

APPENDIX C - RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS TABLE

1.1 Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

The Applicant's response to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) Request for Further Information is provided in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 Response to DPHI

Summary of Matters Raised	Responses
1. Telstra Exchange Infrastructure	
<p>The Department acknowledges that the proposal seeks to retain and integrate the Telstra Exchange building and telecommunication infrastructure within the development. The Department also acknowledges the constraints around designing a functional and high-quality mixed-use development while retaining this infrastructure.</p> <p>As part of your consideration of the points raised in this letter, the Department requests that you consider any opportunities to improve design outcomes while still meeting the functional requirements of the Telstra Exchange infrastructure. In this regard, you should provide supporting evidence where appropriate to demonstrate where options are or are not available to address design solutions.</p>	<p>The Telstra Exchange Building is a critical piece of telecommunications infrastructure that services a large catchment of Sydney's North Shore and therefore, must remain fully operational as part of this project. This presents significant site-specific constraints and limitations for the architectural design and integration of the Telstra Exchange Building with the remaining proposed tower.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, DKO have successfully integrated the critical infrastructure with the proposed tower through careful structural planning and coordinated services arrangements and ultimately, have significantly improved the site's interface with the surrounding streets and adjacent buildings.</p> <p>DKO have prepared an Addendum Design Report, which clearly details the proposed integration with the Telstra Exchange Building, which is provided at Appendix E. For additional information, refer to Section 4.1 of the Submissions Report.</p>
2. Built Form and Urban Design	
<p>(a) Building Height</p> <p>Provide amended plans which demonstrate that the proposed building height is no higher than the proposed height control within the concurrent State Led Rezoning, noting the current inconsistencies between the EIS (RL 235.75 / 42 storeys) and the proposed height control of RL 228.8 / 43 storeys.</p>	<p>Amended elevation plans have been provided to clearly show the proposed building height, which is RL235.75 (155m) to the top of the lift overrun. Notwithstanding, it is emphasised that there is no habitable floor space located above RL228.8 (148m). Refer to Appendix D for amended plans.</p>

(b) Podium Height

Provide justification for the 8-storey podium height which exceeds the 6-storey street wall height in the St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan. In particular, demonstrate how the podium height is appropriate and would transition down to the existing development at 500 Pacific Highway and considers the potential future development of 69 Christie Street.

The proposed podium has been designed to ensure a sense of transition along Pacific Highway, comprising of mixed-use ground level retail space, short term accommodation, car parking and the Exchange infrastructure. The proposed 8-storey podium is successful at breaking down the built form of the proposed development, providing active amenity and adding to the character of the streetscape immensely.

It is emphasised that the proposed podium height was supported by the State Design Review Panel. Detailed justification for the variation against the recommended 6 storey podium height under the 2036 Plan is provided at **Section 4.2.2** of the Submissions Report as well as in the Addendum Design Report at **Appendix E**.

(c) Building facades

The Department notes that the proposal appears to provide blank walls on the eastern and southern boundaries up to level 5. The south elevation will front Nicholson Lane (also referred to as the 69 Christie Street pedestrian service way) and the eastern elevation adjoins The Landmark building at 500 Pacific Highway.

Provide plans and visualisations detailing the materials and treatment of the proposed boundary walls to demonstrate an acceptable visual interface between the proposed boundary walls and:

- the commercial levels of The Landmark, which appear to have external terraces adjoining the site
- the lower-level apartments which have balconies directly facing the proposed blank wall
- Nicholson Lane (see point 1(d) below) and the neighbouring building at 69 Christie Street.

An Addendum Design Report has been provided in **Appendix E**, which provides further details regarding the interface between the proposed development and the adjacent Landmark building to the east and 69 Christie Street to the south of the site.

The existing Telstra Exchange Building comprises a blank wall and due to the requirement to retain this infrastructure, there is limited opportunity to significantly redesign the eastern and southern building façade. Despite this, the proposal seeks to make good the existing building by implementing design features to improve the outlook onto the development.

Specifically, the proposal seeks to enhance the existing interface by integrating hit and miss brick articulation, planting, and applying a new finish to the existing brick work, which will show as a uniform dark brick and will pick up on the darker shades from the main podium façade to ensure continuity.

This is the extent of design that can be appropriately applied to the Telstra Exchange building without impacting the critical infrastructure. Any further detailing would require the internal critical components of the building to be removed or modified, which is unattainable. Notwithstanding, the proposed redevelopment of the site will significantly enhance and improve the interface to the surrounding development as it will revitalise and make good an old and dilapidated building. Further detail is provided in **Appendix E** and **Section 4.3** of the Submissions Report.

(d) Activation of Nicholson Lane

The plans previously presented to the NSW State Design Review Panel in August 2022 showed the opportunity for activation of Nicholson Lane. The EIS also refers to public domain improvements in Nicholson Lane. The proposal however provides a blank wall to Nicholson Lane.

The Department requests that you further consider opportunities to provide an activated frontage to Nicholson Lane, in conjunction with exploring the opportunity for public domain improvements as outlined in point 2(a) below.

The activation and revitalisation of Nicholson Lane does not form part of this proposal. This is because it does not form part of the site, nor is it owned or under the control of the proponent.

It is acknowledged that it once did form part of the public benefit offer with Lane Cove Council, however, after several rounds of consultation and negotiations, it was removed from the offer and replaced with the provision of affordable housing in which Council and DPPI are aware of. This is further discussed in **Section 4.7.1** of the Submissions Report.

(e) Building separation

Provide annotated building setback and separation plans (in both plan and section) showing the setbacks to the boundary and the separation between the proposal and:

- the neighbouring development at 500 Pacific Highway
- the existing and future potential development of 69 Christie Street

Justification should be provided for any departures from the recommended minimum building separation in the Apartment Design Guide (ADG).

The proposed development has been designed accordingly with a slim tower design to minimise overshadowing as well as the perceived mass and bulk from the public domain. The proposed design ensures a substantial building separation to the Landmark building to the east, which in most cases, is more than the minimum ADG separation requirement.

The first five storeys of the podium present a 0m setback to the eastern boundary, which increases to 6m between Levels 5 and 9. From Level 10 and above, the tower adopts a slanted edge design that has a minimum setback of 12m at the southernmost point, which gradually increases to a maximum of 20m at the northernmost point. It should be acknowledged that the Landmark building was approved and constructed with a wavy building edge that has a weighted average setback of 7-metre to the common boundary, which is non-compliant with the ADG. Notwithstanding, due to the appropriate setbacks proposed on the subject development, the building separation to the Landmark ranges between 19m to 27m, which predominantly falls on Home and the subject site to provide a high level of residential amenity and visual privacy.

