



RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

RE: MP07_0106 REDEVELOPMENT FOR MIXED USES AT 60 CHARLOTTE STREET, CAMPSIE (FORMER SUNBEAM FACTORY SITE)

We write in acknowledgement of the public submission received by the Department of Planning during the public exhibition of the Environmental Assessment (MP07_0106). We would like to take this opportunity to respond to the key issues raised in the submissions. It is noted that of the total 13 submissions received, 8 were in objection; 4 in support and 1 neutral. The following issues were raised in the submissions and each has been addressed below and related back to the submissions as numbered within the Public submissions table prepared by DoP (see attached):

1. Increased Traffic: Objector 2; 3; 6; 7; 9; 10; 11; 12 and 13

Comment:

The site is currently not occupied for zoned and approved uses thus generating minimal traffic volumes. The existing zoned and prior industrial use is estimated to generate up to 600veh/hr at peak periods (Refer to TMAP at **Appendix 20 of PPR**), with a higher proportion of heavy vehicles than what is proposed under the major project application. Any use that might be contemplated will create traffic impacts that will essentially be a net increase over existing conditions. In the case of the major project application, the TMAP demonstrates (refer to table 3 within TMAP) traffic volumes of 1,057veh/hr during the critical evening peak period. Generally the development will result in moderate traffic volumes during the AM peak period, with peak demands occurring on a Thursday evening or Saturday morning.

The proposed mix of uses has a synergy so that parking and particularly traffic generation is reduced by virtue of linked trips (where patrons will divert from their existing trips) and multi-purpose trips (where one vehicle trip will involve visits to several uses). In addition, many people using the onsite facilities will be drawn from the on-site population, so that there will be a high proportion of walking trips, thereby containing external travel demand.

The provision of efficient site accesses, via the permeable public road system that is proposed, will also mitigate against any adverse local traffic impacts. The TMAP concludes (Chapter 6 Conclusion, page 40):

"The traffic impacts create no unacceptable environmental amenity concerns having regard for then predominant industrial character of the area. The volume increases in the locality are significant when compared with existing flows (with the site essentially dormant) but as all road frontages are collector roads they remain within acceptable limits"

2. Lack of public transport: Objector 2; 11; 12; and 13

Comment:

The TMAP as well as a Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) includes a section on public transport services. Below is a summary of the TMAP prepared by Traffix (Chapter 5, Section 5.4, page 15):

Pedestrian and bicycle linkages

"...In summary, the development of the public road network within the site provides an internal system of footpaths that will allow pedestrians to move freely within and through the site. This system links with the existing pedestrian network external to the site...."



WorleyParsons

resources & energy

Incorporating
planning workshop australia

"It is expected that cyclists will use the internal road carriageways that are provided as a shared on road facility..."

The site adjoins existing cycle routes (Charlotte Street and Alfred Street) identified within the City of Canterbury Cycleway Plan. Chapter 5, Section 5.4, page 16 of the TMAP provides:

"The majority of the external cycle routes are via the shared road carriageways, with exclusive cycle lanes provided only along Charlotte Street to the north and along Harp Street between Alfred Street and Charlotte Street. As such, the provision for shared on-road facilities within the site is consistent with the overall cycle plan of the surrounding area. The subject site does not specifically form part of the existing or proposed cycle network and it is considered sufficient to provide access to these established routes only. Therefore, dedicated cycle lanes within the site are not considered necessary".

In addition, Lot 3 the subject of the Project Application/s allows for 16 bicycle spaces within the basement whilst Lot 1 allows for 49 bicycle spaces. See amended pedestrian movement plan (**Attached at Appendix 20 of PPR**) for details on pedestrian routes to major bus stops as well as linkages from the site to existing and proposed cycle routes.

Chapter 5, Section 5.3, page 15 of the TMAP provides:

Rail services

"Rail services provide access to the wider transport network serving the greater metropolitan area. Numerous stations are located in the wider vicinity of the site including Campsie (approximately 1.6 kilometres from the site), Belmore and Kingsgrove. Residents and staff of the subject site are not anticipated to walk to these stations as the distance involved is considered slightly too far for the average person. However, diverted bus services as discussed above will provide a direct connection and this will provide access by employees, residents and visitors".

Chapter 5, Section 5.2.2, page 14 of the TMAP provides:

Proposed bus services

"The potential to divert some existing services to serve the subject development exists due to the increased residential, commercial and retail yields. Accordingly, bus stops are intended on both sides of Charlotte Street immediately adjacent to the site."

These services will provide an alternative travel mode choice for residents, employees and visitors associated with the proposed development.

Chapter 5, Section 5.6, page 17 of the TMAP provides:

Taxi services

"Taxi services will be able to access the site directly via the internal road system".

