

Response to Agency Submissions Summary, prepared by Urbis

Stamford, North Ryde MP10_0112 & MP10_0113

No.	Issue	Response
1	RTA – Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee	
a	RTA does not grant concurrence under the section 138 of the Roads Act 1993 for proposed vehicular access to Epping Road.	<p>The access referred to by the RTA in fact relates to the Type 3 public roadway as identified in Council's Street Network Structure Plan and is also incorporated into Council's DCP 2010. This road is intended to provide left-out only movements onto Epping Road.</p> <p>The provision of this roadway is intended to provide a permeable road network and to maximise the dispersal of traffic onto the road network. It is understood that this arrangement has been previously reviewed by the RTA prior to adoption of the DCP.</p> <p>In fact, the proposal relocates this road from the centre of the site to the western site boundary. This achieves a greater separation from the intersection of Herring Road with Epping Road, which improves safety and would be expected to be supported by the RTA. The relocation of this road to the western boundary also permits the Type 3 public road that was proposed just to the west of the site boundary to be deleted. Hence, the proposed development results in the effective consolidation of public roads onto Epping Road, which the RTA might reasonably be expected to also support as a matter of principle.</p> <p>The development thus provides a unique opportunity to stage the delivery of the (now) single Type 3 public road onto Epping Road. This is achieved through the construction of a half-road connection onto Epping Road, which is contained within the boundary of the subject site. This will provide exit movements only from the development onto Epping Road, until such time as the full carriageway width is constructed and the Type 3 road connected into the long-term road network to the north of the site.</p>
b	RTA declared strip of road along Epping Road.	RTA land not affected by project and future slip lane has been considered in building design and traffic modelling

No.	Issue	Response
c	Road Traffic noise from Epping Road mitigation requirements	Noted. Can be conditioned and documented at Project Application stage. The proposed acoustic treatments for the development include architectural and building fabric constructions to achieve internal noise levels and does not depend on any noise walls/screens, planting or the like between the development site and surrounding road ways. See attached Additional Acoustic Information response at Appendix H of the Preferred Project Report.
d	Parking layout compliance with Australian Standards	Noted. Can be conditioned and documented at Project Application stage. Notwithstanding the current design reflects the requirements of the Australian Standards.
e	Building maintenance and removalists need to be provided	The loading docks are concealed from public view and have been integrated into the back of Buildings C and W and sit below the natural ground level adjacent to Epping Road. Truck access to the loading docks is on-grade. The loading docks are to be used for garbage pick-up, deliveries and maintenance access. Garbage truck pick-up for the whole development will take place in the loading docks to the rear of buildings C and W. Furniture and removalist deliveries can be set down in the loading dock area and delivered to all buildings via the basement car park lift access.
f	All vehicles shall enter and exit the site in a forward direction.	Noted and agreed
g	All vehicles shall be wholly contained on site before being required to stop.	Noted and agreed
h	A construction zone will not be permitted on Epping Road.	Noted and agreed
i	A Construction Traffic Management Plan is to be submitted to Council prior to issue of a Construction Certificate.	Noted and agreed
j	All works shall be at no cost to the RTA.	Noted and agreed

No.	Issue	Response
2	NSW State Transit	
a	No major objection to proposal.	Noted and agreed
b	Potential cumulative traffic impacts of recent development approvals at the Herring Road/Epping intersection.	<p>The submitted Traffic Assessment adopted the Macquarie Park Growth Model (a Paramics Microsimulation Model) which was expressly established by Council for the purpose of assessing and monitoring the cumulative impacts of development, with consideration also of the range of traffic infrastructure improvements that are embodied in Council's long term strategic (2031) model. We note that the cost of obtaining the model from Council was substantial and included an allowance for a peer review for Council to engage its own consultants to undertake this review.</p>
c	Restricted parking inappropriate	<p>790 spaces were originally proposed as a compromise between the 869 spaces required under Council's DCP and DPI and OEH (see below) desire to restrict parking to strategically discourage private car use. This is now further reduced to 741 spaces as part of the preferred project concept plan in response to DPI and OEH concerns.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is located within close proximity to extensive bus and rail services and as such it is expected that a considerable number of residents will rely on public transport for journey to work and other trips. The development also proposes a reduced parking provision compared to that required by Council, which will further moderate traffic generation.</p> <p>The proponent has entered into discussions with Go Get with intentions of setting aside at least three car parking spaces for Go Get or similar companies usage. Bike racks will also be installed to encourage residents to use bikes as an alternative to using a motor vehicle.</p>