In relation to the southern boundary, the proposed development adopts a zero-metre setback to the common boundary from Ground Level to Level 9, which increases to a 1.2m setback from Level 10 and above. A detailed assessment against building separation design criteria under Section 2F of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG), with the existing and future development at 69 Christie Street is provided at **Section 4.4** and **Section 4.5** of the Submissions Report, respectively.

Additional plans and diagrams showing the building separation to each boundary have been prepared and are provided within the Addendum Urban Design Report at **Appendix E**.

(f) Entrance / Lobby

Consider any opportunities to simplify and improve the entrance and lobby components of the development. In addition, provide further clarification and rationale on the drop off and pick up location and outline if all cars dropping off individuals would enter the carpark. Is pickup and drop off envisaged along Christie Street?

The proposed building entrance and lobby has been designed accordingly to exhibit design excellence and a high level of amenity. Specifically, it comprises a large double height space that is tiered down over three levels due to the slope of the land and is activated through the main lobby, café space and a library/lounge breakout space on the upper mezzanine. By activating the lobby, it is seen as an open, engaging and dynamically design space that is conceived as a continuation and extension of the public domain.

In addition, the selection of materials for the podium further elevates the entry, with brickwork reflecting the historical streetscape and planter boxes softening the transition, which ultimately provides a warming and welcoming entrance. All lobby entrances are flush with the streetscape to ensure universal access and the public domain finish will extend through the colonnade to ensure design continuity. Further detail on the proposed entrance and lobby is provided within the Addendum Design Report at **Appendix D**. It is noted that pickup and drop off can be accommodated within the on-site carpark.

(g) State Design Review Panel Advice

Provide a response to SDRP – 4 advice letter (August 2022). The EIS outlines a response to the advice letter is provided

A detailed response to the feedback received from the State Design Review Panel (SDRP) over all four meetings has been provided within the Addendum Design Report at **Appendix E**. Comments replying to all matters made in this advice letters are included within the report.

within Appendix H – Urban Design Report although this has not been included. Further clarification is particularly sought on how the proposal responds to the following matters:

- A Visual Impact Study
- Activation or future potential to activate Nicholson Lane
- Façade along Pacific Highway to encourage a respite from the hostile environment.
- Basement layout and pedestrian user experience
- Communal open space and consideration of double-height areas
- Further consideration of landscaping by reducing the extent of paving for residents

Consideration of wind mitigation measures that integrate with the architecture of facades.

(h) Plans and Documentation

Review the landscape and architectural plans to ensure they are accurate and consistent. For example, the landscape plans show communal open space with a BBQ area on level 9 (Figure 1) however the Architectural plans (Figure 2) show a car stacker exhaust in this location.

Documentation has been reviewed and it is noted that a new set of Landscape Drawings have been prepared by Oculus and are provided at **Appendix F**.

Review the architectural plans for accuracy, for example the plans submitted with the EIS include two plans labelled eastern elevation.

Revised building elevations have been provided at **Appendix D**.

Prode Landscape plans separately from the Landscape Design Report with title blocks for inclusion on any consent.

A separate set of Landscape Plans have been issued and provided at **Appendix F**.

3. Public Domain

(a) Nicholson Lane / 69 Christie Street pedestrian service way

As mentioned above and in **Section 4.7.1** of the Submissions Report, Home removed the activation of Nicholson Lane from the public benefit offer and replaced it with the provision of 10 affordable housing units and a monetary contribution of

The EIS states that one of the objectives of the proposal is to revitalise Nicholson Lane as a through site link for passive pedestrians and cyclists, recreation, activation, collaboration and culture. The EIS also concludes that the proposal will facilitate public domain improvements, particularly to the south of the site at Nicholson Lane.

The proposal does not appear to involve any improvements to Nicholson Lane and proposes a blank boundary wall to the southern elevation.

The Department considers that the proposed development provides the opportunity to improve Nicholson Lane and requests that you engage with the neighbouring property owner and provide owners consent for any works on their site including:

- removal of existing fig trees

opportunities for paving renewal, replacement planting and other landscape features to activate and embellish the lane.

\$3.6M. the primary reason for removing the activation of Nicholson Lane was due to logistical issues surrounding ownership structure, the egress easement and the site-specific constraints of the existing Telstra Exchange building, preventing it from being an active frontage. It is emphasised that the public benefit offer has been the subject of several rounds of consultation and negotiation and as such, Lane Cove Council are aware of the replacement of Nicholson Lane with the provision of monetary contribution and affordable housing and have provided their in principal agreement.

In relation to tree removal, Home requests that agreement from the landowners of 69 Christie Street on removal of trees be conditioned within the consent to ensure that it be undertaken prior to the issuing of a construction certificate (CC). It should be noted that the landowners have been consulted multiple times throughout the design process and also have had the opportunity to make a submission during public exhibition, in which they did not raise tree removal as a concern.

(b) Street Trees

Provide evidence of consultation with Council in relation to:

- the proposed removal of the London Plane tree on Christie Street and replacement planting with *Waterhousia floribunda*

the proposed *Tristanopsis laurina* planting along the Pacific Highway.

Similar to the above, it is requested that the requirement to consult with Council in relation to the removal of the street tree along Christie Street be conditioned within the consent as a construction certificate matter. It is emphasised that Lane Cove Council reviewed the application during the public exhibition and did not raise any concern around tree removal. In fact, they expressed support for the proposed development, which should be considered as part of this assessment.

4. Future development of 69 Christie Street

Provide a response to the concerns raised by the neighbouring property owner in relation to the impacts of the proposal on the future development potential of 69 Christie Street having regard to the St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan.

A detailed study outlining the development potential of 69 Christie Street has been prepared by DKO and is provided at **Appendix E**. Further discussion on the development potential is provided in **Section 4.5** of the Submissions Report.

5. Environmental Amenity

(a) Wind Impacts

The Wind Microclimate Design review did not provide clear assessment outcomes or demonstrate mitigation measures that would feasibly improve predicted wind conditions on the ground level and on the outdoor communal open space to acceptable levels. Further, the Mitigation Measures Table in Appendix D does not include any wind mitigation measures.