3. Parking: Objector 2 and 6

Comment:

The major project application responds to the desire of the Ministry of Transport to *"reduce the provision of on-site parking as an effective measure to encourage greater mode shift to public transport together with increased walking and cycling"* (refer to letter received by urban assessment on 19 May 2008).

The table below demonstrates the number of parking spaces provided across the site per use.



Amended Table 16: Summary of Parking spaces

Lot	Use	Yield (GFA unless stated otherwise)	Spaces Required	Spaces Proposed
1	Bulky goods	17,907m ²	430	448
	Gym	1,253	93	93
	Specialty Retail	1,250	42	60
	Commercial	5,840	146	146
Sub total			711	747
2	Residential	214 units	294	294
	Shops	2,751	92	55
	Supermarket	2,585	92	90
	Medical Centre	3,719	151	90
Sub total			629	529
3	Residential	58 units	85	85
	Child Care	6,36m ² 75 places	8	8
Sub total			93	93
4	Residential	64 units	90	96
Sub total			90	96
5	High Care	50 beds	35	35
	Independent Living Units	59 units	65	65
Sub total			100	100
TOTAL			1533	1469

Source: Traffix Amended Appendix 20

Traffix conclude (Chapter 6 Conclusions, page 40):

“The overall parking provision (1,469 spaces) is 4% less than Council’s DCP requirement as assessed (1,533 spaces, even assuming a reduced rate and with discounts sharing) and this accounts for the synergy between the uses and the ability to share parking where peak demands do not overlap. The level of provision is also intended to promote alternate travel modes and is responsive to the Director General’s requirements.”

4. Height of buildings: Objector 3; 7; 8; 9; 10; and 13

Comment:

The amended plans the subject of the Preferred Project Report redistribute the development yield lost at Lot 5 (removal of Building 5C) as a consequence of the flood study and relocated this yield to Lot 2 and to Building 5B. In order to maintain amenity to surrounding properties the additional levels were stepped in so as to improve any overshadowing impacts.

The increase in height is consistent with the desire to increase residential density in areas well served by physical and social infrastructure; providing flexibility to include housing capable of being designed to suit an increasingly aged population.

Throughout the site, the buildings vary in height in order to reduce the perception of mass around the perimeter of the site. In establishing the appropriate height, scale and form the proposed development had regard for the appropriate massing relationships between building form. Accordingly, higher buildings were located within the central part of the proposed development site in order to create a transition from lower buildings on the perimeter adjoining mostly existing 2 storey residential developments to higher buildings. In addition, buildings have been orientated to



maximize solar exposure whilst creating view corridors and minimise the impact on the surrounding area.

5. Visual impact/bulk and scale: Objector 3

Comment:

The highest anticipated development would occur as part of Lot 2, being 8 storeys. The proposal locates the tallest buildings towards the centre of the development site, surrounded by lower buildings, to allow for a transition of scale. In this regard, as a consequence of the topography falling away from Canterbury Road towards the south, as well as the generous setbacks to existing boundaries the supposed bulk would not be apparent from private nor public spaces, "outside" of the proposed development site.

The proposal has been designed to take into account the existing form and design of the surrounding development and minimizing any adverse impacts in the surrounding locality. The height, setback, form and axis orientation is varied throughout the development, in order to avoid the creation of a wall of buildings effect. This, through careful landscaping and orientation of buildings, will assist in reducing the impact on the adjacent existing developments.

The design make every attempt to minimise environmental impacts with careful consideration given to appropriate relationships in scale to the public domain areas of the site and neighbouring sites, overshadowing, optimising views and the optimal amenity of residents in terms of solar access, natural ventilation and privacy. The design incorporates satisfactory levels of articulation and modulation that serve to soften the visual bulk of the building.

Generous separation between buildings is proposed with the building to the north (Lot 3 Residential Building) setback approximately 7m-18m from the boundary with a height 4 storeys or 13.5m so that there is no massing or overshadowing concerns.

The preferred project plans demonstrate that the development on the eastern boundary (Lot 4) is setback 4.5m from the boundary and will be kept as low scale and under 9-11m to be consistent with adjoining development.

The development on the southern boundary (Lot 5 - Seniors Living) will provide side boundary setbacks of a minimum of 22-40m, ensuring appropriate massing relationships between building forms.

The development on the western boundary, relating to the existing industrial uses, is the subject of the Project Application (Lot 1 Bulky Goods Building). This building will be a perimeter building with a height consistent with the existing building. The amended plans (preferred project) reduce the bulk and scale by re-orientating the commercial levels to be set back from Harp Street. It is also rotated to reduce the bulk along New Alfred Street.

6. Overlooking/Privacy: Objector 8; 10 and 13

Comment:

The perimeter arrangement of built form optimises the visual privacy by maximising the building separation as well as generating a different orientation for the balconies of each building. The general recessing of the balcony spaces within the façade restricts site lines and further mitigates adverse effects of visual privacy.

