

ATTACHMENT D

Authority Consultation Undertaken
as part of this Environmental Assessment

ATTACHMENT D - PUBLIC AUTHORITY CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN FOR COLUMBIA PRECINCT REGENERATION PROJECT

The Director General's Requirements of November 2010 (found at Attachment B to this Concept Plan Environmental Assessment), requires at point #18 that the EA "...undertake an appropriate and justified level of consultation in accordance with the Department's *Major Project Community Consultation Guidelines October 2009*, and consultation with relevant agencies including Council and RailCorp".

The Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report ⁽¹⁾ was lodged with the Department in July 2010 and was notified by the Department to a number of relevant public bodies. Responses were received, and evaluated by the Department in combination with the PEA Report (see Attachment C), prior to the Department's Declaration of Columbia Precinct as a Part 3A Major Project in October 2010. Public bodies contacted including Strathfield Council, NSW Transport, State Transit, RailCorp and DECCW, and where appropriate the Department incorporated their suggestions into the DGR's issued in November 2010.

Following issuance of the DGR's, a range of further consultations have been conducted, now by the project team preparing this Environmental Assessment rather than the Department. These have covered a range of public authorities (including several consulted before) as well as a public consultation process as documented under the following Attachment E, having regard for the Department's Consultation Guidelines referenced above. The public authorities were contacted by phone, letter and email as appropriate, and their comments and requirements taken into account. Summary follows:-

Strathfield Council – Discussions and briefing meeting held at Council, (see attached Minutes). Also response to Council email by subsequent CBHK letter regarding new George Street intersection leg, leading to amendments to intersection design.

⁽¹⁾CBHK Planning with Mayoh Architects, Columbia Precinct Part 3A Preliminary Environmental Assessment, July 2010.

Roads & Traffic Authority – Discussions/emails, and meeting held at RTA Parramatta, with adopted parameters and results of modelling presented. See attached Minutes of meeting. RTA will now need to sign-off on the EA traffic report once lodged, along with the intersection layout design and operation. Discussions separately held with other Officers regarding necessary footbridge clearances over Parramatta Road (minimum 5.3 metres due to 4.3 metre clearance of adjacent Arnotts rail bridge).

Sydney Water – Owns the Powell's Creek stormwater canal, as well as the responsible body for sewer and water. Discussions/emails, and meeting in Parramatta, leading to verbal advice that stormwater could not be stored in the canal, that bridge crossings of the canal should be minimised, and that an 'in principle' Section 73 Certificate should be sought in relation to sewer and water supply. That S.73 application has been lodged, hopefully verifying the findings of SLR Consulting on the subject. No riparian planting is recommended.

Energy Australia and Integral Energy – responsible for transmission lines and District substation respectively – A series of emails and telephone conversations with relevant officers, establishing the following site planning criteria pertaining to their interests:-

- a) Vehicle access (20 tonne) is to be retained to each pylon
- b) Any structures beneath overhead lines are preferably non-conductive, or if that is not possible, very well earthed, particularly in public spaces
- c) Landscaping in the easements will need to be formally approved as part of EA Approval process
- d) The underground 132KV lines in the site just to the north of the substation will need formal easement on Title, with no build-over
- e) A large articulated vehicle will need to be able to access the substation over the future roads through Columbia Precinct.

Transport NSW – By CBHK letter, email and telephone discussions, providing advice as to the foreshadowed future upgrade of the northern Sydney freight line (timing and movement projections, largely for input to acoustic impact assessment by SLR), and on the future use of the spare rail capacity across the Arnotts Bridge (it will not be made available for any non-rail use, such as bike way).

Transport NSW (Sydney Metro) – By CBHK letter, email and telephone. Although the State Government announced the shelving of Sydney Metro some time ago, it remains a matter for consideration under SEPP Infrastructure for any excavation in the vicinity of the Metro alignment shown on Transport plans and sections. The corresponding Sydney Metro Development Guidelines have then been obtained and assessed, and their requirements for horizontal and vertical separations have been taken into account in the design.

