

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue    | Points of Concern   | Response  |
|--------------|---|---|
| Urban design | Proposal is overdevelopment of site. The scale, height and setbacks are inappropriate for the site. | <p>The amended plans forming part of the PPR reduce the building bulk in the most critical part of the site.</p> <p>The circular ramp has been removed from the north east corner of the site and the first floor extension comprising the DDS has been significantly reduced in size with significant setbacks now provided from northern boundary and north eastern corner reducing visual impact from Victoria Road to the north and Murray Street to the east. The new upper level addition is setback 87 metres from the northern site boundary with Victoria Road.</p> <p>The projecting car park structures above first floor retail addition (behind the Mill House) have also been removed and setback a further 9 metres from the original proposal.</p> <p>The preferred project provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building heights that are consistent with the maximum height limits specified within the draft MLEP;</li> <li>- Setback of the upper level addition well back from the established building line particularly where adjacent to residential areas.</li> <li>- Stronger built form where adjacent to existing industrial properties and where there are no amenity implications.</li> </ul> |
|              | Development will be a 'Westfield' style development.  | <p>The preferred project will result in a total GLA of 39,700sqm. This is approximately 50% of the scale of the average regional shopping centre in Australia. A typical 'Westfield' super regional is over 100,00sqm.</p> <p>The Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre expansion has been designed to cater for the under supply of retail floor space in the region and provide additional retail services for the local community.</p> <p>The proposed development cannot be reasonably compared to a Westfield style development.</p>  |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue | Points of Concern   | Response   |
|-----------|---|--|
|           | Unattractive development - Architectural design looks outdated and disproportionate to surroundings, 'driftwood' concept needs to be more modern. | <p>The overall feel for the new buildings and the additions to the existing centre are industrial in respect of the heritage of the site and the context of the development. Whilst most retail centres adopt an exuberant festive look and feel, this approach to this proposal has been more restrained.</p> <p>The proposal removes the existing precast walls along Murray and Smidmore Street and replaces them with shopfronts and banded brickwork to balance the proposed façades of the Edinburgh Road building. The walls that mask the new loading dock and services will be clad in precast with a grooved pattern that extend the banding effect of the brickwork. The precast will have the same colour oxide as the panels on the building on the Edinburgh industrial site to present a cohesive visual picture along Murray Street.</p> |
|           | Poor appearance of pedestrian and vehicle bridge over Smidmore Street.  | The pedestrian bridge has been removed from the Preferred Project.   |
|           | Location, appearance and height of car park access and spiral car parking ramp on Murray Street and impact on streetscape                         | <p>The spiral car park access ramp has been removed and the Preferred Project retains the existing car park ramp off Murray Street in the existing location away from the residential properties to the north east, on the opposite side of Murray Street.</p> <p>The amended plans indicate that the majority of trees along the Murray Street frontage (between Victoria Road and Smidmore Street) will be retained. While rationalisation of the loading docks will result in the loss of 4 existing trees, the loss of these trees will be more than compensated by opportunities for new landscaping where existing opening to loading docks will be removed.</p>   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue | Points of Concern  | Response   |
|-----------|--|--|
|           | <p>Current metro size sufficient – No need for supermarket or DDS.</p> <p>No need for another shopping complex – oversupply of similar shopping centres in Broadway, Rockdale and Miranda.</p> | <p>The Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) prepared by Pitney Bowes Business Insight indicates that the trade area served by the centre is characterised by a significant under supply of retail floor space and that Marrickville Metro is the only shopping centre within the defined main trade area which offers consumers significant comparison shopping facilities.</p> <p>Research of residents of the Marrickville region shows that about half of them shop primarily outside the area for their clothing, homewares and giftware needs at Sydney CBD, Broadway, Westfield Burwood and Westfield Bondi Junction. Marrickville Metro offers floor area which can accommodate national brands and provide a greater range of retail services.</p> |
|           | Proposed community services/open space will duplicate services already provided.   | <p>The proposal includes upgrading of existing open space at the north of the site which will enhance the setting of heritage item 'Mill House' in Civic Place, provide safer, attractive recreational area.</p> <p>The 'plaza' space originally proposed for Smidmore Street has been removed but replaced with an activated retail street.</p> <p>Additional community facilities are no longer proposed based on the feedback of Council.</p>   |