The proposed building on Lot 3 has been design with generous setbacks. A minimum setback of 7m adjoining Wade Street is proposed, whilst a 10.5m separation between the balconies of Units



1.01; 2.01; 3.01 and 4.01 and the residential property boundary in Wade Street is proposed. (See attached privacy analysis at **Appendix 8 of PPR**)

The remainder of the building is setback 17.5m from the north-western boundary adjoining Sunbeam Lane (3.5m wide) totalling a separation of 21m compared with the 12m required under SEPP 65.

The preferred project plan allows for a 4.5m setback to the eastern boundary (lot 4) complying with councils DCP controls. There are no balconies proposed, to the upper levels of Lot 4, fronting the properties in Viking Street. The upper levels fronting Viking Street consist of bedrooms only which has a low frequency of use, with limited overlooking potential. Fixed vertical louvers were included on the preferred project plans. In addition, the proposal allows for approx. 17m separation between buildings.

In conclusion, the development has been designed using careful orientation, siting, setbacks and landscaping treatment to ensure minimal loss of privacy between the proposed buildings themselves and indeed the adjacent residential buildings.

7. Overshadowing / shadow diagrams: Objectors 7; 8; and 13

Comment:

The orientations of the buildings are such that overshadowing will mostly occur to the subject site and to a lesser extent on adjoining properties. An assessment of the level of overshadowing on the adjacent properties at 9am, 12pm and 3pm, during the winter and summer months was carried out and is supplied within the **Amended Appendix 11** of the **PPR**.

Marchese + Partners confirm (**Amended Appendix 11** of the **PPR**):

TABLE OF SOLAR ACCESS TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES:

ADDRESS	TIME	HOURS*
79 Charlotte St	10.30am-3pm	4.5
81 Charlotte St	10.30am-3pm	4.5
83A Charlotte St	10.30am-3pm	4.5
85 Charlotte St	10.30am-3pm	4.5
2 Harp St	10am-1pm	3
1 Alfred St	10am-12.30pm	2.5
3 Alfred St	10am-2pm	4
5 Alfred St	10am-2pm	4
7 Alfred St	10am-2pm	4
9 Alfred St	10am-2pm	4
15A Reld St	9am-2pm	5
81 Viking St	9am-2pm	5
83A Viking St	9am-2pm	5

*Hours of sunlight to minimum 50% of private open space between 9am - 3pm mid-winter.

With respect to overshadowing from Lot 5 the Preferred Project Plans redistribute the building bulk away from the side boundary, achieving a new built form demonstrating a minimum of 2hr of solar access to at least 50% of the primary open spaces of all adjoining residential dwellings.

8. Out of character with existing area: Objectors 9 and 13

Comment:



The proposed development provides a new character to the area consistent with other Council strategies for example the Campsie precinct (LEP 148) which allows for higher densities and heights.

Increasing residential density in areas well served by physical and social infrastructure; providing flexibility to include housing capable of being designed to suit an increasingly aged population in the Concept Application are basic tenets of sound planning.

In this respect, it is noted that the proposed project provides a mixture of compatible land uses to better integrate suitable residential, retail, childcare and bulky goods uses in an accessible location, surrounded largely by existing residential developments. The project will be the catalyst for the creation of a new “centre” for working and living, providing a new character to the area.

The Minister’s authorisation of a Concept Plan recognise the importance of this site in delivering increased jobs and housing whilst ensuring that there are no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding locality.

9. Acoustic privacy/ Noise: Objectors 3; 7; 9; 11; 12 and 13

Comment:

An Environmental Noise assessment has been prepared by Acoustic Logic and is attached at Appendix 17 to the EA. The noise report measured noise levels and sets noise goals in accordance with the requirements of Canterbury Council and relevant statutory/regulatory authorities.

An acoustic assessment of the proposed loading dock has been conducted by Acoustic Logic and the required acoustic treatments (acoustic screens) to ensure compliance with EPA criteria was recommended. In addition Management controls were recommended to be implemented to ensure that *trucks are not kept waiting on public roads prior to entry to the loading dock and Trucks to turn engines off during periods when they are loading and unloading*”.

In addition, an amended Statement of Commitments includes a condition of consent on the hours for loading and unloading to mitigate noise impact.

10. Construction Issues incl. Dust/Air Pollution; Noise; Hours of Work: Objectors 3 and 13

Comment:

A construction management plan has been prepared which is attached at **Appendix 36 of the EA**, which addresses dust control; air quality management and surface water management. A detailed assessment of any likely construction impacts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of any works on site.

The amended Statement of commitments also includes conditions of consent to mitigate any concerns.

11. Impact on Existing Infrastructure (Roads and Trees): Objector 3 and 13

Comment:

Based on the responses from the utility providers; Sewer, Water, Gas, Electrical and Telecommunications supply can be made available to the site subject to the noted conditions, including extensions of the of existing networks as discussed in the body of the Utilities report prepared by Hyder and attached to the EA. Detailed design by accredited designers of the extensions and reticulation within the site will be required prior to construction.

