



APPENDIX B – RESPONSE TO AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

Issue Raised	Response
NSW Department of Planning and Environment	
<p>The Department considers the overall density of the development is excessive and should be reduced. The proposed density of the development should be informed by a detailed urban design analysis, consideration of amenity and traffic impacts and the capacity of public transport and other infrastructure to support the development.</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been significantly reduced to between 9- 10 storeys above the 2 -storey podium and divided into two separate building forms along the park edge. Building D has a length of approx. 40m; Building J has a length of 70m. The three lower scale towers (Building E, F & G) between 4-6 storeys to the rear remain generally as exhibited with minor internal planning changes and addition of roof top plant.</p> <p>As a consequence of these changes, the proposal has resulted in a reduction of 107 apartments and 161 car parking spaces compared to the 2018 exhibited scheme.</p> <p>The massing of the amended proposal is highly consistent with existing and proposed buildings in the vicinity of the site as documented in the MR and Urban Context Report (Appendix G).</p> <p>A series of design measures have been proposed to articulate the building façade and mitigate the scale and mass in response to the sites context and matters raised during exhibition, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The separation of Building D-J into two slimmer discrete building forms minimises the dominance of the building on the public domain while maintaining a strong frame and edge to Eastlake Reserve. • The reduction in height of Building D to 10 storeys above podium (12 storeys total) and the curved corners is more consistent with the approved Gateway Building 1B (seven storeys above podium) on the opposite side of Evans Avenue. The consistency between Building D and Building 1B is accentuated by the consistent datum line created by the façade material change on the eighth storey of Building D. This creates a common architectural language in the precinct and provides an appropriate height transition from Building 1B (on the North Site) to Building D and Building J.



Issue Raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building J has been amended to step down in height at the southern boundary to minimise the built form impact on the Barber Avenue streetscape, resulting in an appropriate interface with the streetscape. • Building D has been setback further from Eastlakes Reserve which opens sight lines down Racecourse Place looking south. The 12-storey form of Building D is appropriate for its corner gateway position for the site and more broadly local centre and compliments the approved (as proposed to be amended) design of the 'north site' buildings. • The facades of Building D and Building J have been treated with different materials to mitigate the visual impact of the mass on the upper levels when viewed from key public places. Stronger colours are used on the lower elements of the façade, while a lighter diaphanous palate is used on the upper façade. This reduces the built form impacts on the park interface and provides a visually appealing façade. <p>Overall, the scale of the development is considered appropriate given the shopping centre is the 'central or focal point' of the locality, and the massing will positively mark the location of the centre. Whilst this will become the tallest development in the centre, the locality is characterised by a mix of building forms that include residential flat buildings and larger towers and thus the proposal in our assessment does not create a discordant relationship to the existing surrounding context.</p> <p>The proposed density and height is also consistent with Bayside Council's recently exhibited <i>draft Eastlakes Master Plan</i> which identifies potential for building heights of up to 9 storeys for sites immediately surrounding the subject site, with heights gradually stepping down as they move away from the site and 'town centre heart'. Given the site is at the centre of the Eastlakes Local Centre in accordance with urban design best practice it is generally expected that building heights in this location are greater in height than the surrounding area. The proposal strategically locates the taller buildings to the west to define and frame the park edge and maximise views out towards the open space, away from any residential interface. To the east and south, building heights gradually step down in recognition of the existing residential context to provide a suitable transition and acceptable level of impact to the surrounding dwellings.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>Given Council's future vision for increased height and density for Eastlakes, the case with respect to the appropriateness of the scale with the desired future character further strengthens.</p>
<p>The proposal should be amended to address the issues raised by the SDRP and ensure the development achieves design excellence. Any revised design must be resubmitted to the SDRP for further consideration.</p>	<p>Amendments to the height, bulk and scale of the Building D-J fronting Eastlakes Reserve among other changes were made in response to this feedback, which were subsequently presented to the SDRP on the 17 April 2019. Written feedback by the SDRP was issued to the Proponent on the 31 May 2019 and is addressed separately in this table. Based on the additional information submitted as part of this RtS and PPR, the proposed amendments to the South Site scheme are considered to positively address the comments received by the SDRP. The Proponent and project team will continue to work closely with the SDRP (if required) as part of this next phase to resolve and close out any remaining issues.</p>
