| <p>17 The report provides no information that would enable the credibility of the traffic assessment to be undertaken relating to intersection performances. There are no Sidra outputs and the assumptions underpinning the modelling are not able to be validated. This is essentially a matter for the RTA in relation to the operation of the Pacific Highway and it is assumed that the application will be assessed by the SRDAC; including whether assessment based on the Sidra modelling (which examines intersections in isolation) is appropriate. In this regard, assessment taking into account the coordination of traffic signals along the Highway may be required.</p> | <p>CBH + K has provided copies of its SIDRA output summaries attached to its report as appended to this PPR.</p> |
| <p>18 The basement car parks need to accommodate uninterrupted two-way flow on all ramps and internal intersections where traffic volumes exceed 30 veh/hr, based on AS 2890.1. No swept path analysis has been undertaken to establish whether this is possible and on the basis of the information available, compliance with AS 2890.1 cannot be assumed.</p> | <p>CBH + K has reviewed this issue and agrees that the design of the access driveway, ramps and internal circulation should appropriately provide for cars and service vehicles. The current proposal is a concept plan for which a further detailed project application will be required. These matters would therefore be most appropriately addressed at the time that a project application is made for the development.</p> |
| <p>19 The proposed service area requires a swept path assessment to establish whether all docks can be accessed while a truck is present in other docks, with forward entry and exit movement being possible.</p> | <p>CBH + K has reviewed this issue and agrees that the design of the access driveway, ramps and internal circulation should appropriately provide for cars and service vehicles. The current proposal is a concept plan for which a further detailed project application will be required. These matters would therefore be most appropriately addressed at the time that a project application is made for the development.</p> |
| <p>20 The issue of activation and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is a major factor in the podium design. The commercial lobbies and commercial cafes only activate during work hours (8 – 6pm M-F), with no night or weekend activity, and the scheme provides weak territorial definition due to the ambiguous undercroft spaces and deep recesses that depend on the building generating activity. The building is spatially removed from the natural activity spine of the Pacific Highway and the train station node.</p> | <p>Noted. The proponent has made a commitment to prepare a CPTED assessment as part of the future project / development application.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Concept Plan is not seeking approval for the uses at ground level. The final uses of these spaces proposed to activate the ground may operate outside of work hours.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---|--|
| <p>21 The DCP aims to activate the area around the underground link are not addressed in the proposal – Figure 38 of the Environmental Assessment Report would indicate that no allowance for an underground link has been made. Even if this link could be accommodated in the remainder of the Lithgow Street plaza, the lack of integration may render it unsafe and underused.</p> | <p>The proposed upgrade to the public domain upgrades on Lithgow Street are unlike to result in the link becoming more unsafe or underused. The link has not been incorporated into the Lithgow Street upgrades as it is on separate title owned by RailCorp. It is also noted that Challenger have a leasehold over the link and are responsible for its maintenance and management under the Forum Plaza Deed.</p> |
| <p>22 The tower does not modulate with setbacks, bays or projections. This in itself is not necessarily bad – the design has a high quality architectural finish, and its rectilinear form may be appropriate elsewhere.</p> <p>However, the proposal disregards the intention of the DCP setbacks in this location defining urban form. The 18m tower setbacks can clearly be related back to a ‘set piece’ comprised of the Forum building and Blocks B1 and B2 of the St Leonards Specialised Centre. It also relates to view sharing in the low rise podium masses together with other adjacent buildings, predominantly affecting already occluded views – while high rise elements step back to frame the Forum and its important views to the south. The 6m perimeter setbacks also have a role in opening up view corridors down streets and avoiding a canyon effect, such as that created on Christie Lane by the proposal.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The DCP makes no reference to view sharing in the precinct specific controls for Block 2. Based on the DCP objectives, the setbacks are intended to achieve a “high quality public plaza”, “maintain public amenity” and “provide high quality tower forms”. Section 5 of the EAR demonstrated that the inverted podium design adopted in the Concept Plan will still achieve all these objectives and therefore the proposed noncompliance with the 18m tower setback is appropriate.</p> |