The amended Statement of Commitments also includes conditions of consent to mitigate any concerns, in order to ensure protection of existing roads and trees.



WorleyParsons

resources & energy

Incorporating
planning workshop australia

12. Asbestos: Objector 8 and 13

Comment:

Only fibro products made before 1987 contain asbestos. In NSW, for example, the use of asbestos was discontinued in fibro sheets by 1982, in corrugated sheets by 1984 and in all other products by 1986. Seeing that the former sunbeam factory was built during 1954 it is likely that some of the existing buildings might contain asbestos.

In this respect, it is noted that asbestos is usually only detected once demolition of existing structures occurs. The amended Statement of Commitments also includes conditions of consent to adequately address any asbestos concerns.

13. Soil and Groundwater Contamination: Objectors 8 and 13

Comment:

One inherent characteristic of the site is that previous investigations have identified contamination of the site through the previous operation of the former Sunbeam factory. A contamination assessment was undertaken across the site, the results of that assessment were used to develop the Remediation Action Plan. The proponent has engaged a Site Auditor for this next phase of work. Discussions with the Site Auditor have indicated that the land is capable of being remediated to accommodate the proposed end uses.

In this respect, prior to commencement of construction, an Evaluation and Assessment Plan any remediation will be performed for that particular stage of the development.

14. Erode Property Value: Objectors 3; 8; 11; 12 and 13

Comment:

Impact on property value is not a planning consideration.

Notwithstanding, it is considered that the proposed mixed use development will revitalise the area by developing a vacant site which has not been aesthetically pleasing for some time. In addition the proposal generates in excess of \$298M of construction investment including construction jobs.

15. Open Space Provision / Recreational Facilities: Objector 13

Comment:

The major project application allows for the provision of the 5,378m² of 'open space' for public access and enjoyment, which will significantly contribute to the amount of open space for the Clemton Park village residents and workers as well as surrounding residents. The open space represents 9.8% of the total site area.

The landscape plans propose a central covered area with long seats and benches for board games and/or lunch. The plans also allow for raised communal playground with a variety of active play equipment such as climbing nets. BBQ/picnic area covered by shade sails adjacent to playground to help with supervision and safety is also proposed. In addition the proposal provides for long and wide sitting steps to form a small amphitheatre.

The proposed new roads and associate streetscapes will allow for feature trees lining the proposed roads to provide aesthetically pleasing corridors for entering motorists and pedestrians. A footpath system provides a valuable pedestrian network around the site. The footpaths link the open space areas with visitor parking and building entries. Footpaths have been widened in certain zones to create alfresco outdoor dining to activate the streetscape both during the day and at night.



16. Safety / Potential Crime Increase (objectors 3; 10; 11 and 12)

Comment:

It is considered that the proposed revitalisation of the current under utilised site (vacant for some time) will reduce the existing crime potential and improve the overall situation. The proposed development allows for more movement of people to minimise opportunities to commit crime. Moreover, the creation of additional jobs will lead to socio-economic benefits.

Crime prevention through environmental design was addressed within section 6.3.4 of the EA. The following table demonstrates the proposed projects key design responses:

CPTED PRINCIPLE	DESIGN RESPONSE
Surveillance	<p>The proposed development incorporates mixed use zoning concepts to improve upon passive surveillance of the area and fundamental design rules to decrease the number of spaces where loitering may become a problem. Passive Surveillance is improved as residential dwellings are positioned above shops and retail space improving safety of the area particularly at night. Development also surrounds a park improving the feeling of enclosure yet safety and subsequent surveillance of the park.</p> <p>Appropriate design has resulted in the provision of sight lines. Sight lines throughout the development, but more so in residential corridors between corners, lift doors and entrances need to be created to minimise hiding opportunities. This can be achieved through the provision of mirrors and dual frontage/doors addressing both sides for lifts, removal of unnecessary walls/obstructions, clear glazing of lift lobbies and car park portals, as well as maximising sight lines from inside front door of units to corridors.</p>
Access Control	<p>The majority of proposed Car Parking on site is situated under building footprints and thus are secure private bays. Access to these Parking spaces is limited to customers during the day or tenants at night.</p> <p>The use of security shutters/swipe card access to residential car parking levels, lifts that service residential levels, and accessibility to the residential levels is to be implemented and maintained. The use of this technology is necessary to ensure effective use of physical and symbolic barriers to attract, channel or restrict the movement of people to minimise opportunities to commit crime.</p> <p>Access to all dwellings and shops are also controlled through appropriate locking systems and passive surveillance; from the street and adjacent buildings.</p>
Territorial Reinforcement	<p>The design of the proposal will need to incorporate aspects to define and distinguish areas strictly for private residential use/access from the areas utilised for public and semi-public purposes.</p> <p>Landscaping and built form helps separate areas and gives unique characteristics to parks and open spaces. Vegetation improves the aesthetics of an area while providing shade during warmer months. Vegetation may inhibit the success of an area through poor maintenance. Pruning and species selection is crucial to improving safety and creating spaces within an area.</p> <p>In addition built form encourages different uses at ground level and may create sight lines or views which strengthen the dynamics of the area.</p>
Space Management	<p>The creation of a well-kept and attractive space will help to attract more people, and thus reduce the likelihood of crime occurring through increased passive surveillance. The use of quality design combined with the implementation of an appropriate management, upkeep and cleaning strategies will reinforce perceptions of safety.</p>