RailCorp Property – By CBHK and RailCorp letter, emails and telephone. This consultation is primarily in relation to the RailCorp Maintenance Depot adjoining the south-eastern corner of Columbia Precinct, accessed only via Columbia Lane. A copy of RailCorp's letter is attached, with the following matters arising:-

- There will be no public access provided under this application through the RailCorp land in the direction of Strathfield Town Centre, as RailCorp has no plans to vacate this land - **response:** this is acknowledged. However, it would be very poor planning indeed to design the Columbia Precinct layout in such a way that any possibility of future access through the RailCorp land were precluded altogether. Accordingly, provision has been made to allow that to occur, in the event that it became a possibility at some future date, however distant.
- Site access via Columbia Lane or future alternative is to be permanently available 24/7, and to be designed to accommodate large articulated vehicles (note that none of that size had been witnessed there, either by Kennards staff or the project team).

Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water – This consultation was undertaken prior to issuance of the DCR's. No interest was expressed (in writing 3 November 2010) for riparian plantings, water quality or aboriginal heritage, accordingly no further consultation was initiated during this EA preparation.

Meeting Minutes

Project	Columbia Precinct, 2-20 Parramatta Rd., Homebush		
Project #	0834		
Date	14-02-2011		
Attendees			
	David Hazeldine	Strathfield Council	DH
	Silvio Falato	Strathfield Council	SF
	Lindsay Hunt	Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes	LH
	Peter Mayoh	Mayoh Architects	PM
	Peter Hinteregger	Mayoh Architects	PH
Distribution	All attendees: 21-02-2011 - draft for review 31-05-2011 - incorporates Strathfield Council officers' response to draft minutes		

#	Item	Comments/ Action
1.	Concept Design Explanation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LH introduced the broad parameters of the project and team to Council PM tabled set of concept plan drawings and explained analysis and design principles contained within present Concept Plan 	
2.	Strathfield Draft LEP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DH noted that amendment of DCP 20 had been postponed to follow development of new LEP which would now include basic development controls including height and FSR. DH explained draft LEP is well progressed but not yet a public document therefore he cannot share explicitly Council's planning for the subject site within the draft LEP. Prelim draft LEP was sent to DoP in Sept 2010. DH believes draft is well progressed and at best could potentially be ready for exhibition within 6-8 weeks however that timeframe is dependent on DoP and resolution of issues to their satisfaction DH noted that the Strathfield draft LEP was not on the DoP "priority list" possibly because Strathfield had significant existing capacity particularly within the Parramatta Road corridor from the 2000 rezoning. DH noted that Council's planning for the site had some similarities and some differences from the proposal. DH noted proposed density was similar to Council's current draft planning. DH noted ultimate height, distribution of height, building configuration and site layouts differed between proposal and Council's planning 	
3.	George St Extension <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DH acknowledged proposed George St extension alignment had some merit with continuation of view corridor from Bakehouse Qtr PH also noted proposed alignment avoided public views into Substation site DH was unaware of reasoning behind alignment as shown in DCP 20. 	

#	Item	Comments/ Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SF suggested alignment shown in DCP 20 was probably derived from building allotment configuration at northern half of site. PH noted that common ownership of these lots by David Lhuede negated the need to follow allotment pattern at north half of the site. DH noted George St intersection was an important nodal point along Parramatta Rd. 	
4.	Powell's Creek Reserve Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DH agreed Proposal was important in stimulating development of the corridor DH identified that reserve land to the immediate north of Parramatta Rd (formerly owned by Arnott's) was currently owned by NSW State Government. The land is due to be transferred to Strathfield Council but this has not yet occurred for various reasons. Council had recently constructed some pedestrian cycle path and landscape works in the reserve corridor north of the Bakehouse area. DH stated that pedestrian / cycle connectivity of the corridor across and over Parramatta Road was important and part of Council's vision for the corridor. LH queried what Council's plans were for land held by Crown International and zoned public open space DH and SF said they were unaware of any agreement in place and were unsure how Council would move to acquire this land. DH confirmed this land was ultimately envisioned by Council to be part of the Powell's Creek Reserve corridor. 	SK/MM
5.	Community Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SF confirmed there is no precinct committee or progress association specifically covering the subject area. SF noted land owners along Parramatta Rd are generally very interested in what the draft LEP will include for their sites and therefore would expect to take interest in this project. LH suggested their consultation may be undertaken by a letter box drop with reference to a website for further information. LH asked whether Council's landowner addresses could be used to assist the consultation. SF & DH indicated there are privacy issues which would possibly prevent Council sharing landowner details but would confer with others in Council and provide written feedback on this matter. 	PH/JS
6.	Section 94 / Voluntary Planning agreement / Community facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LH suggested that only a rough S.94 estimate would be able to be made at the concept plan stage but that some combination of \$ and other contributions (land dedication, works in-kind, etc.) would form a S.94 package SF noted a Voluntary Planning Agreement was possible PH noted there is opportunity on site to accommodate community facilities which could form part of the contribution. PM noted that inclusion of a community facility which was already 	