|           | Design of development has no relationship to surrounding character.  | The architectural report that has been prepared as part of the Preferred Project outlines the design philosophy and approach. The design concept draws heavily on the character of the surrounding area.   |
|           | <p>Suggestions to Improve the development:</p> <p>Metro needs small revitalisation.</p> <p>Proposal needs to further activate street frontages.</p>  | <p>The scale of the expansion has been determined based on the market analysis and the physical capacity of the site and surrounding infrastructure to accommodate the expansion. The Preferred Project is a reduced development scheme that balances these factors.</p> <p>The proposed development will activate Smidmore Street, but there are design considerations and physical constraints associated with the site that limit the ability</p>   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                                   | <p>Development should contain residential development</p> <p>Development should contain a theatre</p> <p>Works should include lots of natural light and open space. Food court needs more seating – more range of eating outlet opportunities.</p> | <p>to further 'activate' the site. For example, a deliberate decision has been made to not activate Victoria Road given the residential context. On Murray Street, internal constraints associated with existing tenancies including the need to provide loading and car access limit the ability to activate this frontage.</p> <p>It is envisaged that residential development may develop surrounding the site, particularly to the east. Placing residential on the site is problematic given the current and future height controls.</p> <p>A theatre use is more appropriate for a regional shopping centre or main street location.</p> <p>The proposed market place will create a light-filled internal plaza space that will create new amenity and convenience for customers.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Key Issue                         | Points of Concern  | Response  |
| <b>Shopping Centre Management</b> | Existing maintenance of Metro is poor - currently only clean inside shopping centre, health concerns due to increased litter and poor management of rubbish bins (Waste).  | AMPCI is committed to effective operational management of the shopping centre which will specify management of waste, safety and security.  |
|                                   | There will be poor trolley management and increased abandoned trolleys   | The Operational Management Plan for the centre will encompass a strategy for trolley management.  |
|                                   | No consideration has been given to emergency evacuation management.  | Emergency and fire evacuation has been considered and addressed in EA and report prepared by Defire. The new building at 13-55 Edinburgh Road has been designed to comply with the DTS provisions of the BCA including and fire safety requirements. The existing portions of the shopping centre will undergo a fire safety upgrade.   |
|                                   | Maintenance of walking and cycling routes  | <p>The Operational Management Plan for the centre will specify maintenance strategy for walking and cycling paths around centre.</p> <p>Refer to revised Statement of Commitments.</p>  |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue      | Points of Concern   | Response   |
|----------------|---|--|
|                | Amenities such as toilets provided inadequate.  | The shopping centre refurbishment and upgrade will upgrade amenities and facilities within the shopping centre and provide adequate number of facilities to comply with BCA requirements.                              |
|                | Development should not include restricted/metered parking.  | There are no proposals to include restricted or metered parking on-site.   |
| <b>Traffic</b> | Proposal includes poor road management planning.  | Not agreed - A detailed Traffic Management and Accessibility Plan has been provided and further amended as part of the PPR.  |
|                | Development will result in increased traffic generation and road congestion on surrounding streets.   | Not agreed - The analysis outlined in the Halcrow Report documents the increased projected traffic generated by the development and explains why this increase can be accommodated without undue increased congestion. |
|                | Impact on congested nature surrounding roads in particular: the intersection of Edgeware Road, Stanmore Road and Enmore Road and roads are at maximum capacity along Enmore Road, King Street, Edgeware Road and Alice Street.  | Not agreed – refer to transport report.  |
|                | Proposal fails to take into account traffic impacts from approved developments in local area including new IKEA at Tempe and new swimming pool at Enmore Road.  | The TMAP includes analysis of other related development. The new swimming pool in particular at Enmore Park is forecast to have a greater impact on some intersections than the expansion of the Metro.                |
|                | Traffic impact Assessment - Underreporting of traffic generation, traffic survey was biased, Lord Street not included in Traffic Impact Assessment, pre-existing traffic problems in the area and around the site which have not been addressed.<br><br>Single lane residential streets around the site were never extended to cope with traffic from existing shopping centre. | This assertion is not agreed with. The methodology and analysis is outlined in the Halcrow Report  |
|                | Traffic Impact Assessment comprised invalid reporting of usage of Smidmore Street. Community surveyed vehicle use.  | An assessment is provided in the amended Transport report prepared by Halcrow.   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                  |  |   |