17. Social Issues (strain of hospital and existing schools): objectors 11 and 12

Comment:

Hospital and School capacities are the responsibility of other State Government Agencies. Nonetheless the subject proposal is well located in relation to social infrastructure.

Notwithstanding, the following is submitted in this respect. The proposed mixed use development provides for 395 new dwellings which equals 1106 people based on an average household size of 2.8 people for Campsie (source: ABS 2006 data). 14.9% of the existing population residing in Campsie are between the ages of 5 and 17 years. Assuming that 14.9% of the additional 1106 people will be of a school age the proposed development will introduce a total of 164 additional children into the Campsie area.

A demographic analysis of schools located in close proximity to the subject site established that there are 10 schools with in a 2km radius of the site. This is more than adequate to cater for the additional children likely to reside within the proposed development.

Social concerns were noted by the proponent and due regard has been given to these during the design of the project. It is anticipated that the project will provide a positive social effect on the local community by allowing for affordable housing, increased job opportunities, provision of community facilities (child care centre, public open space and seniors living) as well as convenience shopping in close proximity to where people live and work.

On balance, therefore, the proposed mixed use development is considered satisfactory and does not cause any unreasonable adverse impact on the adjoining properties.

18. Other Matters

Chapter 3, Part 2 – Site-related requirements		
Clause 26	Location and access to facilities	Comment (capability of compliance)
(1)	A consent authority must not consent to a development application made pursuant to this Chapter unless the consent authority is satisfied, by written evidence, that residents of the proposed development will have access that complies with subclause (2) to: (a) shops, bank service providers and other retail and commercial services that residents may reasonably require, and (b) community services and recreation facilities, and (c) the practice of a general medical practitioner.	Directly north along Charlotte Street approximately 350 metres is the Canterbury Hospital which provides a range of medical health care services. Approximately 230 metres south of the subject site is the Yatama Park and bowling greens and club house which provide walkable access to open space assets. In addition the proposed project allows for new shops as defined by the CPSO which may include a new bank and convenience retail services, fruit shops and the like at Lot 2. Community services include a child care centre at Lot 3, and public open space at Lot 2 Please also refer to TMAP pedestrian linkages to Hospital and Campsie Station bus service As well as a 3,719m ² medical centre at Lot 2
(2)	Access complies with this clause if: (a) the facilities and services referred to in subclause (1) are located at a distance of not more than 400 metres from the site of the proposed development that is a distance accessible by means of a suitable access pathway and the overall average gradient for the	Neighborhood shopping centre, convenience retail medical centre are located 20m from the proposed seniors living component. The retail strip in New Alfred Street with the main entry to the supermarket is located 45m from the boundary of Lot 5.



Chapter 3, Part 2 – Site-related requirements

- pathway is no more than 1:14, although the following gradients along the pathway are also acceptable:
- (i) a gradient of no more than 1:12 for slopes for a maximum of 15 metres at a time,
 - (ii) a gradient of no more than 1:10 for a maximum length of 5 metres at a time,
 - (iii) a gradient of no more than 1:8 for distances of no more than 1.5 metres at a time, or
- (b) in the case of a proposed development on land in a local government area within the **Sydney Statistical Division—there is a public** transport service available to the residents who will occupy the proposed development:
- (i) that is located at a distance of not more than 400 metres from the site of the proposed development and the distance is accessible by means of a suitable access pathway, and
 - (ii) that will take those residents to a place that is located at a distance of not more than 400 metres from the facilities and services referred to in subclause (1), and
 - (iii) that is available both to and from the proposed development at least once between 8am and 12pm per day and at least once between 12pm and 6pm each day from Monday to Friday (both days inclusive),
and the gradient along the pathway from the site to the public transport services (and from the public transport services to the facilities and services referred to in subclause (1)) complies with subclause (3), or
- c) in the case of a proposed development on land in a local government area that is not within the **Sydney Statistical Division—there is a transport service** available to the residents who will occupy the proposed development:
- (i) that is located at a distance of not more than 400 metres from the site of the proposed development and the distance is accessible by means of a suitable access pathway, and
 - (ii) that will take those residents to a place that is located at a distance of not more than 400 metres from the facilities and services referred to in subclause (1), and
 - (iii) that is available both to and from the proposed development during daylight hours at least once each day from Monday to Friday (both days inclusive),
and the gradient along the pathway from the site to the public transport services (and from the transport services to the facilities and services referred to in subclause (1)) complies with subclause (3).