<p>The Department does not support the proposed height of the western building (Building D-J) as it is incompatible with the site's context, does not provide an appropriate height transition to neighbouring sites and would result in adverse visual and amenity impacts. As such, the Department requests that the overall height of the building be reduced.</p>	<p>The height of Building D-J located along the park frontage has been reduced between three – four storeys to a maximum height of 10 storeys above the two storey podium.</p> <p>The following provides a summary of the updated assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provides significantly greater solar access to Eastlakes Reserve during mid-winter compared to the approved development by approximately 50%. Between 11am and 3pm at mid-winter the proposal provides unimpeded solar access to Eastlakes Reserve.</p> <p>In summary, all the buildings in the immediate context of the proposed development will receive in excess of two hours of solar access on 21 June.</p> <p>View Impact Assessment</p> <p>An updated View Impact Assessment has been undertaken. 10 key viewpoints were identified and a comparison analysis between the existing centre, the approved development, the exhibited development, and the Preferred Project was undertaken.</p> <p>The analysis demonstrates that although the Preferred Project scheme increases visibility of the centre, this heightened visibility provides a key wayfinding and legibility marker to both pedestrians</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>and motorists in the 800m catchment of the site. The analysis demonstrates when viewed from 800m, the proposed built form, although visible, sits within the overall composition of other elements in the skyline, both built and natural.</p> <p>The analysis also demonstrates that the reduction of three – four storeys in the Preferred Project provides an improved response to the local context. Furthermore, View 8 from St Helena Parade is the only view that the developments building envelope maintains a particularly prominent presence. However, the building quickly recedes beyond it and cumulatively there is a substantial reduction in visible building form compared to the 2018 exhibited scheme.</p> <p>Urban Context Analysis</p> <p>As outlined in the Urbis urban context analysis, the scale of the development is considered appropriate given the shopping centre is the ‘central or focal point’ of the locality, and the massing will positively mark the location of the centre. Whilst this will become the tallest development in the centre, the locality is characterised by a mix of building forms that include residential flat buildings and larger towers and thus the proposal in our assessment does not create a discordant relationship to the existing surrounding context.</p> <p>The proposed density and height is also consistent with Bayside Council’s recently exhibited <i>draft Eastlakes Master Plan</i> which identifies potential for building heights of up to 9 storeys and FSR’s up to 2.5:1 for sites immediately surrounding the subject site, with heights gradually stepping down as they move away from the site and ‘town centre heart’. Given the site is at the centre of the Eastlakes Local Centre in accordance with urban design best practice it is generally expected that building heights in this location are greater in height than the surrounding area. The proposal strategically locates the taller buildings to the west to define and frame the park edge and maximise views out towards the open space, away from any residential interface. To the east and south, building heights gradually step down in recognition of the existing residential context to provide a suitable transition and acceptable level of impact to the surrounding dwellings.</p> <p>Given this, when overlaying the potential that Council will identify increased density opportunities in the centre in the future, the case with respect to the appropriateness of the scale with the desired future character further strengthens.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>The consolidation of residential towers in Building D-J results in excessive bulk and scale when viewed from surrounding areas. The proposal should be redesigned to provide slender building envelopes to reduce the visual impact of the development and minimise amenity impacts on surrounding properties.</p>	<p>The upper level consolidation of Building D-J located along the park frontage has been removed and a greater building separation has been introduced.</p> <p>The horizontal datums of the upper levels have also been amended to be more consistent with Building 1B on the North Site. The facades of Building D and Building J have also been treated with different materials to mitigate the visual impact of the mass on the upper levels when viewed from key public places. Stronger colours are used on the lower elements of the façade, while a lighter diaphanous palate is used on the upper façade.</p> <p>A series of amended photomontages have been prepared by FJMT to illustrate how the Preferred Project has been amended to reduce the visual impacts of the development in response to matters raised by the community and the Government Architects.</p>
<p>The design of the residential towers (Building D-J) compromises the amenity of apartments, with regards to solar access, natural ventilation and the number of units accessed from a single lift core. The proposal should be amended to improve the residential amenity of the apartments.</p>	<p>The proposed modifications to Building D-J specifically respond to the issue raised by the Department with respect to Section 4F in terms of the number of apartments off a single circulation core. Building D has 11 apartments off a single circulation core and Building J1 has 6 and J2 has 9.</p> <p>Building J has been amended such that it now has two cores. The maximum number of apartments served of a single core is thus reduced from 17 to a maximum of 11, which is within the 12 specified as a maximum under the ADG. All lobbies have access to daylight and views out toward the landscaped spaces. Incidental spaces and seating adjacent to lifts have also been proposed.</p> <p>The amended scheme is also now fully ADG compliant in regard to solar access and cross ventilation. Supporting diagrams are included within the drawing set that forms part of this submission.</p> <p>The following table provides an overview of the key controls in the ADG.</p>