|------------------|--|---|
|                  | Results are (11am to 12 noon – 994 vehicles, 12 noon to 1pm – 1052 vehicles, 1pm-2pm -1003 vehicles).  |   |
|                  | <p>Traffic safety issues - increased chance of vehicle collisions, increased opportunities for pedestrian/vehicle conflicts including safety hazards for school children (St Pius).</p> <p>Impacts on access to education centres within 500m and 1000m.</p> <p>Increased heavy vehicles on local side streets, heavy vehicles will travel on local streets at maximum legal speed limits.</p> | The assessment authorities (RTA and Council) have not raised any specific traffic safety issues.  |
|                  | Impact on access to residents homes on surrounding streets.  | The net traffic increases on surrounding roads are expected to be moderate to low and the proposal is not expected to restrict access residential development around the site.  |
|                  | Vehicle entrances to car park may result in queuing on surrounding streets.  | The amended scheme removes the spiral car park ramp in the north eastern corner of the site and retains the existing car park entrance on Murray Street. Proposal involves minor reconfiguration of existing car park entrance from Smidmore Street, and new car park access from Edinburgh Road. There will be no significant change to existing vehicle ingress and egress movements to the shopping centre and no additional queuing on residential streets. |
|                  | <p>Relocation of taxi stand to Murray Street is problematic.</p> <p>Taxi stand should contain a minimum of 6 spaces</p>  | The taxi stand will be relocated to Smidmore Street with a length of 38 metres, meaning capacity for approximately 5 taxis. This is considered an adequate number of spaces to service the centre and is an appropriate location for the rank with good access from both shopping centre buildings.   |
|                  | Pick up and set down measures for old/disabled customers have not been considered.   | Accessible, safe drop off and pick up area will be located on Smidmore Street within close proximity to the shopping centre entrances on the north and south sides of the street.   |
| <b>Key Issue</b> | <b>Points of Concern</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|                  | Impact on cycle access to and around the site.   | It is now proposed to retain the cycling route from Sydenham Station along Shirlow Street, but to change the route to Sydenham Station and instead uses Saywell and Cadogen Streets (which form part of an existing cycle route) then use Sydenham  |

**Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Proposal needs management plan which encourages more walking and cycling.</p> | <p>Road to get to the Sydenham Road/Shirlow Street intersection.</p> <p>Thereafter a two-way route would continue along Sydenham Road and Railway Parade to Sydenham Station as originally proposed. Regional Cycle Rate No. 5 (Stage 2) has been added to the TMAP plans, a copy of which is attached in the Halcrow Transport Report.</p> <p>Currently, 16% of shoppers (during Thursday PM peak) walk to Marrickville Metro. The TMAP outlines proposed measures to further promote walking and cycling and the use of public transport, including upgrade public domain and landscaping, new directional signage, improved pedestrian connections to railway stations and preparation of a 'green travel guide' which includes measure to enhance centres non car mode access.</p> <p>Bike parking and storage will be located on the site and showers will be located in the building.</p> |
| <p>Proposal lacks planning to improve public transport infrastructure.</p>       | <p>Sydney Buses have been consulted – refer to Halcrow Transport report.</p> <p>Changes/increases in bus services are a matter for Transport NSW to approve and fund.</p> <p>The development proposes a new bus terminus on Edinburgh Road that will enable for increased capacity (3 bus parking areas compared to 2 currently on Smidmore Street). The proposed bus terminus will thus increase bus stop capacity by 50%. This will provide more than sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the proposed expansion. Therefore this additional capacity will assist in the event that additional services are funded.</p> <p>A community bus parking bay is also proposed along Smidmore Street subject to Council approval.</p>  |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue | Points of Concern  | Response  |
|-----------|--|---|
| Parking   | Development does not comply with Council's Parking DCP.  | <p>The proposed provision of parking accords with RTA parking rates for shopping centres which require 4.1 spaces/100sqm for shopping centres with over 30,000sqm.</p> <p>The provision of parking represents a balance between providing for the needs of customers but also promoting other forms of transport including walking, cycling and public transport.</p>   |
|           | <p>Development will cause parking chaos in Enmore and Marrickville, contribute to existing parking congestion along Enmore Road and Marrickville Roads and Juliette Street.</p> <p>Development will result in the removal of car parking along May Street and Unwin's Bridge Road.</p> | <p>The parking restriction is limited to the loss of 8 car spaces over a half hour weekday period, noting that there are already no-stopping/parking restrictions in place between 3.30 and 5.30pm on weekdays.</p> <p>In any event, the need for such parking restrictions will arise from other development (Council Aquatic Centre and private development on Alice Street) irrespective of the expansion of Marrickville Metro.</p> <p>On May Street, the design has been amended such that the existing parking on the south side of the street is maintained by reducing the east bound provision by a total of 3 spaces only. This option retains the car parking adjacent to the existing residential dwellings. The total loss of 3 spaces is not considered to be a significant impact and will assist to improve the performance of this intersection.</p> |