Provide an updated wind assessment, including wind tunnel modelling, which demonstrates safe and comfortable wind conditions can be achieved throughout the development and provides clear mitigation measures (to be included in an updated mitigation measures table).

A Wind Report was prepared by RWDI for the original EIS packaged, which included digital Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling. It provided a detailed assessment and demonstrated mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the design to feasibly improve predicted wind conditions on the ground level, outdoor communal open spaces and on balconies.

Notwithstanding, we understand that the Department have requested a detailed wind tunnel testing be undertaken. As such, this is currently in the process of being undertaken and will be submitted within 3 weeks to DPHI for review and consideration. Due to the long lead time of obtaining this model, it is requested that the Department accept this initial response and proceed with assessment and referrals of the additional information submitted.

(b) Solar Access to Communal Open Space

Provide a plan which demonstrates the percentage of the communal open spaces which achieve a minimum of 50% direct sunlight communal open spaces for a minimum of two hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June (mid-winter) in accordance with the ADG. Justification should be provided for any departures from the ADG.

The updated Architectural Drawings provided at **Appendix D** provides additional solar access diagrams to communal open spaces. These diagrams confirm that the key open spaces within the proposed development achieved compliance with the ADG design criteria in that solar access is achieved for a minimum of 2 hours between 9am to 3pm on the winter solstice.

(c) Apartment Size and Layout

The Architectural plans identify building columns or black circles within a number of apartments, short term accommodation and private open space balconies. Clarify whether the black circles/squares shown on the plans (Figure 3) are structural columns and if so consider amendments to apartment layouts to integrate structural requirements more seamlessly and improve the function, layout and amenity of affected apartments.

The Addendum Design Report prepared by DKO at **Appendix E** provides additional information in relation to the black circles and squares shown on the architectural plans. It is confirmed that these black circles represent structural columns, which are required as part of the structural strategy to integrate the Telstra Exchange infrastructure that is to be supported by an 'A Frame' to transfer the structural load of the tower above.

The structural raking columns have been integrated into the design of the short-term accommodation units and ultimately, facilitate an interiors concept that celebrates structure and engineering.

(d) Circulation

Justify the number of lifts provided for the different uses within the building (built to rent, short term accommodation and key worker housing) having regard to the design criteria of Objective 4F-1 of the Apartment Design Guide.

A Lift Evaluation Report has been prepared by Floth, which confirms that the number of lifts proposed is suitable for the proposed development. Further detail is provided in **Appendix I**.

6. Noise and Vibration

The EIS and Noise and Vibration Impact assessment do not assess the impact of the car stacker (plant and mechanical car lift) and operational use of the Telstra Exchange on the residential and short-term accommodation users on level 3-8. Provide an assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts for the residential uses within the podium and outline any proposed redesigns or mitigation measures required to reduce potential impacts to an acceptable level

An updated Noise and Vibration Assessment has been prepared by Pulse White Noise Acoustics (PWNA) which is provided at **Appendix G**. The report provides an additional assessment against the potential noise impacts from the car stacker and operational use of the Telstra Exchange.

In summary, PWNA concluded that through sufficient and coordination, careful design and implementation of recommended mitigation measures, they are confident that sufficient allowances have been provided to ensure full noise compliance can be achieved. Refer to **Section 4.10** of the Submissions Report for further detail.

In addition, the mitigation measures have been updated to capture the additional measures included in the updated noise report, which can be found at **Appendix B**.

7. Traffic, Transport and Accessibility

(a) Clarify and provide revised plans showing the proposed car parking provision, noting the Architectural Plans appear to show 36 spaces, however the EIS states that the proposal provides 48 spaces.

It is confirmed that the proposed development comprises 48 car parking spaces. There is no reference to 36 carparking spaces shown on the plans.

(b) Confirm the number of accessible and EV spaces proposed.

Due to the carparking being accommodated within a car stacker, it is emphasised that all spaces are accessible and contain EV charging.

(c) Explore options to enable all loading to occur within the site, without relying on an on-street loading zone in Christie Street. If for the on-street loading zone is retained, please provide justification for this and an analysis of the impacts on loss of on-street parking in St Leonards.

It is emphasised that all loading is accommodated on-site and within the proposed carpark. An Addendum Traffic Statement has been prepared by TTPA (**Appendix H**), which confirms that the proposed loading is sufficient and the development will not require or result in any on street loading.

(d) Provide traffic modelling which analyses the impact of the proposal on the following intersections:

- Pacific Highway and Oxley Street
- Pacific Highway and Christie Street
- Christie Street and Albany Street
- Christie Street and Chandos Street

An Addendum Traffic Statement has been prepared by TTPA (**Appendix H**), which confirms that the assessed traffic generation of the proposed development is 10 vehicles in and out during both the AM and PM peak hour periods. Due to the minimal amount of traffic generation posed, TTPA confirm that it will not result in any adverse impacts on the operation of the surrounding intersections.

Furthermore, it is noted that the access driveway is some 30m from the Pacific Highway and there will be provision for 7 cars to queue within the site on approach to the car stacker. The ingress stacker platform will always auto revert and wait at the ground level to pick up cars. As such, the impacts are minor and it is unlikely that the maximum 10 ingress cars peak hour could ever queue up significantly to affect traffic movements on the highway intersection.

8. Airspace Protection

(a) The proposed height of 235.75m and construction crane height of 241.75m breaches the Obstacle Limitation

Noted. The requirement for a Controlled Activity Approval (CAA) will be conditioned and a request will be made prior to issuing the construction certificate. It should also be noted that both Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and Sydney

Surface for Sydney Airport which is set at 156m AHD. Controlled activities cannot be carried out without an approval granted under regulations made for the purposes of Division 4 of Part 12 of the Airports Act 1996 of the Commonwealth.

Airport have reviewed the recommendations, processes and advice provided by AvLaw in their Aeronautical Impact Assessment and raised no further comments, which should be acknowledged when assessing this development application.

(b) The Department requests that you address Clause 6.7 Airspace operations of Lane Cove LEP 2009 and obtain approval for the controlled activity.

Compliance with Clause 6.7 Airspace Operations of the Lane Cove LEP 2009 will be met. Although as mentioned above, no concern was raised by either CASA or Sydney Airport and as such, a request will be made prior to the issuing of the construction certificate.

(c) The Aeronautical Impact Assessment identifies that the proposed development is within the Royal North Shore Hospital (RNSH) Helicopter Landing Site. The Department requests that you consult with RNSH to confirm the proposed development would not interfere or encroach in their operational requirements for helicopter arrivals and departures.