Issue Raised	Response						
	Control	Building D	Building J	Building E	Building F	Building G	Total
	Apartment yield	105	126	48	48	34	361
	Solar	84	95	34	35	24	272 (75%)
	No solar	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Cross ventilation	45	63	30	32	24	194 (63%)
Detailed shadow diagrams (including in elevation form) are required to enable a full assessment of the shadow impacts of the development, within the site and surrounding areas.	FJMT have prepared a solar heat analysis of the amount of direct sunlight received by surrounding properties. The analysis demonstrates that all the buildings in the immediate context of the proposed development will receive in excess of two hours of solar access on 21 June.						
<p>The proposal does not provide an appropriate height transition to Eastlakes Reserve to the west.</p> <p>The ground level should be redesigned to improve permeability and accessibility along the western facade of the development.</p>	<p>The levels along the west of the site have been amended such that there is an improved relationship between the proposal and Eastlakes Reserve. The western area has been lowered such that there are no steps at the southern end of the site. A new centrally located ramp has been introduced to ensure equitable access (refer to image extracts below).</p>						

Issue Raised	Response
	 <p>The top rendering shows a side view of a modern building with a large, cantilevered upper level. Two horizontal dashed lines indicate floor levels: a red line labeled 'SUBMITTED GROUND FLOOR' and a blue line labeled 'REVISED GROUND FLOOR'. The revised ground floor is lower, creating a new level of outdoor space with a yellow-paved walkway, a green lawn, and a white ramp. A person is shown riding a bicycle on the yellow path. The bottom rendering is an aerial view of a courtyard area in front of a multi-story building with a grid-like facade. The courtyard features several trees, including a large green tree and a yellow-flowered tree, along with a paved walkway and a green lawn. A person is walking on the path.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>The back of house facilities and loading dock along Barber Avenue (the eastern and southern site boundaries) is excessive and should be redesigned to minimise its impact on the streetscape and the amenity of surrounding residents.</p>	<p>The loading dock area on Barber Avenue is required to support the function of the retail tenants and the supermarket. The footprint and street impact of back of house facilities and loading dock along Barber Avenue have been minimised where possible. All dimensions have been reviewed again with consideration of the comments provided and there is no scope for further reduction having regard to the increased commercial uses proposed.</p> <p>The location of the loading dock remains consistent with the Part 3A Project Approval. External and internal design changes are proposed as part of this application to ensure sufficient capacity in line with changes to the overall development.</p> <p>All streets bounded the site were analysed to determine the most appropriate location for the loading dock. The southern portion of Barber Avenue was considered to be the ideal location for the loading dock in order to provide contiguous activation up Barber Avenue, across Evans Avenue and down the Eastlakes Reserve frontage.</p>
<p>The reduction of retail tenancies along Evans Avenue and Eastlakes Reserve adversely impacts on street activation. Additional street activation should be provided along these frontages.</p>	<p>The following changes have been which provides increased activation compared to the approved situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfiguration of the ground floor layout and increase the total number of retail tenancies from 21 to 42 (four more than approved) and extension of non-residential uses to the entire northern portion of Level 1 to provide for increased surveillance and activation along the park edge. • Creation of Racecourse Plaza to provide dual function as a community meeting place and civic event space. The added provision of escalators and a lift to provide direct access to Level 1 will further heighten the activation and use of this plaza area. • Improved interface with Eastlakes Reserve through a drop-in level at the ground level of the shopping centre to provide an improved transition between the two sites. • Addition of an open air 'eat street' off Barber Avenue to provide increased activation along the eastern elevation of the site and improve the east west connectivity though the site, by reducing the extent of roofed area.



Issue Raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of a new glass oculus over the central retail space to allow increased daylight and views to the sky. • Provision of landscaping and public art to blank walls along the south east elevation. <p>Cumulatively, the proposal results in activation to 70% of the sites street elevations. The remainder of the site is used for servicing with the overall positioning being consistent with the approved scheme.</p>
<p>The location of the carpark driveway on Evans Avenue compromises pedestrian access to Eastlakes Reserve and it impacts on the amenity of this area. Consideration should be given to: relocating the driveway away from the public open space; or redesigning it to minimise potential impacts.</p>	<p>The location of the carpark driveway is consistent with the Project Approval. A series of other access options were investigated as part of the Project Approval but were not considered feasible.</p> <p>As discussed in the Traffic and Parking Report (refer Appendix K), the preferred access arrangements were selected based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the access points to the southern site are located to easily and quickly capture traffic accessing the centre without using local streets; • the size of the southern car park requires two access points. They have been located at the western end of the site to minimise traffic effects on Evans Avenue (east) and Barber Avenue (east); • if not located at the western end of the site, the access points would have to be located on Evans Avenue (east) and Barber Avenue (east). Access from either of these locations would increase traffic on these streets compared to the project approval access arrangements and would impact on pedestrian linkage between the northern and southern sites. <p>Furthermore, an analysis of pedestrian walking routes from the various directions surrounding the centre indicate that a pedestrian visiting the centre will approach the site generally as per the image below, avoiding the location of the Evans Avenue vehicular driveway.</p>

Issue Raised	Response
	 <p data-bbox="835 995 2013 1118">Notwithstanding, a further review of the Evans Avenue driveway has been undertaken. As a result, the driveway ramp has been moved 3m south relative to the exhibited scheme to allow for improved pedestrian amenity, ie: cars will not be approaching the cross over immediately after ramping.</p> <p data-bbox="835 1134 2013 1286">As illustrated in the below perspective view looking south toward the Evans Avenue driveway, FJMT have designed the area around the driveway to direct pedestrian travel up and over the driveway to Racecourse Plaza and the Eastlakes Reserve. Appropriate signage and footpath treatments will be installed, as well as the walls around the driveway to deter people from using this as a pedestrian crossing.</p>