No.	Issue	Response
d	Upgrade required to Epping/Herring Road intersection and contribution to grade separation suggested.	Need for grade separation arises from regional traffic volumes, with only marginal demand generated by the project. Grade separation is not considered necessary.
e	Upgrade required to bus stop adjacent on Epping Road.	The proponent would have no objection to making a reasonable contribution to the upgrade of adjacent bus stops to the site.
f	Bus Lane along the northern side of Epping Road to be provided in place of T3 Transit Lanes (Morning Peak) and a on the southern side of Epping Road (Afternoon Peak).	Noted. Not inconsistent with project.
3	Sydney Water	
a	Upgrade the potable water main to a 200mm diameter.	Noted. Conditional matter to be complied with at Construction Certificate stage.
b	Upgrade the wastewater main to 225mm diameter.	Noted. Conditional matter to be complied with at Construction Certificate stage.
c	A Section 73 Certificate will be required from Sydney Water.	Noted. This will be obtained at a later stage in the project.
4	NSW Office of Environment and Heritage	
a	Proposed car parking exceeds RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments by nearly 30%.	A reduced parking allocation of 790 spaces was proposed as a compromise between the 869 spaces required under Council's DCP and the 611 spaces recommended in RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments. However, in recognition of the Office of Environment and Heritage (and others) concerns, and in recognition of the reduced yield, the PPR scheme further reduces this to 741 spaces.
5	Ryde City Council	
a	Non-compliance with adopted planning controls relating to Height.	This matter has been considered by DPI and addressed in the PPRs. The proponent's response, which generally reflects the PPRs is detailed at Section 4 and 6.1.2.

No.	Issue	Response
b	Any consideration of extra height for this site should be guided by Ryde DCP2010 – Part 4.5 and approvals granted by the former DoP on part of the former Morling College site.	<p>Recent approved Concept plans include Macquarie University and Morling College that both include more substantial built form that will accommodate greater densities and heights.</p> <p>The Morling College approval involved 12 storeys to Herring Road in a midblock location. The now reduced maximum height of 18-20 storeys is consistent with Morling College approval, insofar as the 18-20 storey element is located on a prominent landmark corner formally recognised in Ryde DCP 2010.</p> <p>In addition the proposed building height of up to 22 storeys (as shown in the EA) has now been reduced to 20 storeys as part of the preferred project concept plan. The proposed 20 storey height is in keeping with the future character of the area. The proposed Concept Plan and building heights and envelopes create an appropriate transition through proposed varying building heights and envelopes that gradually decline towards the surrounding low density residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The preferred project concept plan has reduced the height, bulk and scale of other buildings. Building L has been reduced by two levels from Epping Road. The building envelope of Building D has been massaged and reduced in height to RL126.8.</p> <p>The preferred project concept plan increases the height of Building C to RL122.25 but in doing so the bulk and scale of Building W has been reduced (RL115.05) to minimise the impact of the proposal on the adjoining properties to the west. The bulk of Building M has been reduced. Buildings H and Y remain unchanged.</p>
c	Non-compliance with adopted planning controls relating to Floor Space Ratio.	<p>LEP 2010 permits an FSR of 1:1, with an additional 1:1 permitted if roads identified in Macquarie Park Corridor Proposed Access Corridor are provided (i.e. 2:1). Draft Amendment 1 to LEP 2010 envisages a 2:1 control. However, Council acknowledge that further work is required to</p>

No.	Issue	Response
		<p>establish FSR's that suitably recognise the strategic transport and land use context of the locality.</p> <p>The proposed FSR of 2.32:1 does not significantly exceed the existing controls, and is less than the 2.662:1 recently approved on the nearby Morling College site, and facilitates the provision of public art and the provision of a 200m² purpose built on-site community centre.</p>
d	2% non-residential is not an appropriate land mix to satisfy the objectives of the B4 zone.	<p>While a broad mix of land uses is sought within the B4 zone, this does not necessarily translate to such a mix being achieved on every site, particularly on a site within approximately 500 metres of the regional retail services provided within the Macquarie Shopping Centre.</p> <p>The 1210m² of retail space proposed is sufficient to generate a mixed use character that activates the ground level and creates a 'shop top housing', rather than a dormitory accommodation character. Land uses within the Herring Road B4 zone area will be broadly mixed.</p> <p>There is no permissibility issue or development standard requiring any specific mix of uses.</p>
e	No guarantee that Stage 2 (non-residential) will eventuate.	<p>The proposed non-residential component is within Stage 2, and therefore any future development in Stage 2 will be bound to be 'generally consistent'.</p>
f	Housing Targets in the Metropolitan Strategy are met, without the serious increase in height and density for the site.	<p>Ryde Council has a housing strategy to exceed its housing targets by 3%. However, there is no guarantee that this strategy will be fully implemented and that all initiatives within the strategy will realise their full planned potential.</p> <p>Furthermore, while Ryde Council is to be commended for its strategy, it is one of only two middle ring Councils to do so, with most falling dramatically short of their targets. In the context of the current significant shortfall in housing supply across Sydney, the existence of a strategy to just barely achieve the targets in one LGA should not be used to constrain a strategic opportunity to optimise transit oriented</p>