As stated within the Aeronautical Impact Assessment prepared by AvLaw for the initial EIS package, the helicopter operations in the vicinity of the site will also not be impacted by the proposed development. At 1000ft, (304.8m AHD) prescribed for the "North Shore" access lane, which is higher than the top of the proposed crane at RL249.5m, the site is not in a take-off or approach direction of the Royal North Shore Hospital (RNSH) Helicopter Landing Site (HLS). As such, it is confirmed that neither the building or the crane will have any adverse effect on the safety of helicopter operations. An application for airspace approval from RNSH's aviation advisor will be submitted during the construction certificate stage and will be conditioned within the consent.

9. Draft Planning Agreement

The Department notes that Council has stated that the proposed payment of 7.11 contributions prior to issue of an Occupation Certificate is inconsistent with previous agreements and it would not agree to the Planning Agreement. The Department requests that you engage with Council and the Department's PLUSH team on this matter and provide evidence of Council's agreement with your response to submissions.

The applicant has revised their public benefit offer and agree to make the Section 7.11 contribution payment prior to the issue of the construction certificate. Evidence of consultation between the applicant and Lane Cove Council confirming this is provided at **Appendix J**.

1.2 Agency Submissions

The Applicant's response to the agency submissions received is outlined in **Table 2** below.

Table 2 Response to Agency Submissions

Summary of Matters Raised	Responses
Sydney Water	
<p>Water servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is within the Killara Remainder Water Supply Zone. The system should have capacity to service the proposed development. <p>Wastewater servicing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is within the North Sydney SCAMP and the NSOOS 2 catchment. The system should have capacity to service the proposed development. Low infiltration sewer and connections are to be used. The Applicant should refer to the Notice of Requirements issued under the Section 73 case 211867 for further information. 	<p>Noted. No action required.</p>
NSW State Emergency Services	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSW SES recommends that consideration of flooding issues is undertaken in accordance with the requirements of NSW Government's Flood Prone Lane Policy as set out in the Flood Risk Management Manual 2013 (the manual) and supporting guidelines including the Support for Emergency Management Planning and relevant planning directions under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. Refer to principles within Appendix A of NSW SES submission. Recommend undertaking additional modelling to ensure the site remains flood free post development to maintain the protection of critical telephone infrastructure existing on site as well as future residents. 	<p>The North Sydney Flood Study by WBM Water (February 2017) confirms that the site and surrounding streets are flood-free in rainfall events up to and including the Probable Maximum Flood (refer to image below). The proposed development will not alter this situation in anyway. For this reason, further flood modelling is not necessary or required at this stage of the development.</p> <p>Ensuring the protection of telecommunications infrastructure is of utmost importance to the proponent and managed through commercial arrangements with Telstra to facilitate the development. If required, further flood modelling could be undertaken prior to commencement of construction (required by a condition of development consent), however, this is not considered to be warranted in these circumstances.</p>
Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA)	
<p>CASA agrees with the recommendations, processes and advice provided by AvLaw in the Aeronautical Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. No Action.</p>
Heritage NSW	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify why the Stage 1 Newspaper advertisement was placed in the Parramatta Advertiser and not in a local newspaper as required by Section 4.1.3 of the Aboriginal Cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (DECCW) 	<p>Comber, the heritage consultant, has confirmed that the advertisement was placed in the NewsLocal for North Sydney in accordance with Section 4.1.3 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation requirements for proponents 2010.</p>

Water Group

Water take and licencing:

Recommendation - Pre-determination:

- Recommend that the proponent quantifies the maximum annual volume of water take due to aquifer interference activities and demonstrates the ability to acquire sufficient water entitlement in the relevant water source unless an exemption applies.

The estimated quantity of the groundwater inflow during the construction cannot be accurately determined using the available information at this stage. Notwithstanding, it is emphasised that the following steps will be undertaken during the proposed intrusive investigation for the project to address requirements of the aquifer interference policy (AIP):

- Installation of three groundwater wells across the site as per the DPIE guidelines;
- Long term monitoring of ground levels within the walls (minimum three months);
- Falling head or rising head permeability tests to assess the hydraulic conductivity of the subsurface;
- Numerical analysis to estimate the groundwater inflows during the excavation and long term; and
- Address the AIP considerations.

On the basis of the above, it is requested that the additional monitoring be undertaken prior commencement of construction, which will be required by way of condition of consent.

Recommendation – Post-approval:

- The proponent should ensure a water access licence (WAL) is obtained to account for the maximum predicted water take for construction and operation activities unless an exemption applies under the Water Management (General) Regulation 2018.

Noted. No action required at this stage.

Groundwater Impacts:

Recommendation - Pre-determination

If the take of groundwater is found to be greater than 3 ML per year, the proponent must assess the impacts due to aquifer interference activities in accordance with the NSW Aquifer Interference Policy and Framework (2012).

It is anticipated that the estimated groundwater take will be below 3M each year. Notwithstanding this, long-term monitoring of ground levels and water inflow assessment will be undertaken prior to construction. The results of this monitoring will be reviewed by the Department to determine whether WAL exemption is applicable to the development. The proponent will be responsible for acquiring suitable water entitlements if the WAL is deemed necessary.

Sydney Trains

Sydney Trains have reviewed the proposal in accordance with the relevant TfNSW standards and Sydney Trains requirements and confirm that TfNSW (Sydney Trains) have no comment on the proposed development works associated with the above SSDA.

Noted. No Action.