Issue Raised	Response
	
<p>Insufficient information has been provided to assess the impacts of the proposal on the road network and the performance of surrounding intersections. An updated traffic report and SIDRA modelling must be provided to assess the traffic impacts associated with the proposal.</p>	<p>CBRK have amended the Traffic Report and updated the SIDRA modelling (refer Appendix K). In terms of traffic impacts the amended Traffic Report states:</p> <p><i>The proposed modifications to the southern site will generate a modest increase in traffic generation of some 60 additional vehicles per hour (two-way) during the Thursday morning and afternoon peak periods, compared to the approved development. During the Saturday</i></p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p><i>midday peak period there would be a smaller increase of some 20 vehicles per hour (two-way).</i></p> <p><i>When distributed to the surrounding road network the greatest increase in traffic would occur on Racecourse Place with increases of some 30 vehicles per hour, two-way in the morning and afternoon peak hours. On other roads the increases would be less at up to 15 vehicles per hour, two-way. These are low increases in traffic, equivalent to an average of less than one additional vehicle every 2 to 4 minutes. Such minor increases during peak periods would not affect the operation of the surrounding road network.</i></p>
<p>A detailed analysis of the existing and future public transport servicing and capacity is required to demonstrate the site can support additional density.</p>	<p>CBRK have amended the Traffic Report to include a detailed assessment of the existing public transport services and the expected demand of the proposed modification. The report finds the following:</p> <p><i>This MOD 4 would result in an increase of some 24 trips by bus in the AM peak hour and some 30 trips by bus in the PM peak hour. These trips would be spread over the four bus routes that service the area which provide an average 16 buses per hour in the peak periods. When these additional trips are spread across these services, it would result in increases of 1 or 2 passengers per bus. Such an increase would not be noticeable in the daily variation of demand for bus services in the area.</i></p> <p><i>Sydney Buses has advised that bus routes in the area will be reviewed following the completion of the light rail. It is anticipated that the completion of the light rail will result in a change in travel patterns to the CBD with passengers having a choice between a trip by bus or by bus/light rail. Sydney Buses advised that this will result in a more trips being each direction along Gardeners Road rather than in the current peak direction, thus increasing capacity.</i></p>
<p>The proposed 24 hour loading dock operation is inappropriate in the context of surrounding residences. The hours of operation should be</p>	<p>Approval is no longer sought for the 24-hour use of the loading dock.</p> <p>The proposed hours of operation of the loading dock and waste removal / collection is to be between 5am and 10pm daily.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>reduced to minimise noise and amenity impacts on surrounding residents.</p>	<p>Pulse Acoustic Consultants have assessed the loading dock operation as documented in the Acoustic Report submitted at Appendix R. Four worst case scenarios of loading dock activities have been assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario 1: Heavy vehicle braking inside the loading dock with the shutter doors open. • Scenario 2: Heavy vehicle idling inside the loading dock with the shutter doors open • Scenario 3: Heavy vehicle reversing inside the loading dock with the shutter doors open • Scenario 4: Heavy vehicle movement inside the loading dock with the shutter doors open <p>Pulse Acoustic Consultancy predict the noise emissions from the loading dock will exceed the sleep arousal criterion. The following acoustic mitigation measures are recommended in order to achieve compliance with the relevant criterion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roller shutter door should be closed during the shoulder period (5am and 7am). • The roller shutter door must be constructed from an imperforate material.
<p>Please provide evidence of continuing negotiations with Bayside Council in relation to public benefits, including additional contributions, public domain improvements and the commitment to affordable housing provision.</p>	<p>A revised Public Benefit Offer (PBO) has been drafted and was issued to Bayside Council for consideration on the 7 May 2019. The revised PBO has been simplified and takes into consideration the comments received by Bayside Council in their submission. The revised PBO proposes a total contribution of benefits equal to \$4,650,000 comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public domain upgrades surrounding the site (with the extent to be agreed with Council); • Monetary contribution to be used for upgrades to established or new community facilities and public spaces within Eastlakes; • Affordable housing contribution equivalent to 10% of the total number of additional apartments proposed in this Modification Application. <p>The quantum of the contribution is considered commensurate to the density uplift and will enable Council to utilise the monetary contribution toward centre wide initiatives it identifies as part of their own strategic studies.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	Reference should be made to the PBO submitted at Appendix W .
Bayside Council	
<p>Council is undertaking the comprehensive LEP and DCP review. An identified priority project as a part of this process is the Eastlakes Local Centre Master Plan.</p> <p>It is therefore considered premature that the proposed modification should be considered ahead of Council's strategic planning for this locality.</p>	<p>Bayside Council exhibited the Draft Eastlakes Master Plan from 3 July 2019 to 31 July 2019. The Master Plan identified opportunities and constraints to guide the future development of the Eastlakes Local Centre, including the Eastlakes Shopping Centre. During this time, the proponent submitted a submission demonstrating how the proposed development aligns with the future aspirations for the local centre. Reference is made to Section 1.6 of the PPR and RtS report for further details.</p> <p>In addition, it should be noted that the proposed modifications are sought under the former Section 75W which is a legitimate planning pathway to modify Part 3A Project Approvals. Given the timing of the comprehensive LEP and DCP review, the determination of this modification as an existing approval should not be delayed.</p>
<p>Inconsistent in its bulk and scale with the established character of the Eastlakes Local Centre.</p> <p>The increase of building heights from 2-8 storeys to 2-14 storeys above the podium is a significant departure from the approved Part 3A proposal and is a significant departure from the architectural character and scale of the Eastlakes Local Centre.</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been substantially reduced to a maximum of 10 storeys above podium level (Building D) and 9 storeys above podium level (Building J) and divided into two separate building forms along the park edge. Building D has a length of approx. 40m; Building J has a length of 70m. The three lower scale towers (Building E, F & G) between 4-6 storeys to the rear remain generally as exhibited with minor internal planning changes and addition of roof top plant.</p> <p>The massing of the amended proposal is highly consistent with existing and proposed buildings in the vicinity of the site as documented in the MR and the amended Urban Context Report (refer Appendix G).</p> <p>A series of design measures have been proposed to articulate the building façade and mitigate the scale and mass in response to the sites context and matters raised during exhibition, including:</p>