Note. Part 5 contains special provisions concerning the granting of consent to development applications made pursuant to this Chapter to carry out development for the purpose of certain seniors housing on land adjoining land zoned primarily for urban purposes. These provisions include provisions relating to transport services.

These facilities are accessible by means of footpaths with an overall average gradient of no more than 1:14

The proposed seniors living is located 80m from a new bus stop within Charlotte Street within is accessible by means of a suitable access pathway with a gradient of no more than 1:14

Numerous bus services operate in the vicinity of the site including along Canterbury Road (280m from the site) Discussions have been held with the existing bus operators in the locality to assess the potential for route diversion to provide improved site accessibility – See TMAP for detail.



Chapter 3, Part 2 – Site-related requirements

- (3) For the purposes of subclause (2) (b) and (c), the overall average gradient along a pathway from the site of the proposed development to the public transport services (and from the transport services to the facilities and services referred to in subclause (1)) is to be no more than 1:14, although the following gradients along the pathway are also acceptable:
- (i) a gradient of no more than 1:12 for slopes for a maximum of 15 metres at a time,
 - (ii) a gradient of no more than 1:10 for a maximum length of 5 metres at a time,
 - (iii) a gradient of no more than 1:8 for distances of no more than 1.5 metres at a time.
- (4) For the purposes of subclause (2):
- (a) a **suitable access pathway** is a path of travel by means of a sealed footpath or other similar and safe means that is suitable for access by means of an electric wheelchair, motorised cart or the like, and
 - (b) distances that are specified for the purposes of that subclause are to be measured by reference to the length of any such pathway.
- (5) In this clause:
bank service provider means any bank, credit union or building society or any post office that provides banking services.

The average gradient along the pathways from the seniors living site to the public transport services and to other social services is no more than 1:14

Matters to be addressed in addition to the items listed in the DoP letter dated 19 March 2009 as requested verbally by Natalie Mitchell on 25 March 2009, include the following:

- a) *Please provide a copy of the Godden Mackay Logan heritage impact statement dated October 2003;*
- b) *Please provide comparative shadow diagrams of existing and proposed situation. Provide elevational shadow diagrams showing the impact on adjoining properties as well as internally to especially the seniors living;*
- c) *Provide a waste management plan during demolition stage; and*
- d) *Provide FSR for each lot.*

In this respect we include:

- a) A copy of the Godden Mackay Logan Heritage Impact Statement dated November 2003, at **Appendix 41**
- b) Comparative shadow diagrams as well as elevational shadow diagrams at **Amended Appendix 11**
- c) A waste management plan during the demolition stage prepared by Metropolitan Demolitions at **Appendix 42**
- d) Please find below a table outlining the proposed project as well as the anticipated FSR based on the floor space area definition within Canterbury PSO.



WorleyParsons

resources & energy

Incorporating
planning workshop australia

Part 3A Application	Whole or part of Land (per proposed subdivision plan dated 2 October 2008)	DEV STAGE	FLOOR SPACE (per Marchese and Buchan Group Area Schedules)	Indicative no. Of units	Anticipated FSR
Project Application/s					
Lot 1 Bulky Goods Premises and commercial premises	Lot 1 (14,037m ²)	1	Bulky goods = 17,995m ² Shop (Specialty retail) = 1,254m ² Commercial = 5,960m ² Recreational facility (Gym) = 1,248m ² Mall = 3,528m ² Lobby = 131m ² Total – 30,117m²	NA	2.15:1
Lot 3 Multiple unit housing including strata subdivision and child care centre	Lot 3 (4,215m ²)	2	RFB = 5,885m ² Child care centre = 636m ² Total = 6,521m²	58	1.55:1
Concept Plan					
Lot 2 Shops, Medical centre and multiple unit housing	Lot 2 (12,311m ²)	3	Shops (Retail = 2,751m ² Supermarket = 2,585m ²) Medical centre = 3,719m ² Multiple unit housing = 21,301m ² Total = 30,356m²	214	2.46:1
Lot 4 Multiple Unit Housing	Lot 4 (5,186m ²)	5	6,514m ²	64	1.25:1
Lot 5 Multiple Unit housing (including but not limited to Seniors Living)	Lot 5 (9,987m ²)	4	Building A = 4,084m ² (50 high care beds & 15 ILU's) Building B = 5,464m ² (44 ILU's) Total = 9,548m²	59	0.95:1
Total	5 Torrens Title Lots		87,056m²	395	