Transport for NSW

TfNSW raises no objection to the application and recommends the following requirements are included in any consent issued by the Department:

- All buildings and structures (other than pedestrian footpath awnings), together with any improvements integral to the future use of the site are to be wholly within the freehold property unlimited in height or depth along the Pacific Highway boundary. Any proposed awning shall be setback a minimum distance of 0.6 metres from the face of kerb on Pacific Highway to protect against the overhang of large vehicles.
- The redundant driveways on the Pacific Highway boundary shall be removed and replaced with kerb and gutter to match existing. The design and construction of the kerb and gutter and associated works on Pacific Highway shall be in accordance with TfNSW requirements. Details of these requirements should be obtained by email to developerworks.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au.
- Detailed design plans of the proposed kerb and gutter and associated works are to be submitted to TfNSW for approval prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate and commencement of any road works. Please send all documentation to development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au.
- A plan checking fee and lodgement of a performance bond is required from the applicant prior to the release of the approved road design plans by TfNSW.
- . The developer is to submit design drawings and documents relating to the excavation of the site and support structures to TfNSW for assessment, in accordance with Technical Direction GTD2012/001.
- The developer is to submit all documentation at least six (6) weeks prior to commencement of construction and is to meet the full cost of the assessment by TfNSW. Please send all documentation to development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au.
- If it is necessary to excavate below the level of the base of the footings of the adjoining roadways, the person acting on the consent shall ensure that the owner/s of the roadway is/are given at least seven (7) day notice of the intention to excavate below the base of the footings. The notice is to include complete details of the work.
- A Road Occupancy Licence (ROL) should be obtained from Transport Management Centre for any works that may impact on traffic flows on Pacific Highway during construction activities. A ROL can be obtained through <https://myrta.com/oplinc2/pages/security/oplincLogin.jsf>.
- The Applicant shall be responsible for all public utility adjustment/relocation works, necessitated by the above work, and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents.

Noted. No action required at this stage.

A review of conditions will be undertaken once draft conditions have been issued to the proponent for review.

Ausgrid

No comments on the submissions

Noted. No action.

Biodiversity Conservation Services

Flood Risk Management

The site is not covered by a flood study from Lane Cove Council. The North Sydney Council Flood Study 2017 has been used to provide flood mapping because this study extends just past the subject site. The mapping from the North Sydney Study indicates that the site is outside of the 1% and PMF overland flood extent. The proponent's Flood Assessment Report by Robert Bird Group, Issue: P03 dated 29 September 2023 indicates that the site is not flood impacted and no flood impact assessment is required. The Pacific Highway is shown on the flood mapping to be flood impacted with H1 hazard in a 1% AEP event to the west of the site however many alternative routes are available, and the flooding is not in the vicinity of the site frontage. BCS also notes that the site is located near the top of the catchment, has very limited change in impervious area coverage and on-site detention is proposed to be installed.

Additional flood assessment is not considered necessary for this proposal.

Noted. No action.

Biodiversity

BCS issued a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) waiver for this SSD on 21 November 2023 and the Department of Planning, Housing and Industry (DPHI) granted the BDAR waiver on 23 November 2023. The EIS is consistent with the description listed in Schedule 1 of the determination of works in the BDAR waiver and therefore BCS has no further comment to make. BCS reiterates that if the proposed development is changed so that it is no longer as described in Schedule 1 of the determination, the applicant will need to lodge a new waiver request or prepare a BDAR.

Further, BCS reiterates that the BDAR waiver does not provide approval for the removal of trees and landowners consent must be obtained prior to any impacts on trees adjoining the development site.

Noted. As per BCS recommendation, consultation with adjoining landowners and consent for the removal of trees will be conditioned within the consent and obtained prior to construction certificate and before any impacts on trees have occurred.

Landscaping

The EIS notes that minimal deep soil is proposed as the proposed development covers most of the site area. BCS recommends any site landscaping / street planting associated with this SSD uses local native provenance species from the relevant native vegetation community that once occurred in this locality (rather than use non-local native or exotic species) to improve local biodiversity.

Noted. The proposed landscaping and street planting will incorporate the planting of native vegetation to improve local biodiversity. This is iterated within the Landscape Design Report submitted with the original EIS package.

1.3 Council Submissions

The Applicant's response to Lane Cove Council and Willoughby City Council's submission are outlined in **Table 3** below.

Table 3 Response to Council Submission

Summary of Matters Raised	Responses
Lane Cove Council	
<p>Council supports the following elements of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scale is appropriate with the existing and future context of the surrounding development. the proposal to activate and create a public space on Nicholson Lane and connect it to the existing pedestrian plazas at Christie Lane and Friedlander Place, and the shifting of mass and orientation of the building envelope to prevent and minimise overshadowing of Newlands Park 	<p>No Action. It is emphasised that Council is in support of the proposed development and have not raised any concern with the project. This should be considered during the assessment of the EIS and the supporting documents.</p> <p>In relation to Council's comment on the activation of Nicholson Lane, it should be acknowledged that this no longer forms part of the public benefit offer as it was removed and replaced with the provision of 10 x affordable housing units. The removal of the laneway from the proposed development is predominantly due to the ownership structure of the laneway and the site-specific constraints surrounding the Telstra Exchange infrastructure and the egress easement that traverses through the lane. It is noted that the public benefit offer has been the subject of several rounds of consultation and negotiation and as such, Lane Cove Council are aware of the removal of Nicholson Lane and most importantly, have provided their in principal support for the revised offer containing monetary contributions and affordable housing.</p>
Willoughby City Council	
<p>Inconsistency with the 2036 Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning proposals and development applications should be consistent with the 2036 Plan. The documentation provided do not demonstrate how or why the additional height, floor space ratio, non-residential component and street wall height will improve the outcomes for the precinct. The concurrent lodgement of the SSDA and State Led Rezoning is also concerning as it appears that individual site outcomes sought by a development application are seeking to override precinct outcomes. 	<p>The proposed development is consistent with the aims, objectives and vision of the St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan (2036 Plan), which has been reiterated in the Submissions Report at Appendix 4.8.</p> <p>In addition, the State Led Rezoning Planning Report that was lodged and exhibited concurrently provided a detailed justification for the minor variations to the building height, non-residential floor space ratio, and street wall height. In summary, the below justification is provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Height: The proposed building height is considered more appropriate for the site for several reasons. This is because it is more commensurate with the surrounding development, including the prominent buildings that surrounding the site such as the Landmark to the east (45 storeys), 88 by JQZ to the west (48 storeys) and St Leonards Square to the east (40 storeys). As such, the 42 storey development outcome is more closely aligned and integrated with the surrounding built form and will complete the skyline of the 'knuckle area' surrounding the St Leonards Station. In addition and most importantly, the proposed development will not result in any additional overshadowing to key public open spaces, specifically Newlands Park to the south of the site, which was a key criterion in establishing the building height and built form controls within the precinct.
<p>Lack of justification of variations from the St Leonards and Crow's Nest 2036 Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence is provided to demonstrate a commercial or non-residential development is not possible over an amalgamated site, at the controls established under the 2036 Plan. It is unclear how the proposed changes will result in an improved outcome for the precinct. It is unclear why an 8m street wall is considered an improved outcome when the expectation is that the surrounding development will comply with 6m control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Podium Height: The proposed 8 storey podium height will ensure a better design outcome as it will provide an appropriate transition between the 4 storey street wall height to the east and the 14 storey street wall height to the west. It will contribute to enhancing the streetscape and ensure a more human like development when viewed from Pacific Highway. In addition, it should be acknowledged that this architectural approach was led by the Government Architects NSW SDRP and a direct response to their feedback. As such, it is considered to demonstrate design excellence and is an appropriate outcome for the site that should be supported. Non-residential FSR: A total non-residential FSR of 2.3:1 is proposed, which comprises of retail and short-term accommodation land uses. This is in addition to the existing Telstra Exchange Building, which takes up an equivalent FSR of 1.4:1 in terms of its own volume. Although this presents a variation to the 4:1 non-residential FSR requirement under the 2036 Plan, it is emphasised that the significant site specific constraints imposed by the Telstra Exchange Building, presents a major impediment to any redevelopment at the site for commercial uses as it prevents high quality A Grade office floor plates, which therefore, results in a suboptimal tenancy offering and therefore, reducing the competitiveness in the market.