Issue Raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The separation of Building D-J into two slimmer discrete building forms minimises the dominance of the building on the public domain while maintaining a strong frame and edge to Eastlake Reserve. • The reduction in height of Building D to 10 storeys above podium (12 storeys total) and the curved corners is more consistent with the approved Gateway Building 1B (seven storeys above podium) on the opposite side of Evans Avenue. The consistency between Building D and Building 1B is accentuated by the consistent datum line created by the façade material change on the eighth storey of Building D. This creates a common architectural language in the precinct and provides an appropriate height transition from Building 1B (on the North Site) to Building D and Building J. • Building J has been amended to step down in height at the southern boundary to minimise the built form impact on the Barber Avenue streetscape, resulting in an appropriate interface with the streetscape. • Building D has been setback further from Eastlakes Reserve which opens sight lines down Racecourse Place looking south. The 12-storey form of Building D is appropriate for its corner gateway position for the site and more broadly local centre and compliments the approved (as proposed to be amended) design of the 'north site' buildings. • The facades of Building D and Building J have been treated with different materials to mitigate the visual impact of the mass on the upper levels when viewed from key public places. Stronger colours are used on the lower elements of the façade, while a lighter diaphanous palate is used on the upper façade. This reduces the built form impacts on the park interface and provides a visually appealing façade.
<p>An increase of GFA from does not address the current capacity of Eastlakes Local Centre to cater for such density. The increase in floor space has led to a much bulkier building,</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been reduced divided back into two separate building forms along the park edge.</p> <p>The amended proposal has been assessed for increased traffic impacts, however the assessment finds the proposed modifications will generate a modest increase in traffic generation of some 60 additional vehicles per hour two-way during the Thursday morning and afternoon peak periods and</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>impacting on the interface with adjoining residential and Council’s open space asset.</p> <p>The impacts of such an increase in density on the Eastlakes Local Centre’s open space, public domain, access and movement including increased traffic and pedestrian movement conflicts is of considerable concern. Such a departure from the approved modification is not supported.</p>	<p>20 additional vehicles per hour during the Saturday peak period, compared to the approved development.</p> <p>Improvements to the surrounding public domain will be achieved by the Proponents PBO which proposes a total contribution of benefits equal to \$4,650,000 comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public domain upgrades surrounding the site (with the extent to be agreed with Council); • Monetary contribution to be used for upgrades to established or new community facilities and public spaces within Eastlakes; and • Affordable housing contribution equivalent to 10% of the total number of additional apartments proposed in this Modification Application.
<p>The proposed built form overwhelms the views from the north, west and immediate south of the site. The approved scheme impacts are minimal, whilst the proposed modification dominates and alters the skyline of the Eastlakes Local Centre. Such a departure from the approved modification is not supported.</p>	<p>To assess the view impacts created by the proposed modification, a GIS view shed analysis of the visibility of the site was undertaken as part of the Visual Context Analysis (refer Appendix I) After defining where the proposed development could be viewed from, 10 key viewpoints were identified and a comparison analysis between the existing centre, the approved development, the exhibited development, and the Preferred Project was undertaken.</p> <p>The following findings were made in relation to each situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing centre is not visible from the adjacent surroundings areas once you are beyond the immediately adjoining streets and thus does not contribute to local legibility or wayfinding within the neighbourhood to key services and facilities. • The Approved 2013 Scheme contributes to some local legibility, however again only once within the immediate vicinity of the site. • The 2018 Exhibited Scheme increases visibility of the centre especially within the walking catchment of the site. The proposed buildings act as landmarks that denote the significance of the local centre and support wayfinding to both motorists and pedestrians within an 800m catchment of the site as well as beyond.

Issue Raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compared to the 2018 Exhibited Scheme, the Preferred Project has reduced building heights which typically mean proposed buildings are more in keeping with skyline views (existing and on the North Site as shown in View 4) and surrounding context. While buildings are less visually prominent than the Exhibited Scheme, they maintain presence as a visual marker to aid wayfinding and legibility of the local centre. <p>The analysis demonstrates that although the Preferred Project scheme increases visibility of the centre, this heightened visibility provides a key wayfinding and legibility marker to both pedestrians and motorists in the 800m catchment of the site. The analysis demonstrates when viewed from 800m, the proposed built form, although visible, sits within the overall composition of other elements in the skyline, both built and natural.</p> <p>The analysis also demonstrates that the reduction of three storeys in the Preferred Project provides a development more in keeping with the local context.</p>
<p>The linear built form response to address the park is not considered appropriate. The linear form overwhelms the western elevation, whilst the approved proposal supported a stepped form transitioning to lower density to the south of the site and a break in form to relieve such bulk and scale. Such a departure from the original principles as approved (including breaks in bulk and street wall and stepping of the form) cannot be supported.</p> <p>The Eastern elevation provides enhanced design elements and increased visual interest however the increase in the height of these buildings is not supported.</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been substantially reduced to a maximum of 10 storeys above podium level (Building D) and 9 storeys above podium level (Building J) and divided into two separate building forms along the park edge. Building D has a length of approx. 40m; Building J has a length of 70m. The three lower scale towers (Building E, F & G) between 4-6 storeys to the rear remain generally as exhibited with minor internal planning changes and addition of roof top plant.</p> <p>The massing of the amended proposal is highly consistent with existing and proposed buildings in the vicinity of the site as documented in the MR and the amended Urban Context Report (refer Appendix G).</p> <p>A series of design measures have been proposed to articulate the building façade and mitigate the scale and mass in response to the sites context and matters raised during exhibition, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The separation of Building D-J into two slimmer discrete building forms minimises the dominance of the building on the public domain while maintaining a strong frame and edge to Eastlake Reserve.