Table 1. Summary of Objector and Other Submissions				
No	DATE	SUPPORT	SUBMISSION COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES
2	11/12/08	Support	Main concern - the impacts on the traffic It would increase traffic enormously at all hours Use Ward Street, Troy Street and Viking Street why not to divert some of the traffic away from Harp/Alfred and Charlotte Street. Public transport is non existent on site therefore parking space should be increased adequately.	Traffic Increase Divert traffic Public Transport Lack Increase Car Parking
3	15/12/08	Objection	Noise pollution from demolition and construction work (house 150 metres away) Destroy right to the peaceful enjoyment of property Heavy vehicle movements and increased traffic congestion Seven storey residential out of character with surrounding area Impact on privacy of property, visual impact on views and district amenity Site contamination, asbestos removal, ongoing noise and dust pollution Working hours Damage to local roads, on-street parking, impact on infrastructure Impact on heritage trees Population pressure, risks to child safety, potential increase in crime Erode value of my property, degrade quality of life	Noise Heavy vehicles Traffic congestion Height out of character Visual impact Pollution Impact on infrastructure, roads and trees Potential crime increase Child safety risk Erode property value Degrade quality of life
7	27/01/09	Objection	Taller than 4 storeys will severely impact the neighbouring houses by dramatically increasing traffic, noise and by casting shadows on existing yards and homes Logistics company noise levels had a negative impact on residents – will bulky goods business be any different? Traffic is going to dramatically increase on today's levels Height study – doesn't take a cross section in relation to houses that back onto canal where Seniors Living is planned. Shadow diagrams – incorrect in terms of buildings that currently exist and direction of shadows at some timeframes. Need to add street names on drawings to confirm orientation or include a clearly marked North direction indicator.	Height impact on neighbours Cross section across canal query Traffic Increase Noise levels Shadow diagrams
8	30/01/09	Objection (32 signatories/ residents)	Concerned with impact of "Lot 4 Residential Area" – particularly privacy, environment and financial value of properties. Believe that 3 storey height will directly overlook backyards/homes leaving residents with no privacy. Believe it will directly cast a constant shadow, obscure view of surroundings, deprive of sunlight. Believe it will devalue properties due to increased noise, impact on neighbourhood character. Want assurance that Asbestos contamination has been fully investigated before development begins – there is no reference in report to this. Want to know if boundary along Viking Street has been investigated and cleared for Soil and Groundwater Contamination. Suggest lowering the height to 2 storeys and not placing any windows on the walls adjoining Viking street boundary.	Lot 4 Residential impact - Height Privacy Shadowing Devalue property Asbestos contamination Soil and groundwater contamination No direct access to amenities on site
9	31/01/09	Objection	Object to height of buildings – 8 storeys in centre and 4 on perimeter will be overbearing for residents Aged care facility roof is 15 metres above my window line Does not fit the area Will change the suburb – from quiet to claustrophobic	Height Neighbourhood Character Traffic increase Noise increase

Table 1. Summary of Objector and Other Submissions				
No	DATE	SUPPORT	SUBMISSION COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES
			Substantial increase in traffic – too much for local traffic. Increased noise due to the bulky goods outlet	
10	01/02/09	Objection	<p>Strongly object to current plans, they will create significant disruptions. Proposed development will significantly degrade the current traffic issues. Very narrow existing streets limited to the amount of traffic they can carry – there is not enough room for two cars to pass each other when vehicles are parked on both sides. The “non Sunbeam” traffic is significantly greater than it was 10 years ago when Sunbeam was fully operational. Traffix report does not consider the amount of ‘heavy vehicle’ traffic the roads will have to cater for and the fact this traffic will be running 24 hrs, 7 days a week. The night of the resident development consultation the consultants stated there was no clear strategy to address the traffic implications. If the site was rebuilt as industrial, as per original documentation by Parkview 3 July 2001, the industrial traffic could be easily catered for. Residents must be provided with a detailed plan on how additional movement of vehicles would be catered for. Traffic issues need to be re-considered and resolved before any approvals are given. Accept that current site is not pleasant to look at – aged architecture. Concern with the height of the proposed buildings. Little mention is made regarding the height of the existing dwellings compared with the proposed development. In the surrounding area there are no obvious buildings above 3 storeys high. 5 -7 stories will look completely out of character for the area and impact on resident’s privacy and is unacceptable. Proposed buildings should retain current heights to match surrounding areas. Current low density environment enjoys low levels of crime. The more people located in one small area, the higher the crime statistics. A strategy to address this must be considered. Please reject this proposal and ask them to consider building commercial premises.</p>	<p>Traffic increase Traffic type and timeframe Industrial uses OK Height concern Privacy Neighbourhood Character Crime Increase Commercial uses OK</p>
11	02/02/09	Objection	<p>Strongly disapprove with the plans of the re-development. There was not much traffic when Sunbeam was operating. Council narrowed our street and only one car can pass at a time and mirrors get knocked off. This redevelopment would make it harder for us to get out of our driveway and turn our street into a busy road. More cars would be extremely dangerous for small children and the general public. Concerned about the amount of people living in such a small area, there is always trouble – look at Minto and Macquarie Fields area. Value of property would go down with such a development. The nursing home and self care area public transport is not convenient for these people. The strain on the public hospital would be enormous, already have to wait 4 hours to be seen – would our hospital cope with a gastro outbreak? We already have vandalism in the area and with extra people who is going to pay for their vandalism? Shopping centre would create extra cars and they would use Jarrett Street all hours of the day. Would like to know if the existing schools would be able to cope with potential children that would</p>	<p>Traffic increase Traffic dangerous Crime increase Property value Public Transport Public hospital strain Vandalism Schools capacity Noise More study needed Consultation issues</p>