|           | Lack of off adequate off street parking will result in congested car parking facilities.   | The off-street parking provision is considered appropriate for the projected demands of the centre.   |



## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue                           | Points of Concern   | Response   |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Access</b>                       | Removal on-street parking will impact disabled parking opportunities.   | Accessible parking will be provided on site in accordance with the BCA and DDA requirements. Disabled parking can also be accommodated on-street as needed.  |
|                                     | Proposal will result in drop off difficulties for customers.  | The retention of Smidmore Street for vehicle traffic allows for the designation of pick up and set down locations in close proximity to the entrances to the existing and proposed centre entrances. Refer to Halcrow Transport report.  |
| <b>Acoustic Impacts</b>             | Increased traffic noise resulting health issues for residents including sleep deprivation for use of loading docks (24 hours).<br><br>Appropriate acoustic isolation of loading docks required. | The acoustic impacts of the proposed development are addressed in the report prepared by Acoustic logic.<br><br>The Preferred Project will limit loading hours between the hours of 7am to 10pm to address concerns regarding sleep disturbance.   |
|                                     | Noise impacts from cleaning and management of building and surrounds – leaf blowing/hosing.   | Cleaning and maintenance of the shopping centre and its surrounds will be carried out in accordance with the Operational Management Plan.  |
| <b>Tree removal and landscaping</b> | Removal of established trees around site will destroy habitat and will negatively impact on appearance of street.   | <p>In response to these concerns, the preferred project proposes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The retention of all street trees in Smidmore Street, which now becomes possible with the removal of the building extension across the road reserve. Appropriate tree protection measures will be put in place during the construction phase.</li> <li>The retention of the mature trees on the Victoria Road frontage, specifically those trees referenced by Council for retention.</li> <li>The removal of the 'rain gardens' concept for Murray Street and therefore the proposed staged replacement of the existing fig trees. The trees will be maintained as part of the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p>The preferred project response will ensure that the majority of significant trees within or adjacent to the site will be retained. The project also provides for the planting of new additional trees that will further contribute to the visual amenity of the precinct.</p> <p>The majority of Fig trees along Murray Street will now be retained. The proposal includes replacement planting of trees to be removed as a result of rationalisation of loading docks. In addition, Eucalyptus trees along Smidmore Street will be</p> |
|                                     | Proposal untruthful - Ficus trees will be removed now and not in the future.  |  |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                               |   | retained.  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Key Issue                     | Points of Concern   | Response   |
| <b>Community consultation</b> | Lack of adequate community consultation, inconvenient consultation times, and lack of adequate information provided about project.<br><br>Limited advice provided in forums, and concerns raised during forums were ignored.  | As outlined in the EA, extensive consultation with community and relevant stakeholder groups prior and during the design development process. The consultation process was designed to meet the Department of Planning's consultation guidelines and involved door knocking and surveying surrounding neighbours, newsletters distributed to the wider community, establishment of a project website and community information days held at the shopping centre prior to lodgement of the application and during the public exhibition period.<br><br>Feedback from the community received during the consultation process was recorded and taken into consideration during the design development.  |
|                               | Consultation provided misleading information about development- AMP has not been truthful about the development.<br><br>Misconception that 'Revitalisation' meant refurbishment and upgrade, not renovation and expansion to the proposed scale.<br><br>Consultation undertaken was disrespectful to community. | All details provided on the development during consultation, for example in the newsletters delivered, on the project's website and information provided during community information days held at the shopping centre were accurate and truthful.   |
|                               | Questionnaire was restrictive and questions in surveys biased.  | The surveys were undertaken by reputable consultants with experience in market research.   |
