

10 November 2010

Mr Michael Woodland
Department of Planning
23-33 Bridge Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000
Michael.woodland@planning.nsw.gov.au

cc. Anthony.witherdin@planning.nsw.gov.au
cc. Ben.lusher@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Michael,

Crown Street Wollongong - MP 06_0257 – response to Wollongong City Council additional submission

We refer to the additional submission from Wollongong City Council in response to the above proposal. We understand that Council were asked whether they maintained the points in their original submission dated 29 January 2008. We note that this latest submission has raised several new matters which have not been raised previously.

Since lodgement of Council's initial submission and receipt of the Department's list of issues (letter dated 7 March 2008), a series of meetings have resulted in alterations to the plans and the provision of additional information to address those issues. After a long history of effort to seemingly resolve the "key issues", the proponent is dismayed that additional issues can come to light at this late stage and we ask that these issues be given little weight in the assessment. Notwithstanding this, the proponent feels that each of the matters have been appropriately addressed.

Each issue is summarised in the table attached, with a response provided to each new matter. This letter should be read in conjunction with the submissions response table and covering letter dated 27 November 2008, also attached to this letter.

Please advise if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,



Paul Altree-Williams
Associate Director

Issue	Comment	Recommended action
Retail floor area including components greater than 400m ²	Refer to previous submissions and economic impact reports.	
Design and land use: ▪ A separate urban design review was commissioned, including criticism on: - o An internal shopping centre attractor an impact on public domain. - o Lack of good active frontage. - o Double-facing frontage not considered good. - o Porte-cochere disrupts pedestrian-flow. - o Shadow impact upon residential.	The Department has undertaken an urban design review of the proposal and amendments have been made to address the issues raised. The majority of the street address to Crown, Corrimal and Burelli Street presents operable “shop” frontage including restaurants and various retail offer. This constitutes 88% of the entire street frontages combined. Part of this frontage has double-facing tenancies, but it is submitted that these should also be considered “good” frontage. This form of shopping centre planning is common and currently best practice. There are many successful examples of double-facing fronted retail in NSW including Westfield Bondi Junction and Westfield Sydney City. The design of the porte-cochere has been amended to improve pedestrian flow. Council’s traffic engineer and RTA representatives did not raise any issue with the amended plans. A detailed shadow analysis has been undertaken as part of the original environmental assessment. This assessment demonstrates that the relevant overshadowing requirements are satisfied.	
Compliance with planning instruments and policies – 1% contributions levy required and other conditions of consent recommended	Concur with conditions	Conditions to be applied
Heritage	It is considered that the current building on the site does not contain any heritage value. To the extent that the use of the site as a hotel has heritage value, the use of a hotel on the site will continue through this proposal. The historical use of the site could be interpreted in the context of redevelopment of the site, if required.	Further consideration in the context of any project application
Traffic – certain pedestrian safety measures recommended by the RTA in relation to the Oxford site	Further to previous correspondence on this issue, further investigation and design development can occur in the context of any future project application for Oxford site	Condition of consent for the Stage 3 works
Stormwater management – information could not be located	This information has since been provided.	
Contamination – remediation of the site has not been completed	Demolition and remediation works were part of a separate approval. If further remediation is required, this can be completed prior to construction.	Condition of consent
Design review – architectural design competition to be held as part of the concept plan	It is not feasible to undertake a design competition at this late stage of the process, particularly considering that no request has been made to date. Given that stage 2 and 3 would be conceptual approvals, aspect such as the envelope and height could be changed if there was merit in any alternate (more detailed) proposal.	Condition requiring a design competition for the stage 2 and 3 projects
Crime prevention through environmental design – matters to be addressed by condition	Concur	Condition of consent