Issue Raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reduction in height of Building D to 10 storeys above podium (12 storeys total) and the curved corners is more consistent with the approved Gateway Building 1B (seven storeys above podium) on the opposite side of Evans Avenue. The consistency between Building D and Building 1B is accentuated by the consistent datum line created by the façade material change on the eighth storey of Building D. This creates a common architectural language in the precinct and provides an appropriate height transition from Building 1B (on the North Site) to Building D and Building J. • Building J has been amended to step down in height at the southern boundary to minimise the built form impact on the Barber Avenue streetscape, resulting in an appropriate interface with the streetscape. • Building D has been setback further from Eastlakes Reserve which opens sight lines down Racecourse Place looking south. The 12-storey form of Building D is appropriate for its corner gateway position for the site and more broadly local centre and compliments the approved (as proposed to be amended) design of the 'north site' buildings. • The facades of Building D and Building J have been treated with different materials to mitigate the visual impact of the mass on the upper levels when viewed from key public places. Stronger colours are used on the lower elements of the façade, while a lighter diaphanous palate is used on the upper façade. This reduces the built form impacts on the park interface and provides a visually appealing façade.
<p>The overshadowing diagrams as provided do not give assurance that the existing dwellings will receive the ADG specifications for required solar access.</p>	<p>FJMT have prepared a solar heat analysis of the amount of direct sunlight received by surrounding properties. The analysis demonstrates that all the buildings in the immediate context of the proposed development will receive in excess of two hours of solar access on 21 June. The following provides an overview of the shadow impacts to the affected properties on Barber Avenue.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal provides significantly greater solar access to Eastlakes Reserve during mid-winter compared to the approved development by approximately 50%. Between 11am and 3pm at mid-winter the proposal provides unimpeded solar access to Eastlakes Reserve.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>Few items have been identified to enhance or improve the active transport network in the Offer of Public Benefit, public domain upgrades surrounding the site will only facilitate improvement to the amenity for the proposed modification site itself, little consideration has been given to the broader requirements of the Local Centre.</p>	<p>A revised Public Benefit Offer (PBO) has been drafted and was issued to Bayside Council for consideration on the 7 May 2019. Further refinements to the PBO are proposed as a result of the amended scheme. Feedback from Bayside Council will be sought as part of the public exhibition of this RtS and PPR. Overall, the PBO has been simplified and takes into consideration the comments received by Bayside Council in their submission.</p> <p>The quantum of the contribution is considered commensurate to the density uplift proposed and will enable Council to utilise the monetary contribution toward centre wide initiatives it identifies as part of their own strategic studies.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the PBO submitted at Appendix W.</p>
<p>Urban design attractive to pedestrian amenity will be extended well beyond the Local Centre, to local schools, recreation areas and public transport.</p> <p>Improvements to bus stop and shelter facilities will be required on both sides of Gardeners Road, in-line with the projected increased volume of users.</p>	<p>CBRK have amended the Traffic Report to include a detailed assessment of the existing public transport services and the expected demand of the proposed modification. The report finds the following:</p> <p><i>This MOD 4 would result in an increase of some 24 trips by bus in the AM peak hour and some 30 trips by bus in the PM peak hour. These trips would be spread over the four bus routes that service the area which provide an average 16 buses per hour in the peak periods. When these additional trips are spread across these services, it would result in increases of 1 or 2 passengers per bus. Such an increase would not be noticeable in the daily variation of demand for bus services in the area.</i></p> <p><i>Sydney Buses has advised that bus routes in the area will be reviewed following the completion of the light rail. It is anticipated that the completion of the light rail will result in a change in travel patterns to the CBD with passengers having a choice between a trip by bus or by bus/light rail. Sydney Buses advised that this will result in a more trips being each direction along Gardeners Road rather than in the current peak direction, thus increasing capacity.</i></p> <p>Given the relatively small quantum of demand, there is no nexus between the increased demand for bus stop facilities and the need to upgrade those facilities. The Proponent has committed to provide improved public domain around the site, monetary contributions for upgrades to</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	established or new community facilities and public spaces within Eastlakes and an affordable housing contribution.
<p>Given Council's current engagement in the development of its Social Infrastructure Strategy, it would be premature for Council to have a strict view on the provision of open space areas proposed by the applicant.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Landscape proposal is acceptable.</p> <p>Inconsistency between landscape and architectural plans.</p> <p>Interface with Reserve doesn't deliver an integrated landscape design. Further detail shall be developed to ensure integration.</p> <p>Further planter boxes with planting in the interface of the development with adjacent residential area can be included in upper levels to provide more privacy, add streetscape value and break the built form.</p>	<p>The Architectural and Landscape drawings have been updated to address inconsistencies.</p> <p>Refer to the Architectural Drawings at Appendix D.</p> <p>Refer to the Landscape Drawings at Appendix F.</p>
<p>The monetary contribution associated with the value uplift arising from the proposed amendments to planning controls should be consistent with Council's general commitment to seek approximately 50% of the value uplift in a planning amendment.</p>	<p>A revised Public Benefit Offer (PBO) has been drafted and was issued to Bayside Council for consideration on the 7 May 2019.</p> <p>The quantum of the contribution is considered commensurate to the density uplift and will enable Council to utilise the monetary contribution toward centre wide initiatives it identifies as part of their own strategic studies.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
Government Architect NSW – <i>Received during November 2018 exhibition period</i>	
<p>While changes have been made to the proposal in response to our advice which we support - these are considered not to address our main concerns relating to GFA and the length and scale of the 14-storey building fronting Eastlakes Reserve.</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been substantially reduced to a maximum of 10 storeys above podium level (Building D) and 9 storeys above podium level (Building J) and divided into two separate building forms along the park edge. Building D has a length of approx. 40m; Building J has a length of 70m. The three lower scale towers (Building E, F & G) between 4-6 storeys to the rear remain generally as exhibited with minor internal planning changes and addition of roof top plant.</p>
<p>We maintain that the significant increase in height, bulk and scale, and apartment numbers and parking will have negative impacts on the streetscape, suburban context and traffic, and that the modification is not matched by significant public benefit. Therefore, we are not able to support the proposal.</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been substantially reduced to a maximum of 10 storeys above podium level (Building D) and 9 storeys above podium level (Building J) and divided into two separate building forms along the park edge. Building D has a length of approx. 40m; Building J has a length of 70m. The three lower scale towers (Building E, F & G) between 4-6 storeys to the rear remain generally as exhibited with minor internal planning changes and addition of roof top plant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The massing of the amended proposal is highly consistent with existing and proposed buildings in the vicinity of the site as documented in the MR and the amended Urban Context Report (refer Appendix G). • A series of design measures have been proposed to articulate the building façade and mitigate the scale and mass in response to the sites context and matters raised during exhibition, including: • The separation of Building D-J into two slimmer discrete building forms minimises the dominance of the building on the public domain while maintaining a strong frame and edge to Eastlake Reserve. • The reduction in height of Building D to 10 storeys above podium (12 storeys total) and the curved corners is more consistent with the approved Gateway Building 1B (seven storeys above podium) on the opposite side of Evans Avenue. The consistency between Building D and Building 1B is accentuated by the consistent datum line created by the façade material change on the eighth storey of Building D. This creates a common architectural language in the precinct