#	Item	Comments/ Action
	<p>identified as being in need in the area would be most suitable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DH discussed Council's section 94 document which lists desired facilities and locations and pointed out that an indoor recreation facility was scheduled for somewhere within the Powell's Creek Reserve corridor SF thought a physical Council presence in the neighbourhood in the form of a community facility would be desirable for Council 	
7.	<p>Concept Plan Design Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LH tabled the list of consultants and their respective disciplines already engaged on the project including Peter Webber for urban design and Richard Lamb on visual impact PM summarized areas of design development since the PEA was lodged being: reduction of commercial space in favour of residential, adjustments to built form to improve views into the site from Parramatta Rd., incorporation of traffic engineering advice DH confirmed that to extend the feel of the Bakehouse Qtr into the site was important with particular respect to architectural general character, scale and activity level. 	
8.	<p>Residential Mix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PM identified the residential market as being strong in the 1-Bed, 1-Bed + study and small 2-Bed units. SF warned against too many small units suggesting that a mix of unit sizes would be appropriate. SF and DH discussed anti-social behavior common amongst students living in apartments around Strathfield Town Centre DH recommended designing to a quality and standard which would attract long-term owner occupiers including provision of amenities such as swimming pools and gyms etc. SF noted that where there hadn't been strata titling in apartment buildings, there was a tendency for more behavioral and criminal problems. 	
9.	<p>Commercial Mix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PM explained Leyshon Consulting had been giving advice on retail / commercial mix Retail was targeted at small scale local facilities with potential for small ethnic supermarkets, as well as cafes/ restaurants etc. Commercial space (exclusive of Kennards) was targeted at small professional business 	

Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes Pty Ltd

as Trustee for C & B Unit Trust
ABN 27 623 918 759

Our Ref: LBH/7453/jj

Transport Planning
Town Planning
Retail Studies

1 April, 2011

Mr James Hall
Roads & Traffic Authority of NSW
Parramatta Office
Argyle Street
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

Dear James,

RE: COLUMBIA PRECINCT MIXED USE MAJOR PROJECT MPI0/0143
MINUTES OF MEETING AT RTA PARRAMATTA OFFICES

Please find enclosed our Minutes of the meeting on the above project held in your office on 17 February.

We believe they are an accurate representation of that Meeting's discussions. Please advise if you think any amendment is needed.

Yours faithfully,
COLSTON BUDD HUNT & KAFES

COPY

L.B. Hunt
Director

Encl. Minutes

Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes Pty Ltd

COLUMBIA PRECINCT PART 3A PROJECT
APPLICANT'S NOTES OF MEETING WITH RTA OFFICERS
HELD AT PARRAMATTA OFFICES ON 17 FEBRUARY 2011

Attendance:

James Hall	RTA
Adrian Paul	RTA
David Chiu	RTA
Stella Qu	RTA
Peter Hinteregger	Mayoh Architects
Stan Kafes	CBHK Traffic
Lindsay Hunt	CBHK Planning

1. It was explained that the meeting was by way of consultation with the RTA in respect of a Part 3A Concept Plan application to the Department of Planning, to address in particular how the site is to be accessed. The current plans were described, and the development floorspace composition outlined (noting that this is likely to evolve).
2. The probable need to retain the existing Kennards building on Parramatta Road was also noted, along with the intention of retaining existing access in and out of Columbia Lane. The proposed intersection works at George Street were also described.
3. RTA officers responded that their first preference would be to close Columbia Lane, once the fourth leg was added opposite George Street. Their second preference would be left-in only, and they would not favour left-out due to likely conflict with the intended widening of Parramatta Road westbound. [It is noted that the RTA could elect to close Columbia Lane once the fourth leg of George Street is added, whether the Kennards land develops or not, as site access would still be available to Kennards via the internal E-W lane].
4. RTA officers indicated that there may be an accident problem at the intersection of Parramatta Road and Columbia Lane. The main safety issues appear to be poor sight lines, speed of westbound traffic on Parramatta Road under the

railway underpass and rear end collisions with vehicles slowing down to turn left into Columbia Lane, which preferably would have a short deceleration taper. The proposed fourth leg onto the signalized intersection of Parramatta Road/George Street and the RTA's preference to close Columbia Lane would improve safety and amenity for vehicles accessing the site in RTA officers' opinion.