|                               | No consultation with community prior or during design development of the scheme.<br><br>Residents only notified of development once Part 3A application on exhibition, not before.  | The scale of the proposed expansion was in part informed by the significant economic and market research that was undertaken from 2005. AMPCI has always been open to Council regarding its aspirations for the expansion of Marrickville Metro and this is documented in numerous correspondence.<br><br>Extensive consultation was undertaken in with community and key stakeholders and involved door knocking and surveying surrounding neighbours, newsletters distributed to the wider community, establishment of a project website and community information days held at the shopping centre prior to lodgement of the application and during the public exhibition period.<br><br>Consultation was carried out prior to lodgement of the application in accordance |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                 |   | with DoP guidelines. The purpose of the Part 3A exhibition period is to provide an opportunity for the public to submit their concerns. Public exhibition period was extended by 14 days by the DoP at the community's request.  |
|-----------------|---|--|
|                 | No newsletters distributed to shops in King St (south) or Enmore Road.  | The extent of newsletter notification was discussed and agreed with Council. The information was also the project website.   |
| Key Issue       | Points of Concern   | Response   |
| Economic impact | <p>Economic Impact Assessment biased.</p> <p>No capability gap assessment undertaken to assess where retail supply is required and if appropriate.</p>  | <p>Not agreed.</p> <p>AMPCI has been researching the economic implications of the proposed Marrickville Metro expansion since 2005. The Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) and Marrickville Retail Strip Review prepared by Pitney Bowes Insight truthfully details these research findings.</p> <p>Research indicates that trade area served by the shopping centre is characterised by significant undersupply of retail floor space. Research of residents within the Marrickville region shows that about half of them shop primarily outside the area for their clothing, homewares and giftware needs at Sydney CBD, Broadway, Westfield Burwood and Westfield Bondi Junction.</p>   |
|                 | <p>Proposal will have negative economic impact small/local businesses, corner shops, on local shopping villages/strip shops on Enmore Road, King Street, Marrickville Road and Illawarra Road.</p> <p>Proposed restaurant area will take away from function of strip shops.</p> | <p>As outlined in the EA, AMPCI commissioned a Retail Strip Review to understand and analyse the impacts of Marrickville Metro on the strips. The report indicates that while the strip centres are currently operating at a healthy level (with the existence of the current Marrickville Metro), the strips also offer cultural differentiation and specialisation, providing food catering and convenience shopping. The strips do not and cannot offer larger retail floor space to cater for national retail brands, large format supermarkets or discount department stores.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the amended scheme involves a reduced additional retail floor space and trading impacts on Marrickville Road are expected to be reduced from the marginal impact originally proposed of 5% to only 4.1%.</p> <p>Food outlets within the centre will be orientated around convenience and are not considered to detract from the cultural attraction of restaurants and cafes along King Street, Marrickville Road and Enmore Road.</p> |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Employment impact on staff in local businesses.  | The proposed development will have a significantly positive employment impact. The impacts on other centres (and therefore employment) are considered to be low and will be far exceeded by the generation of new employment opportunities within the expanded retail centre.   |
| Proposed number of jobs to be created is not true.   | The employment projections are based on modelling using ABS data on employment densities.   |
| Decline in economic competition in surrounding areas.  | <p>The proposed Marrickville Metro expansion will provide additional retail floor space to meet an undersupply in the region and provide additional retail services to support the Marrickville community.</p> <p>It is forecast that trading impacts on surrounding centres will be low and will not threaten their on-going viability. Notwithstanding this, the planning system is not designed to prevent normal competition between retailers.</p> |
| Marrickville Metro is not a 'town centre' and will take away from Marrickville Road functioning as town centre.    | Estimated trade impacts will not be at a scale which threatens the viability of strip shop centres. Marrickville Metro will compete more directly with higher order facilities located beyond the trade area such as the Sydney CBD, Westfields Bondi Junction, Burwood, Ashfield Mall and Campsie Centre. It is estimated that the trade impact on Marrickville Road is only 4.1%.   |
| There are vacant shops in existing centre and along Marrickville Road – there is no need for the centre to expand. | This issue is addressed PBBI EIA where it is expected that there are some vacancies given the extensive distances over which the supply of retail space is dispersed. Vacant retail space along Marrickville Road cannot cater for national retail brands, large format supermarkets or discount department stores.   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue                       | Points of Concern   | Response   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Sale of Smidmore Street</b>  | Closure and privatisation of Smidmore Street is not legal.  | The Preferred Project does not seek to close Smidmore Street.  |