- The height and FSR increases are also considered excessive, and it is unclear how they will result in an improved outcome on the precinct.
- The proposed reduction in the non-commercial floor space required is also not consistent with the precinct plan's careful balance of residential and non-residential uses.
- Concern that the concurrent state led rezoning and SSDA will set precedents that will undermine the local and state strategic planning. Endorsed strategic plans should be recognised.

In addition to this, a detailed economic assessment was undertaken, which found that the demand for commercial office space in St Leonards has significantly declined relative to other Sydney Office Markets over the years. On this basis, the requirement for 4:1 non-residential FSR is considered to be unreasonable, unnecessary and outdated as it was nominated prior to the market decline resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic.

Notwithstanding the above variations, the proposed development is consistent with the overall vision and intent of the 2036 Plan. It is also emphasised that the 2036 Plan states that variations are allowed where significant public benefit is proposed. This development application includes an exceptional public benefit offer including monetary contribution and the provision of affordable housing, which has been reviewed by a third-party peer reviewer who has confirmed the offer is reasonable and appropriate. On this basis, the proposed variations are justified, and the associated public benefit offer and other positive impacts are considered to outweigh the non-compliances with the 2036 Plan.

In relation to the planning pathway, it should be acknowledged that the project was accepted under the Priority Acceleration Program (PAP) due to its significant public benefit. As such, the concurrent State Led Rezoning is allowed and the amendments to the Lane Cove LEP will be made prior to the approval of this development application.

Proposed MU1 Mixed Use zone is not supported

- Since the proposal is seeking BTR, the site does not need to be rezoned from E2 to MU1.
- Willoughby Council stated that the 2036 plan identified this site as an E2 zone, which should be maintained.

The 2036 Plan specifically recommends a mixed-use zone for the site and as such, the State Led Rezoning lodged concurrently with this development applications seeks to rezone the site from E2 Commercial Centre to MU1 Mixed Use, which is entirely consistent with the 2036 Plan.

Increased demand on infrastructure and public benefit

- The development will generate infrastructure demands beyond LCC and will impact Willoughby and North Sydney Council.
- For example, traffic impacts will extend north onto Christie Street, within Willoughby LGA.
- Open space and Community Service demands will also be met across all three Council areas.
- Only Lane Cove Councils infrastructure needs have been considered.
- The HPC should outline how funding is dispersed to Lane Cove, Willoughby, and North Sydney to address priority infrastructure needs.
- The affordable housing proposed is limited to temporary housing that can revert back to market housing after 15 years. This short-term approach should not be supported, and it should be required beyond 15 years.

A Social Impact Assessment (SIA) has been prepared for this site which details the impacts of this development for key stakeholders and the broader affected community. The assessment concluded the development presents an opportunity to increase public amenity and improve wellbeing outcomes for local residents through its facilitation of a vibrant, liveable, and cohesive community in transit-oriented development. This benefit is also enhanced by the social infrastructure offerings for future residents of the site, and the wider community.

The proposed development will also be the subject of a voluntary planning agreement with Lane Cove Council, which includes the payment of monetary contributions and the provision of affordable housing, in addition to the payment of Section 7.11 contributions and Housing and Productivity Contributions. It should be acknowledged that this public benefit offer has been reviewed by DPHI, who have confirmed that the proposed offer is exceptional and reasonable in the context of the proposed development.

This funding will be put towards local community needs, which will benefit Lane Cove Council, as well as the surrounding local government areas of Willoughby and North Sydney.

No comment.

No action.

1.4 Public Submissions

A total of 16 submissions from the general public were received during the public exhibition of the SSDA. The submissions have been summarised into key themes and a response to each theme is provided in **Table 4** below.

Table 4 Response to Public Submissions

Summary of Matters Raised	Responses
Traffic and accessibility Impacts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the traffic congestion at Christie Street, Chandos Street and Pacific Highway as a result of the development. All traffic associated with the building will have to travel via Nicholson Street to Oxley Street to exit the area – unless Christie Street can be made two ways. 	<p>An Addendum Traffic Statement has been prepared by TTPA, which confirms that the proposed development will have negligible impact on the traffic congestion of the surrounding network. Specifically, it is emphasised that the proposed development results in a traffic generation of 10 vehicles in and out during both the AM and PM peak hour periods. This is minimal and will present very minimal impacts on the operation of the intersection and road performance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction traffic will creep into Oxley Street and Nicholson Street just as it did for the construction of 88 Christie. 	<p>An indicative Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) was lodged as part of the original EIS package. It outlines the indicative timeframe for construction, proposed work zones, predicted truck types and movements, onsite workers and traffic control measures. The CTMP will be finalised once the builder has been engaged to construct the building and prior to issuing of construction certificate.</p> <p>In addition, it is also emphasised that any associated construction traffic impacts are temporarily only and will not result in long-term traffic impacts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with the car lift and associated queuing impacts. 	<p>As detailed in the Addendum Traffic Report (Appendix H), the access driveway is situated approximately 30m from the Pacific Highway and therefore, there will be provision for 7 cars to queue within the site on approach to the car stacker. The ingress stacker platform will always auto revert and wait at the ground level to pick up cars. As such, the impacts are minor, and it is unlikely that the maximum 10 ingress cars per peak hour could ever queue up significantly to affect traffic movements on the highway intersection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient carparking is proposed, which will have major impacts on the already limited street parking and traffic congestion. Traffic report does not provide a clear allocation of spaces and it is unclear how spaces will be allocated or broken down into different land uses. The trip generation identified does not factor in cars that future residents own that will not be accommodated within the building. The removal of street parking is not acceptable. 	<p>The proposed development provides a total of 48 car parking spaces, including 28 residential spaces, 19 short stay accommodation spaces, and 1 car share space.</p> <p>The <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i> (Housing SEPP) has a non-discretionary development standard relating to carparking, which requires a carparking rate of 0.2 per dwelling to be applied. The proposed development comprises 282 dwellings, which would require 56 residential carparking spaces.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the reduction in carparking spaces is considered appropriate given the site's proximity to public transport and the reduced impact it will have on traffic generation, movement, and congestion within the area. It is also emphasised that the proposed development does not include the removal of any street parking within the surrounding streets.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Travel Plan does not provide any certainty that alternative modes of travel will be adopted 	<p>While there is no certainty that alternative modes of travel will be adopted, it is emphasised that the implementation of the Green Travel Plan is a specific mitigation measure outlined in Appendix B, which will be conditioned within the development consent to minimise any potential impacts and promote sustainable travel modes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EV charging stations within the building should be accessible to all. 	<p>It is confirmed that EV charging stations will be accessible to all 48 of the carparking spaces.</p>