No.	Issue	Response
		housing within walking distance of major employment, retail and educational facilities, particularly when the proposal does not manifest in unreasonable impacts upon surrounding properties.
g	Cumulative traffic impacts of recent development applications need to be addressed.	The submitted traffic assessment adopted the Macquarie Park Growth Model (a Paramics Microsimulation Model) which was expressly established by Council for the purpose of assessing and monitoring the cumulative impacts of development, with consideration also of the range of traffic infrastructure improvements that are embodied in Council's long term strategic (2031) model. We note that the cost of obtaining the model from Council was substantial and included an allowance for a peer review for Council to engage its own consultants to undertake this review
h	Council requests a copy of proponent's traffic modelling results as derived through the application of <i>Paramics</i> .	Paramics modelling was provided to Council (specifically to Mr Paul Davidson) with whom Traffix had numerous discussions throughout the study process, focussing particularly on procedural matters in relation to the Macquarie Park Growth Model.
i	Potential for a series of high rise buildings to impact on the privacy of dwellings in SP 9577.	<p>The 'Primary Development Controls' section of the 'Residential Flat Design Code' recommends a building separation of 24 metres between buildings of more than 25 metres in height, to address potential issues of <i>'visual and acoustic privacy, loss of daylight access to apartments and to private and shared open spaces'</i>.</p> <p>Noting that the buildings at SP 9577 are considerably lower than 25 metres, as are some of the buildings proposed adjacent to the common boundary, the proposed separation of up to 20.6 metres, with the majority of the separation accommodated within the subject site, appropriately preserves the privacy of SP 9577. Furthermore, two rows of substantial street trees within this separation will screen potential sight lines.</p>

No.	Issue	Response
j	The environmental impact assessment on adjoining existing buildings and surrounding residential amenity is inadequate.	<p>The proposed transitional heights of buildings stepping away from adjoining boundaries, and the overall building separation distances contribute to reducing levels of enclosure and impact on adjoining properties.</p> <p>Please refer to the Design Report Section B3 at Appendix D for detailed analysis.</p>
k	More comprehensive report on the impact to surrounding residents required, that integrates existing appendices and addresses cut and fill on shared boundaries, acoustic and visual privacy etc	Please refer to the Design Report Section B3 at Appendix D .
l	Photomontage drawn close to ground level along each of the site boundaries is desired.	Additional montages at various locations along the site boundaries are included at Appendix L .
m	Any PPR should include the outline of a compliant scheme for the site for comparison to what is currently proposed.	The DG's EARs provide detailed requirements as to the appropriate documentation. This does not include comparison to a 'compliant' scheme.
n	More detail on design of clearly delineated, inviting and useable publicly available open space without impacting the privacy and security of residents on site required.	The site layout including built form, at grade circulation and landscaping has been amended to reduce the overall density and create increased open space and amenity within the proposed development. The overall reduction in road widths and reduced building footprints of building M and D contribute to providing an additional 1,024m ² of overall open space. The overall proposed open space is 11,530m ² (51% site coverage).
o	Section 94 contributions will be calculated at a later stage. Intentions are that any possible bedroom (i.e. study) be included.	Noted.
p	The agreement from the downstream owner for an easement needs to be confirmed.	This will be provided for at Construction Certificate stage.

No.	Issue	Response
q	Address should be '114' not '118'.	Noted. Preferred Project Report references 110-114 Herring Road.
r	Photomontages in Appendix V should be labelled and referred back to the relevant section in the EA.	The Preferred Project Report references all appended photomontages.
6	NSW Office of Water	
s	NOW requests the following condition of consent to be included with any approval: The Applicant, prior to undertaking any works that intercept the groundwater table, must obtain the necessary licensing approvals under NSW Water legislation from the Office of Water	Noted and accepted.