|                                 | Loss of bus stop which services community.  | <p>Sydney Buses have been consulted – refer to Halcrow report.</p> <p>The development proposes a new bus terminus on Edinburgh Road that will enable for increased capacity (3 bus parking areas compared to 2 currently on Smidmore Street). The proposed bus terminus will thus increase bus stop capacity by 50%. This will provide more than sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the proposed expansion. Therefore this additional capacity will assist in the event that additional services are funded.</p> <p>A community bus parking bay is also proposed along Smidmore Street.</p>  |
|                                 | Offering open space to the community in return for sale of Smidmore Street inappropriate due to existing satisfactory open space (Enmore Park). | The Preferred Project does not seek to close Smidmore Street.  |
| <b>Impact on area character</b> | Large shopping centre not suited to local area and will have a negative impact on residential precinct. This is not a commercial precinct.      | The site is occupied by an existing shopping centre which is a commercial use and is bounded by residential properties to the north, west and north east and industrial land to the south, south west and south east. The proposal involves expansion into the adjoining industrial land to the south. In addition, the proposed additional bulk to the existing shopping centre building will be setback to the southern portion of the site and will not significantly impact the nearby residential properties.   |
|                                 | Lack of public transport and infrastructure to support development.   | <p>The Preferred Project includes a number of measures to promote public transport usage and improve access to the centre include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of new bus shelter to service buses along Edinburgh Road which will have direct pedestrian access to the shopping centre's southern entrance. The proposal also provides opportunities for improvements to bus facilities and increased trip frequency to better service the customers and staff. The proposed bus terminus will thus increase bus stop capacity by 50%.</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian connections to railway stations with inclusion of directional signage.</li> </ul> |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|           |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved public domain and landscaping around the site to enhance pedestrian amenity.</li> <li>Provision of cycle routes and bicycle facilities located at the shopping centre entrances in Murray Street, Victoria and Edinburgh Roads.</li> <li>Improved bicycle routes from St Peters and Sydenham Stations.</li> <li>Provision of car sharing spaces allocated within the centre car park.</li> <li>Improved pick up and set down areas for shuttle buses and customers.</li> </ul> |
|-----------|--|--|
|           | Proposal will have negative impact on natural environment.               | <p>The proposal includes upgrading of existing open space at the north of the site which will enhance the setting of heritage item 'Mill House' in Civic Place, provide safer, attractive recreational area.</p> <p>The amended scheme involves retention of majority of Fig trees along Murray Street, with replacement of trees required to be removed and the retention of mature Eucalyptus trees along Smidmore Street.</p>   |
| Key Issue | Points of Concern  | Response   |
| Heritage  | Heritage items will be demolished.                                       | The proposal does not involve the removal or demolition of heritage items on the site. Amended plans show increased setback of additions to retain setting of 'Mill House'. HIS indicates development is consistent with the relevant Conservation Management Plan for Mill House and new landscaping reinforces setting.  |
|           | Impact on Vicars Mill façade.  | <p>The remnant walls of the Vicars Mill facade will be retained as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>The rain gardens along Victoria Road will be retained, but have been removed along Murray Street.</p> <p>The substantial setback of the upper level addition will retain the scale and quality of the former factory façade.</p>   |
|           | Development will impact on surrounding Federation residential buildings. | The proposal involves expansion into the adjoining industrial land to the south. The additional bulk in the north eastern portion of the site has been removed from the proposal and concentrated towards the southern/south eastern end of the site and setback from the north, northeast and western residential interfaces. The additional bulk will not be significantly visible from the nearby residential properties or   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                                |  | streetscape.   |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Key Issue                      | Points of Concern  | Response   |
| <b>Social/Community Impact</b> | Nature of development conflicts with the vibrant, creative diverse, environmentally friendly communities.<br><br>Loss of local 'niche' feeling/village like community/cultural hub, undermining community space, imposition of pre-fabricated culture. | Social research indicates that there will be no significant change to the social fabric of the area as the shopping centre currently exists and the proposed expansion is towards an industrial zone.<br><br>Social research also indicates that the proposed expansion will benefit the community by provided additional services for the community not at the expense of local shops. Research indicates that people are likely to shop along strip shops and at centres which provides floor space to accommodate national brands and major supermarkets. |