Noise impacts

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a significant and constant noise pollution due to heavy traffic and afterhours garbage collection including for commercial and retail floors. The apartments facing Pacific Highway and Christie Street should have extra thick glass to mitigate noise impacts. 	<p>PWNA have prepared an updated Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment report which details the acoustic impact the proposed development will have throughout all stages including pre and post construction.</p> <p>Compliance will be achieved with the relevant ground-borne noise level criteria. As compliance is likely to be achieved with the ground-borne noise level, it is also likely that compliance will be achieved with the vibration criteria for human comfort provided under the guideline, <i>'Assessing Vibration – A Technical Guideline'</i>.</p> <p>The report concluded that the future design and treatment of all building services associated with the proposed development can be acoustically treated to ensure impacts on surrounding community members are mitigated. The proposed development has been subject to a number of mitigation measures that are detailed within Appendix B, which are recommended as a means to reduce acoustic impact. Methods include utilising material which will absorb sound and limiting construction hours as to not affect the general public.</p> <p>Further detail regarding noise impacts can be found within the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment at Appendix G.</p>
---	--

Land Use

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support the mixed-use zoning for the site. Lack of support for BTR development on the site. There are already too many residential developments in the area, including 88 Christie Street, 500 Pacific Highway, 1 Marshall Avenue and 23-35 Atchison Street. The documentation does not provide any justification that Key Worker Housing is permissible with consent. Development does not generate employment on the site. Rezoning this site also means diminishing future potential for employment space in St Leonards, by turning potential office space into residential. The land should be rezoned to a public park. 	<p>The proposed rezoning of the site to MU1 Mixed Use is entirely compliant with the recommendation of the 2036 Plan, which recommends a high-density mixed use development for this particular site due to its prominent location within a strategic centre such as St Leonards.</p> <p>Furthermore, the 2036 Plan specifically encourages build-to-rent housing within the precinct as it has the <i>'potential to deliver key public benefits for the community, including greater housing choice in a stable rental environment, which can result in more established residents actively participating in the community.'</i></p> <p>On this basis, the proposed development for a new mixed-use build-to-rent development is entirely consistent with the aims and objectives of the 2036 Plan and is more than appropriate for the context of the site. In addition, the provision of 282 apartments, including key worker housing will contribute to multiple government initiatives to increase housing supply, including the National Housing Accord which sets a target of 1.2 dwellings to be delivered in the next 5 years from 2024.</p> <p>In relation to employment, the proposed development will generate 70 new full time equivalent operational jobs and 1,090 construction jobs and therefore, will contribute to the employment generation within the precinct. Further assessment on employment generation and the lack of viability for the site to provide commercial floor space is provided within the Economic Impact Assessment prepared by Ethos Urban at Appendix MM of the original EIS package.</p>
---	---

Visual Impact

- There will be a loss of view of apartments that face the CBD. The bulk and height of the building will tower over all the smaller apartments and buildings on Atchison Street. This will have a negative impact on the value of our property.
 - Development will block views of the apartments in 500 Pacific Highway that face west.
 - Access to views of the district, the sky and the harbour from apartments on the southern side of Forum building will be most adversely affected, especially all those in vertical alignment.
- A Visual Impact Assessment was prepared by Ethos Urban as part of the initial EIS lodgement package, which confirmed that view loss from the apartments along Atchison Street and from the Forum are considered acceptable for the following reasons:
- The properties are in the core of St Leonards, a strategic centre that has been endorsed for significant built form and density uplift in the 2036 Plan.
 - Strategic and statutory plans, including the 2036 Plan are clear in their intent to promote St Leonards as a strategic centre for job growth and housing diversity. This is reinforced by significant public investment in the locality, most notably the Crows Nest Metro Station, approximately 300m east of the site.
 - Consistent with this, significant development has occurred recently that fundamentally changes the visual context of 2 Atchison Street, 10 Atchison Street and 1 Sergeants Lane. New buildings include both “The Landmark” and “88 by JQZ” towers, which are positioned either side of the site and are comparable in scale and density to the proposed development.
 - The 2036 Plan proposes that future buildings between 42 storeys and 50 storeys are located between the affected properties and the subject site. Future height compliance buildings on land between the affected properties and the subject site will either block or significantly reduce views towards and across the subject site.
 - The volume of a compliant 2036 Plan envelope results in greater view loss from the Atchison Road apartments than that generated by the proposed SSDA envelope. This is because the proposed development implements a slender tower form, with a slanted building edge to the east to mitigate visual impact from northern properties. In addition, the additional height above 35 storeys proposed by the SSDA is not perceptible within the frame of viewing from the Atchison Street apartments and does not contribute to the loss of distant built form and water views generated by the proposed development.
- On this basis, it was concluded that the extent of view loss is insufficient in its own right to warrant redesign or refusal of the proposal on merit grounds. For further assessment on visual impact, refer to Appendix M of the initial lodgement package.

Built Form

- The proposed building height is too tall.
 - Significant setbacks must be included in this site around the whole parameter of the planned physical environment, including rear, frontage, and side boundaries.
 - No building separation proposed to the east.
- Justification for the proposed building height and building separation is provided within **Section 4.2** and **Section 4.4** of the Submissions Report and within the Addendum Design Report at **Appendix D**.