| <p>23 A final design consideration is the contribution the building makes to the desired future context. In this case, three councils have (commendably, and somewhat unusually) come together to form a coherent cross-boundary strategic plan – the St Leonards Strategy (Nov 2006). In the subsequent 4 years, each council has realised the strategy in its own manner – the Forum development in Willoughby LGA, the NSLEP height and view sharing controls, and the ‘St Leonards Specialised Centre’ in the new Lane Cove DCP are all manifestations of that strategy.</p> | <p>The proposed Concept Plan is entirely consistent with the St Leonards Strategy which aimed to create a southern business district which had envelopes capable of delivering prestige large floorplate commercial development needed to attract new businesses to the St Leonard Centre. Compliance with the DCP block plans would not provide prestige large floorplates and would be contrary to the St Leonards Strategy.</p> <p>The graphic shown in Urbis’ submission on behalf of Challenger is not an extract from the St Leonards Strategy rather it is a hybrid of the DCP block plan and overlaid on an aerial photo. The Forum development and NSLEP height and view sharing controls all predate the St Leonards Strategy by over half a decade.</p> |
| <p>24 Even if it was accepted no viable scheme can be developed, serious consideration should be given as to whether the long term prejudicing of both 84 Christie Street and a new laneway is an acceptable long term planning and traffic management outcome.</p> | <p>As described in the CBH + K report, from a traffic management outcome perspective, all existing developments (and the subject proposal) would continue to operate satisfactorily under existing arrangements.</p> |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 25 | Block B2 also envisages the use of the Pacific Highway frontage, yet the EA only touches on amalgamation to Pacific Highway lots, with “2 of 8 lots purchased”. It would be pertinent to know which 2 lots have been acquired. The DCP shows that only 3 lots are required for development of a tower. | <p>The attempts to amalgamate with the Pacific Highway frontage was not covered in the same level of detail in the EA as it was not requested in the DGRs.</p> <p>Winten own 558 and 562 Pacific Highway, and are therefore not in a position to develop the land fronting the Pacific Highway. It is also noted that ownership of the three lots indicated in the Challenger submission would not be sufficient to develop the tower as suggested.</p> |
| General Public / Resident Submissions | | |
| 1 | Winten have not made reasonable attempts to amalgamate with the sites to the north fronting the Pacific Highway. | Winten has separately provided the DoP with suitable (commercial in confidence) information to address this issue. |
| 2 | The development is out of character with the rest of the commercial buildings in the area. | The proposal will alter the existing character of the southern side of the Pacific Highway. This is considered to be a positive change which is consistent with both Lane Cove Council and the State government’s vision for the area. |
| 3 | The building would tower over the lots fronting the Pacific Highway. This would sterilize the area surrounding Winten’s proposed project. | The proposed development will provide an additional 1,630 jobs on the southern side of the Pacific Highway and provide a new public plaza along Lithgow Street. As a result the development is far more likely to activate these commercial properties along Pacific Highway by substantially increasing the level of pedestrian activity rather than sterilizing them. |
| 4 | The amalgamation of the entire area would be an optimal solution for the area as a whole. | As detailed in Section 5.3 of the EAR, Winten attempted to amalgamate the whole site. However, despite making numerous offers above their potential development value, they were only able to purchase 2 of the 8 lots. |
| 5 | The proposed development will affect the functionality of Christie Lane which would hamper access to the rear of the properties fronting the Pacific Highway. | <p>The existing development on the site has loading dock and car park access from Christie Lane. The proposed development will remove these access and therefore turning movements to and from the site and will therefore improve the functionality of Christie Lane.</p> <p>Traffic increases in Christie Lane would be some 10 to 55 vehicles per hour during weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. Such low increases would not have significant effects on the operation of Christie Lane.</p> |
| 6 | The proposal is discriminatory towards smaller property owners and would be a gross under-utilisation of the space which should include the lots to the north to create the gateway into the St Leonards Centre. | As detailed in Section 5.3 of the EAR, Winten attempted to amalgamate the whole site. However, despite making numerous offers above their potential development value, they were only able to purchase 2 of the 8 lots. |