|                                | Alienate residents and negative impact on liveability of area.   | The proposal involves upgrade of an existing shopping centre and expansion of the shopping centre in to an existing industrial site. The proposed expansion will provide additional retail services to the Marrickville community. The upgrade, refurbishment and expansion of the shopping centre will enhance the usability of the site as well as provide safe vehicle and pedestrian access to and from the site.  |
|                                | Adequate level of existing community facilities in Marrickville – no need for more, no agreement with Council regarding community services (i.e. Library services proposed).   | The proposal includes upgrading of existing open space at the north of the site which will enhance the setting of heritage item 'Mill House' in Civic Place, provide safer, attractive recreational area.<br><br>No additional community facilities are proposed as part of the Preferred Project.   |
| <b>Residential amenity</b>     | Impact on residential health and lifestyle.  | The proposal is for the expansion and upgrade of an existing shopping centre and extension to an existing industrial site. The proposal includes upgrade and enhancement of existing open space, increased pedestrian activation around the site, improved vehicular access and landscaping works including retention of significant trees along Murray and Smidmore Streets.  |
|                                | Overshadowing impacts.   | The proposal will not result in any additional overshadowing impacts on adjoining residential properties. The amended proposal involves additional bulk to the southern portion of the site, away from the residential properties to the north, northeast and west.  |
|                                | Loss of visual privacy to properties in Llewellyn Street.  | Llewellyn Street is located approximately 200m from Victoria Road (the northern portion of the building), approximately 2 blocks. The proposed extension will be   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                 |   | setback significantly from the north and will not cause visual privacy loss for residents along Llewellyn Street.   |
|-----------------|---|---|
|                 | Noise and air pollution from traffic generation.  | Addressed in Acoustic report.   |
|                 | Acoustic/noise impacts from mechanical ventilation.   | Addressed in Acoustic report.   |
| Key Issue       | Points of Concern   | Response  |
| Part 3A process | Proposal is a grab for profit by AMP.   |   |
|                 | Concern for the way development proposal bypassed local government to be Part 3A.   | On 19 January 2010, NSW Department of Planning declared that the proposal meets the mandatory criteria for a Major Project under the SEPP (Major Development) 2005.<br><br>Despite the project being assessed by the Department of Planning, the proponent has sought to work closely with Marrickville Council officers.   |
|                 | Development proposal is a manipulation of planning legislation - loss of employment land.   | The DoP as the delegate for the Minister of Planning formed the opinion that the proposal meets the mandatory criteria for a Major Project.   |
|                 | Development should not be assessed under Part 3A as it is neither a State Significant site nor Critical Infrastructure.   | The proposal was declared a Major Project meeting the mandatory criteria for a Major Project being a development with a capital investment value greater than \$100 million   |
|                 | No reference to proposed AMP development on adjoining Unilever site?  | There is no proposed development for the adjacent Unilever site which is unrelated to the proposed development at Marrickville Metro.   |
| Land use        | Development does not comply with industrial zoning.<br><br>Industrial land should be retained to ensure adequate industrial land is available close to Sydney Airport., loss of cheap industrial land | As the project has been declared a Major Project under Part 3A of the Act, a use that does not comply with the current zoning can be considered.<br><br>The land at 13-55 Edinburgh Road has been identified in the Draft Sub-Regional Planning Strategy as a site where land uses beyond industrial should be considered.<br><br>The Strategy supports the expansion of the existing retail centre (Marrickville Metro) through specifically identifying opportunities for the redevelopment of industrial land at 13-55 Edinburgh Road: |



## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <i>'Marrickville, Sydenham (2) (Manufacturing-Heavy Freight and Logistics)....Land north of Edinburgh Road and south of Smidmore Street and between Smidmore and Murray Street has potential for higher level employment uses, which could include retail, office or mixed uses. This would support the Marrickville Metro Centre and encourage a redesign which better relates to the surrounding area.'</i> (Page 33)                    |
|   | Telstra tower (33 metres) above current metro would change the height of the footprint.   | The existing Telstra communication facilities will need to be relocated as part of the redevelopment but will be subject to a separate approval process.   |
| <b>Consistency with Planning Controls</b> | Development does not comply with Marrickville LGA planning controls including Marrickville Urban Strategy 2007 and Village Centres Study.   | A comprehensive assessment against relevant policies and controls has been provided in the EA submission.  |