Development Potential for 69 Christie Street

- The development potential of AMA House has not adequately been considered in the context of the St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan.
 - Building interference issues
 - Incongruent street wall height
- DKO have prepared a detailed study demonstrating the development potential for the future redevelopment of 69 Christie Street. Refer to **Appendix D** and **Section 4.5** of the Submissions Report for further detail.

Amenity

- Development will be overshadowed by development to the north and therefore will not receive any solar access.
- Apartments will not receive any breeze or air.
- Overlooking and privacy concerns will increase.
- Communal spaces within the building will only benefit the residents of the building and not the local community.
- The addition of the Telstra Exchange building will add further artificial light, which will impact the view and amenity of surrounding development.

A detailed assessment against the residential amenity of the proposed development was undertaken as part of the initial EIS package, however, a summary is provided below to reiterate the findings:

- The proposed development will not result in any overshadowing to development to the north of the site.
- 60% of the proposed apartments will achieve cross ventilation, which is consistent with the ADG design criteria.
- Appropriate and reasonable building separations have been adopted as part of the proposed development to mitigate overlooking and visual privacy concerns. Where compliance with the ADG building separation criteria has not been met, appropriate visual screening will be provided to reduce associated impacts.
- A number of communal open spaces has been provided within the building, which will likely reduce the need for residents to use local infrastructure and facilities and therefore, generate less demand. While these communal open spaces are limited to the residents of the building, it is emphasised that the proposal is accompanied by a public benefit offer, which includes the payment of a significant monetary contribution in addition to both Section 7.11 and Housing and Productivity Contributions. As such, there a significant funds provided to Council and the State Government to reinvest into local infrastructure for the local community to enjoy.
- The proposed development will be designed accordingly to ensure compliance with relevant lighting standards.

Construction

- Major concern on the construction impacts relating to traffic, noise and air quality.
- How will the Telstra Exchange site be maintained and untouched during construction.

A detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP) will be prepared by the appointed contractor prior to the commencement of works. The CMP will address matters such as material management, construction traffic management, health and safety, dust control measures, and methods for disposal of demolition waste.

In relation to the maintenance of the Telstra Exchange building, a detailed discussion relating to the integration and structural planning approach has been outlined within the Addendum Design Report at **Appendix D** and in **Section 4.1** of the Submissions Report.

Public Domain and Landscaping

- Mature street trees should be retained. Do not support the removal of the large tree.
- Recommend focusing on the streetscape and verge area for the full perimeter of this site.
- The angle and steepness of the footpath is unsafe for pedestrians at the corner of the site.
- Recommend the inclusion of a deep soil zone to facilitate improve tree canopy, green space and walk-ways, accessibility for pedestrians, dogs, bikes and the like.
- St Leonards needs more public open space not more high-density development.

The proposed landscaping and public domain strategy is a key element of the proposal and provides a strong opportunity to improve and activate the streetscape, while also enhancing the pedestrian network within the precinct. The EIS and subsequent proposed development have outlined a plan to enhance landscaping while facilitating the development of a high-density mixed-use building.

While it is acknowledged 9 trees are proposed to be removed from the site, it is emphasised that none of them are identified as having a high retention value. Additionally, the proposed landscaping strategy seeks to plant an additional 6 trees along the perimeter of the site, as well as several vegetation groups within the communal open space areas, which will enhance the interface of the development with the surrounding streetscape and adjoining buildings.

Although no deep soil is proposed on site, the development will deliver landscaped areas across the development, particularly in the form of vertical villages and outdoor terraces that have been designed around the concept of “seasonality”, which will incorporate and place emphasis on designing with country.

A public space plan was prepared by Oculus as part of the initial EIS lodgement pack, which further details the sites landscaping within the proposed development.

Impact on existing infrastructure

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development will put significant strain on existing utilities and infrastructure. • The development adds nothing to social or community infrastructure in the immediate area yet brings a meaningful increase in population. • There are too many dwellings within the St Leonards area, which will lead to overcrowding and decreased liveability. | <p>A Social Impact Assessment (SIA) was prepared for the site as part of the initial EIS package, which detailed the impacts of the proposed development on key stakeholders and the broader community. The assessment concluded the development presents an opportunity to increase public amenity and improve wellbeing outcomes for local residents through its facilitation of a vibrant, liveable, and cohesive community in transit-oriented development. This benefit is also enhanced by the social infrastructure offerings for future residents of the site, and the wider community.</p> <p>The proposed development will also be subject to the payment of both State and Local Development Contributions, in addition to the provision of affordable housing and an additional monetary contribution to support and fund local community needs, which will benefit all residents of St Leonards.</p> |
|---|---|

Public Benefit

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development only includes 10 "affordable housing units" for a period of 10 years. This is an insufficient public benefit with consideration of the development that is being proposed. It should not have a time limit. • The development contributions paid should be spend in the immediate St Leonards area. | <p>It is emphasised that the proposed public benefit offer has been the subject of an extensive number of consultation meetings and negotiation rounds with Lane Cove Council, who in principal support the offer. It is emphasised that the Department have reviewed the offer and have confirmed that it is exceptional and significant given the context of the development and the site. As such, the provision of affordable housing is considered appropriate and will be a significant benefit to the local community, particularly the key workers of the Royal North Shore Hospital (RNSH) and the broader health and education precinct. It should be acknowledged that there is no legislative requirement to provide affordable housing on the site and therefore, the provision of 10 affordable housing units is considered a major public benefit in that it exceeds the expectations of the local area.</p> <p>In addition, the monetary contribution offered as part of the public benefit offer will be dedicated to Council and will be spent at local governments discretion. The applicant of the site will not have a say on where or what this contribution is spent on, however, typically development contributions of this nature are spent on the maintenance and inclusion of social infrastructure within the local government area to mitigate the effect of new residents to the wider community.</p> |
|--|--|

Other

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about lifts and whether there are sufficient amount of lifts to support the building | <p>A Lift Evaluation Report has been prepared by Floth, which confirms that the number of lifts proposed is suitable for the proposed development. Further detail is provided in Appendix H.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future monitoring and reporting against these measures will help inform future developments and provide evidence to then challenge those with vested interest. | <p>Noted. Future monitoring and reporting of development performance will be conditioned within the development consent.</p> |