Table 1. Summary of Objector and Other Submissions				
No	DATE	SUPPORT	SUBMISSION COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES
			<p>move into the development – already they schools use demountables as there is not enough room. More demountables would take away playground space and lead to more childhood obesity. Disagree that noise would not change – it would increase with more cars and more people living here. The childcare centre would create more noise. Needs to be more study put into this before anything goes ahead. Many people in area are elderly – should do a door to door survey. Web site is confusing and terminology of application is very hard to understand. Please reconsider</p>	
12	02/02/09	Objection	<p>[almost identical to Submission 11 above - additional comment below] I am elderly and can find it hard to get into a public hospital I will have no chance with all these extra people you want to put into this area.</p>	<p>Traffic increase Traffic dangerous Crime increase Property value Public Transport Public hospital strain Vandalism Schools capacity Noise More study needed Consultation issues</p>
13	30/01/09	Objection	<p>Objection in strongest possible terms. Inappropriate scale and density in relation to surrounding allotments. Out of character with existing area. Sunbeam factory has been a benign neighbour for more than fifty years. Inadequate consideration of design parameters and appropriateness of design features. Development should be totally redesigned to remain in keeping with the surrounding areas, reduce the number of dwellings. Excessive height, seven storeys will become a blight on the landscape. Proposed seven storey building must be abandoned and other residential development limited to three stories (or the current height of the existing building). Individual landowners should be consulted over their overshadowing concerns. Serious invasion of privacy of existing landowners with hundreds of windows overlooking backyards etc. Intolerable! Redesign residential developments to limit the number of outward facing windows. Question the need for the development – the area is already well serviced for bulky goods (ie Bankstown), also well serviced with child care centres and after school care and a number of nursing homes and retirement villages in the area. Proposed bulky goods centre must be abandoned and child care / senior citizens seriously reconsidered. There appears to be no provision for any significant area of public space or community facilities. At least one third of the land area must be preserved as public space, open to the community and provision of an indoor community facility and outdoor facility such as playing fields. Negative impact on land values. Developer must contract Valuer-General to make a study of impact on land values.</p>	<p>Scale and density Neighbourhood Character Design Height Privacy Overshadowing Property value Transport and parking plan Noise Air pollution Open space provision Community / recreational facilities Flora and fauna protection Hours of work Traffic Public Transport</p>

Table 1. Summary of Objector and Other Submissions

No	DATE	SUPPORT	SUBMISSION COMMENTS	MAIN ISSUES
			<p>Developer must compensate owners at sale where land values are found to be reduced.</p> <p>Lack of adequate access, roads, transport, traffic and parking plan for the site</p> <p>Excessive noise and air pollution during demolition and construction.</p> <p>Substantial noise barriers up to three stories in height must be constructed and EPA to monitor the demolition and construction noise daily.</p> <p>Residents to be notified in writing at least seven days before any commencement of particularly noisy work.</p> <p>Effective dust amelioration measures must be implemented and monitored by the EPA.</p> <p>Inadequate site contamination remediation and investigation of the presence of asbestos.</p> <p>Proposed truck movements appears excessive, they must be limited to industry standards and monitored by RTA.</p> <p>Hours of work appear excessive, must be limited to 0700-1500 Monday-Friday and 0700-1200 Saturday, with no work on Sundays or Public Holidays.</p> <p>No plan for the protection of existing flora and fauna on the site. Significant trees must be preserved and maintained and a fauna survey undertaken.</p> <p>Protest the timing and duration of the exhibition stage – most residents on holidays, difficult to address at any length.</p> <p>Proposal will increase traffic volumes exponentially. A new traffic plan must be created to address traffic flows and congestion.</p> <p>Construction traffic will lead to major damage to local roads; developer must be responsible to meet cost of maintenance.</p> <p>Provision of parking is inadequate on site.</p> <p>Number of access points to development is inadequate.</p> <p>Viking St must be retained as a cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Development site is not well served by public transport. Developer must negotiate with STA to provide additional bus routes and fund a mini-bus shuttle 7 days a week to Campsie and Bexley North train stations.</p>	