|   | Non compliance with Marrickville Action Plans for Urban Centres.  |  |
|   | Conflicts with South Subregional Strategy.  |  |
|   | Inconsistent with Business Centres DCP 38.  |  |
| <b>Safety and security</b>                | <p>Development will attract crime including attract drug dealing, car theft.</p> <p>Open space area to become attraction for anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Increase smoking spaces.</p> | <p>The proposed development will involve CPTED initiatives including natural/passive surveillance, CCTV to entrances and around site, access control for loading docks and car park areas, regular security patrols, appropriate signage and lighting and management regime for on-going maintenance of the centre.</p> <p>Security management of the shopping centre open space is addressed in the revised Statement of Commitments.</p> |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

| Key Issue             | Points of Concern  | Response  |
|-----------------------|--|---|
|                       | Light spill from car park areas and from car park ramp.                        | <p>The deletion of the circular ramp in the north-east corner of the site and retain the existing Murray Street access point largely overcomes this specific concern. By retaining the Murray Street access arrangements, there will be no effective change to the light spill and acoustic impacts within this part of the site. The roof top parking will be retained in this part of the site (behind the existing parapet) with ramps accessing upper levels well setback from the site boundaries.</p> <p>The proposed access ramp from Smidmore Street will similarly be retained in-situ, except that the entry point is relocated slightly further west on Smidmore Street. Once on the ramp, vehicles will circulate on the first floor and upper car park decks as they do now. In other words, essentially the status quo will remain in terms of the movement of vehicles around the rooftop.</p> <p>All car park levels have a safety hob 1200mm high above the floor in concrete. The height of this hob is sufficient to prevent light spilling out of the car park.</p> |
|                       | Brightness of signage.   | <p>Signage will be subject to separate development approval.</p> <p>Addressed in revised Statement of Commitments.</p>  |
| <b>Property value</b> | De-value residential property  | The Preferred Project incorporates mitigation measures design to prevent the loss of amenity. Public domain will be enhanced by the development and therefore it is envisaged that the proposal will positively impact on property values.  |
| <b>ESD</b>            | <p>Lack of commitment to ESD.</p> <p>Hindrance to ESD initiatives for LGA.</p> | <p>Lend Lease design considers embodied energy as described in Section 6.5 of the ESD report. The carbon analysis carried out on retail centres shows that up to 80% of the embodied energy will be in four key areas; concrete and steel structure, facade selection, internal partitioning and floor finishes. LLD construction teams have consistently reduced embodied energy by using flyash as cement replacement, steel reinforcement with up to 100% recycled content, lightweight internal blockwork and safe, natural non-slip floor finishes that require minimal ongoing maintenance (no chemicals or energy use). All of this experience will be brought to the detailed design of Marrickville Metro.</p> <p>The application considers the use of onsite renewables and co-generation (also</p>   |

## Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre – Response to Public Submissions

|                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
|                             |   | <p>commonly referred to as trigeneration once absorption cooling is added) in Section 6.1. The provision of on-site solar renewables is straightforward and has little ongoing operational implications for the owner but the provision of gas-fired decentralised power is not so straightforward and should be managed by a specialist energy services company (ESCO)). Decentralised cogeneration increases reliance on natural gas (fossil fuel) infrastructure and introduces issues of local air quality for nearby residents. Many experts in the industry recognise cogeneration as a transition technology that can be used to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels but it can only go so far; a truly zero carbon future can only be delivered by renewable energy sources and solutions that take us straight to that scenario, leapfrogging any transitional fossil fuel based solutions, are certainly of equal merit to cogeneration.</p> <p>Whichever path is taken to reduce energy supply side emissions the first priority should always be to reduce energy demand. AMPCI will be investing in efficient building services that minimise the energy used to light and condition the space while maintaining appropriate air quality and visual and thermal comfort.</p> |
|                             |   |   |
| <b>Construction impacts</b> | Noise from night works construction.  | <p>A detailed construction management plan is included in the revised Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>Stage 1 of the development will involve works 13-55 Edinburgh Road, located away from residential properties to the north, northeast and west.</p>   |
|                             | Phasing of construction is convenient for proponent and will not inconvenience residents. |   |

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| <b>Total</b> | <b>576</b> |
| Objection    | 547        |
| Support      | 27         |
| Neutral      | 2          |