Issue Raised	Response
	<p>and provides an appropriate height transition from Building 1B (on the North Site) to Building D and Building J.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building J has been amended to step down in height at the southern boundary to minimise the built form impact on the Barber Avenue streetscape, resulting in an appropriate interface with the streetscape. • Building D has been setback further from Eastlakes Reserve which opens sight lines down Racecourse Place looking south. The 12-storey form of Building D is appropriate for its corner gateway position for the site and more broadly local centre and compliments the approved (as proposed to be amended) design of the 'north site' buildings. • The facades of Building D and Building J have been treated with different materials to mitigate the visual impact of the mass on the upper levels when viewed from key public places. Stronger colours are used on the lower elements of the façade, while a lighter diaphanous palette is used on the upper façade. This reduces the built form impacts on the park interface and provides a visually appealing façade. <p>Overall, the scale of the development is considered appropriate given the shopping centre is the 'central or focal point' of the locality, and the massing will positively mark the location of the centre. Whilst this will become the tallest development in the centre, the locality is characterised by a mix of building forms that include residential flat buildings and larger towers and thus the proposal in our assessment does not create a discordant relationship to the existing surrounding context. Given this, when overlaying the potential that Council will identify increased density opportunities in the centre as earmarked in Bayside Council's <i>Draft Eastlakes Master Plan</i>, the case with respect to the appropriateness of the scale with the desired future character further strengthens.</p> <p>CBRK have assessed the traffic generated by the increased yield and found that the proposed modifications will generate a modest increase in traffic generation of some 60 additional vehicles per hour two-way during the Thursday morning and afternoon peak periods, and 20 additional vehicles per hour two way during the Saturday peak periods compared to the approved development. When distributed to the surrounding road network the greatest increase in traffic would occur on Racecourse Place with increases of some 30 vehicles per hour, two-way in the</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>morning and afternoon peak hours. On other roads the increases would be less at up to 15 vehicles per hour, two-way. These are low increases in traffic, equivalent to an average of less than one additional vehicle every 2 to 4 minutes. Such minor increases during peak periods would not affect the operation of the surrounding road network.</p> <p>The proposal makes a significant voluntary planning contribution offer to be used toward public domain upgrades, community facilities and open space and affordable housing. The quantum of the contribution is considered commensurate to the density uplift proposed and will enable Council to utilise the monetary contribution toward centre wide initiatives it identifies as part of their own strategic studies. The Public Benefit Offer has been submitted to Bayside Council for review and consideration and is also attached at Appendix W.</p>
<p>State Design Review Panel Meeting Minutes – 5 August 2018</p>	
<p>The panel were concerned at the impacts of the proposed increases in bulk, height and scale of the development, impacts on the streetscapes, increased car traffic and the limited access to public transport.</p>	<p>The amended bulk and scale has been addressed above and is documented in the Architectural Drawings prepared by FJMT (refer Appendix D) and the Urban Context Analysis prepared by Urbis (refer Appendix G).</p>
<p>The scale and length of the 14-storey linear building along the western boundary was not supported in its current state.</p>	<p>The length of Building D has been reduced to approx. 40m; and the length of Building J has been reduced to approx. 70m. The length of these buildings is commensurate with the length of buildings located throughout Eastlakes that range in length between 22m – 131m.</p> <p>Buildings D and J has been substantially reduced in scale by removing between three - four storeys, stepping of Building J to the south and removing the upper level connection of Building D-J.</p> <p>The horizontal datums of the upper levels have also been amended to be more consistent with Building 1B on the North Site. The facades of Building D and Building J have also been treated with different materials to mitigate the visual impact of the mass on the upper levels when viewed</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	from key public places. Stronger colours are used on the lower elements of the façade, while a lighter diaphanous palate is used on the upper façade.
<p>The panel was concerned that the modifications to the podium decreased the street activation along the southern and eastern elevation.</p>	<p>The following changes have been which provides increased activation compared to the approved situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater provision of retail tenancies at ground level and extension of non-residential uses to the entire northern portion of Level 1 to provide for increased surveillance and activation along the park edge. • Creation of Racecourse Plaza to provide dual function as a community meeting place and civic event space. The added provision of escalators and a lift to provide direct access to Level 1 will further heighten the activation and use of this plaza area. • Improved interface with Eastlakes Reserve through a drop-in level at the ground level of the shopping centre to provide an improved transition between the two sites. • Addition of an open air 'east street' off Barber Avenue to provide increased activation along the eastern elevation of the site and improve the east west connectivity though the site, by reducing the extent of roofed area. • Addition of a new glass oculus over the central retail space to allow increased daylight and views to the sky. • Provision of landscaping and public art to blank walls along the south east elevation. <p>Cumulatively, the proposal results in activation to 70% of the sites street elevations. The remainder of the site is used for servicing with the overall positioning being consistent with the approved scheme.</p>
<p>The setback of the residential towers along Barber Avenue does not provide opportunities for visual activation and surveillance of the street.</p>	<p>Building F has been brought closer to the street at Level 1 podium level to increase activation and provide opportunities for surveillance of the street.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>The general design of the shopping centre was supported, however, were concerned about the reduction of retail tenancies and dedicated through-site links. Greater permeability through the site, ideally with natural light and air is strongly recommended.</p>	<p>The amendments to the retail design on ground level includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfiguration of the ground floor layout and increase the total number of retail tenancies from 21 to 42 (four more than approved). • Relocate the controlled entrance points at Evans Avenue and Barber Avenue by pushing back entry doors into the retail area to provide larger public areas. The retail mall space will provide public through-site links during operating hours. • Amend the Barber Avenue pedestrian entrance and through-site link to create an open to the sky 'eat street' allowing greater light and air into the space, while increasing opportunities for activation along this elevation. • Addition of a new glass oculus over the central retail space to allow increased daylight and views to the sky.
<p>Further detail is required on the 'market -place' as a means to support existing retail tenants to remain in the centre.</p>	<p>As part of the Response to Submissions process, Crown have undertaken a comprehensive review of the retail strategy. This study sought to ensure that the retail offering is of a high quality, can accommodate future flexibility and is aligned with community requirements. In parallel, the review sought to address previous feedback from the Department and the Government Architect NSW, SDRP in regard to street activation and public domain.</p> <p>This retail review recommended increased activation at the edges of the site, including the creation of an open air 'east street' off Barber Avenue to provide increased activation along the eastern elevation of the site and improve the east west connectivity though the site, by reducing the extent of roofed area. The retail review also recommended that the internal spaces, including the previous market square be compressed to create a more intimate internal retail experience. These adjustments are designed to ensure the centre's edges and publicly accessible spaces are highly activated.</p>