5. James Hall suggested that it might be desirable to extend the existing westbound right-turn bay from Parramatta Road to George Street north anyway, regardless of the Columbia Precinct development. That extension would close the eastbound turn into Columbia Lane, although the RTA would have to contend with the SRA and Energy Australia who currently use that access, and that is the only viable access for semi-trailers at the present time. However, RTA officers advised that no roadworks were currently planned for this section of Parramatta Road, outside of what will be required to serve new developments such as Bakehouse Quarter and Columbia Precinct.
6. RTA officers stated that they considered Columbia Lane to be relatively unimportant for Kennards' access once the new intersection is constructed, as the RTA is of the view that Kennards is more regular a destination for customers than for McDonalds say, which tends to be more an impulse destination. The applicants' representatives put the contrary case, based on Kennards' experience and findings. RTA officers believe that access to Kennards via a signalised intersection at George Street was superior to Columbia Lane due to safety benefits of new controlled intersections.
7. The new George Street intersection is likely to be signal-phased as a 'double diamond' operation (ideally with pedestrian crossings on all four legs), and that would need to be modelled by us, in combination with the coordinated cycle intersections to the west (additional counts available from RTA). Levels of service and vehicle storage capacities will need to be quantified.
8. RTA officers indicated that traffic signal data was available for existing traffic signals along Parramatta Road to the west of the site. This data included real-time phase sequencing, cycle lengths and green time splits. RTA confirmed that SCATES and/or SIDRA intersection models were appropriate.
9. RTA officers stated that the overall peak period traffic assessment should include the cumulative impact of the proposed development and the proposed Bakehouse Quarter development. RTA officers confirmed that the peak period assessment should be undertaken during the weekday morning and afternoon peak periods and during the Saturday midday period.

Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes Pty Ltd

10. David Chiu stressed that the intersection drawing needed to be clearly prepared to scale, and in accordance with the CAD survey information and noting affected utility services. Stan Kafes emphasised the application would comply with that requirement, (as the design already does at least at the broad level).
11. Officers acknowledged the high public transport accessibility of this site, and would expect lower-than-average car ownership and private trip generation rates associated with the land's redevelopment.
12. It was agreed the team would provide more information to the RTA in due course as it became available on intersection operation and design, traffic impacts and carparking rates. This would not need a further meeting, although such could be arranged if necessary.

L.B. Hunt
Director

18 February, 2011

21 March 2011

LB Hunt
Director
Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes
PO Box 5186
WEST CHATSWOOD NSW 1515

Dear Sir/Madam,

**COLUMBIA PRECINCT MIXED DEVELOPMENT – MP 10/0143
REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

I refer to your letter dated 4 February 2011 regarding the above. In response to the items you requested further information RailCorp provides the following advice:

- RailCorp disagrees with your assessment of this issue. It is RailCorp's view that it would be poor planning to create an unrealistic expectation that access to Strathfield Town Centre through RailCorp's land would be provided. RailCorp advises there is no long term plan to dispose of this site or change its use.

RailCorp also advises that should your proposal continue to contain this access you are effectively including land owned by a party that is not part of the proposal. This may in effect require you to obtain RailCorp's land owner's consent before the Minister for Planning can approve your proposal. Given the above it is unlikely that RailCorp would consent to such a request. Therefore, to avoid any unnecessary delays to the assessment of your Part 3A Concept Plan, RailCorp requests that any reference to access through RailCorp land be removed.

- In regard to this matter, you advised to contact Aaron Bowden, Planning Manager, Transport Construction Authority (TCA) on 9422 5402.
- Access to RailCorp's depot from Columbia Lane is required 24hrs 7 days a week. RailCorp constantly has vehicles using this access and must also be available in case of any emergency works. RailCorp advises that this access is used by articulated and container heavy vehicles and as such access for these larger vehicles needs to be ensured.

- In regard to this matter, please contact Ben Hendriks or Mohini Nair from Transport NSW on 8202 2200.

Should you have any queries regarding this submission please contact me on 8922 1987 or via the email address provided above.

Yours sincerely,



Jim Tsirimiagos
Manager, Land Use & Planning