| 7 | The proposal will obstruct the bridge and city views to almost half of the apartments with views in the Forum development. | The view analysis at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document demonstrates that the apartments in The Forum will retain the majority of their outlook. |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Of The Forum (East) Residential tower some 2 units per floor over 10 floors (20 units or 4% of units in the building) will be affected in part, whilst of The Forum West Residential tower only 1 unit per floor over 7 floors (7 units or 2% of unit in the building) will in part be affected.</p> <p>The view affection of residential apartments in both The Forum and The Forum West apartment buildings has been reduced to 9.5% in both instances.</p> <p>The indicative floor plans have located the core of the building on the northern side, as a result the building will not affect the privacy of the apartments in the Forum.</p> <p>Further assessment of the impact of view loss generated by the proposal on dwellings in the Forum development is located at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document.</p> |
| 8 | The property values of the apartments in the Forum will be unfairly reduced. | Further assessment of the impact of view loss generated by the proposal on dwellings in the Forum development is located at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document. |
| 9 | The development will significantly affect the outlook and privacy of the apartments in the Forum. | <p>As above. The view analysis at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document demonstrates that the apartments in The Forum will retain the majority of their outlook. Of The Forum (East) Residential tower some 2 units per floor over 10 floors (20 units or 4% of units in the building) will be affected in part, whilst of The Forum West Residential tower only 1 unit per floor over 7 floors (7 units or 2% of unit in the building) will in part be affected.</p> <p>The view affection of residential apartments in both The Forum and The Forum West apartment buildings has been reduced to 9.5% in both instances.</p> <p>The indicative floor plans have located the core of the building on the northern side, as a result the building will not affect the privacy of the apartments in the Forum.</p> <p>Privacy will not be affected as the separation between the buildings is in the order of 40 or more metres. This is well in excess of accepted norms for separation distances.</p> |
| 10 | The impact of the proposed view loss should be determined on the number of apartments that have views of the Harbour Bridge from the Forum Tower not the total number of units. I.e 20 of 38 Units in Forum West. | As above. The view analysis at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document demonstrates that the apartments in The Forum will retain the majority of their outlook. Of The Forum (East) Residential tower some 2 units per floor over 10 floors (20 units or 4% of units in the building) will be affected in part, whilst of The Forum West Residential tower only 1 unit per floor over 7 floors (7 units or 2% of unit in the building) will in part be affected. |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The view affection of residential apartments in both The Forum and The Forum West apartment buildings has been reduced to 9.5% in both instances.</p> <p>The indicative floor plans have located the core of the building on the northern side, as a result the building will not affect the privacy of the apartments in the Forum.</p> <p>Further assessment of the impact of view loss generated by the proposal on dwellings in the Forum development is located at Section 2.2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submissions document.</p> |
| 11 | The development will have adverse traffic impacts on Chandos Street which is already congested. Particularly at peak PM periods. | The Traffic Impact Assessment submitted with the EAR demonstrated that the proposal will not affect the Level of Service at any of the surrounding intersections. A separate traffic response addressing the concerns raised in the public submission is located at Attachment C . |
| 12 | The proposal will impact on the traffic flow in St Leonards and Lane Cove area. | CBH + K has advised in its revised traffic report to support the PPR that the key intersections around, and servicing, the site continue to operate at a Level of Service of between A/B and C as documented in Section 5.5.2 of the exhibited EAR as a result of a 16% reduction in new traffic generation (184 new parking spaces instead of the originally planned 220 new parking spaces). |
| 13 | The proposal will exceed the LEP height control. | <p>Further discussion regarding the exceedance of the LEP height control is located in Section 2 of the Preferred Project Report / Response to Submission document.</p> <p>Note, Council has now itself moderated its earlier position with respect to height.</p> <p>Since exhibition of the project, and further liaison with Council on various design matters, Council has advised (see comments from letter dated 12 November 2010 below and as attached), that "Council reaffirms its view that the building should be limited to the LEP's 65 metres maximum, other than that minor variations only may be justified". This comment on minor variations, based on discussion at a meeting held with Council on 2 November 2010, relates to the upper habitable floor being both under and over the maximum height due to the site's topography.</p> |
| 14 | The proposal does not comply with the DCP block plan. | <p>Council indicated in the meeting on the 24 June 2010 that the architect appears to have "taken on board the urban design objectives of the DCP". Whilst the DCP presents a desired development outcome, it also states up front that:</p> <p><i>"Block Plan Controls will be applied with flexibility based on achievement of objectives"</i></p> <p>Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the EAR demonstrated that the proposal is entirely consistent with the DCP objectives for Block 2.</p> |

| Issues Raised | Proponent Response |
|---------------|---|
| | If redevelopment can only occur in accordance with the DCP block diagram (which requires amalgamation of 13 lots) then it is unlikely that any development will occur on the southern side of the Lane Cove Centre in the short to medium term. During consultation prior to exhibition, Lane Cove Council acknowledged that the proposal was the best resolution of the issues created by land ownership around the site in the foreseeable future. In Council's formal submission to the Department no objection to the non-compliances with the DCP were raised. |
| 15 | The proposal will create overshadowing in excess of acceptable limits. |
| | As demonstrated in Section 5.6.1 of the EAR, the proposed development will not have any adverse or significant shadowing impacts. |
| 16 | The proposal will have adverse acoustic impacts on the nearby residential properties in the Forum. |
| | <p>The acoustic impacts from the plant will be assessed as part of the future project / development application for the site and will be designed in accordance with the acceptable acoustic standards.</p> <p>It is noted that based on the distance from the site and the significant noise generated by traffic travelling along the Pacific Highway which runs between the site and the Forum development, as well as noise from the Challenger rooftop plant, the acoustic impacts from the plant room will be negligible.</p> |
| 17 | There is an oversupply of office and retail space in the area. |
| | There is significant demand for large floorplate commercial development in the area. The vacancy rates quoted in the submissions reflect the large quantity of redundant commercial space within the Centre and the need for redevelopment of these sites to occur. |
| 18 | View loss analysis has not been provided for the College of Law, Abode, and IBM building which will experience view loss. |
| | The College of Law will not experience view loss. Any view loss at the Abode or IBM buildings would not be significant and does not require further assessment and will be affected and lost by other development as envisaged by the LEP and the DCP. |
| 19 | The proposed car parking is not sufficient to accommodate the increase in jobs on the site. |
| | The proposed car parking has been determined in accordance with Lane Cove Council's car parking rate. |
| 20 | No study has been undertaken on the ability for the public transport system to cope. |
| | The NSW Transport Plan and Metropolitan Strategy require development to utilise public transport and not rely on private cars. It is anticipated that City Rail and Sydney Buses will make the necessary increases to the services operating to St Leonards in accordance with overall future demand. |
| 21 | There is no consideration of construction traffic. |
| | An assessment of the proposed construction traffic will be undertaken at the project / development application stage. |
| 22 | The development will not allow for the sites to the north to achieve a viable envelope or floorplate. |
| | Section 5.3 of the EAR demonstrates that the sites to the north are capable of achieving the development potential afforded to them under the LEP. |

| Issues Raised | | Proponent Response |
|---|--|---|
| 23 | The proposed development will block light and view corridors from 69 Christie Street. | 69 Christie Street is a commercial building located to the east of the proposed site. The proposed development will not block light to the building. The building is orientated to face the City and will not lose any significant views as a result of the proposed development. |
| Nature Care College (46 Nicholson Street) | | |
| 1 | NCC are impressed with the pedestrian initiatives, vehicular ingress and egress position in Lithgow Street, in the proposed development and the generally the workable multi street level and topographic sensitivity of the scheme. | Noted. |
| 2 | The Pacific Highway precinct will benefit from the proposed redevelopment. The site will provide a gateway to the precinct and the zone will benefit from the redevelopment. | Noted. |