Issue Raised	Response																																			
<p>The panel identified that the proposed community library space and childcare centre are only accessible via residential lift cores and are not visible or accessible from the public domain. The panel recommends changing the location of these two elements.</p>	<p>An escalator and lift from Racecourse Plaza to level 1 has been introduced providing access to the childcare centre and other commercial uses on level 1. Way finding signage will direct childcare users towards level 1.</p> <p>The community centre is accessible from Barber Avenue. It is located in a prominent location adjacent to Eastlakes Reserve and is highly visible from the public domain.</p>																																			
<p>The panel raised concerns as to whether the 'town square' adjacent to the parking entry could be expected to work as a public space given the traffic impacts.</p>	<p>The location of the carpark driveway is approved under the original DA. The location (off an existing roundabout) is the most appropriate position in terms of safely managing traffic and avoiding vehicle queues in multiple locations on the streets surrounding the site.</p> <p>FJMT have designed the area around the driveway to direct pedestrian travel up and over the driveway. Appropriate signage and footpath treatments can be installed to ensure safety if a pedestrian chooses to use the driveway cross over.</p>																																			
<p>The panel requested further evidence that the proposed modification would result in better amenity for apartments.</p>	<p>The amended scheme is also now fully ADG compliant in regard to solar access and cross ventilation. Supporting diagrams are included within the drawing set that forms part of this submission.</p> <p>The following table provides an overview of the key controls in the ADG.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="840 1040 1942 1329"> <thead> <tr> <th>Control</th> <th>Building D</th> <th>Building J</th> <th>Building E</th> <th>Building F</th> <th>Building G</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Apartment yield</td> <td>105</td> <td>126</td> <td>48</td> <td>48</td> <td>34</td> <td>361</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solar</td> <td>84</td> <td>95</td> <td>34</td> <td>35</td> <td>24</td> <td>272 (75%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No solar</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cross ventilation</td> <td>45</td> <td>63</td> <td>30</td> <td>32</td> <td>24</td> <td>194 (63%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Control	Building D	Building J	Building E	Building F	Building G	Total	Apartment yield	105	126	48	48	34	361	Solar	84	95	34	35	24	272 (75%)	No solar	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)	Cross ventilation	45	63	30	32	24	194 (63%)
Control	Building D	Building J	Building E	Building F	Building G	Total																														
Apartment yield	105	126	48	48	34	361																														
Solar	84	95	34	35	24	272 (75%)																														
No solar	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)																														
Cross ventilation	45	63	30	32	24	194 (63%)																														



Issue Raised	Response
<p>The panel noted that there was not ESD strategies or ratings targets which would provide an improvement on the approved scheme.</p>	<p>A revised Ecologically Sustainable Development Report including a revised BASIX and NatHERS Certificate has been prepared by WSP and is submitted under separate cover. The report confirms that the buildings meet the statutory requirements for single occupancy dwellings under Section J and BASIX and describes how best practice ESD principles will be incorporated in the design of the development.</p>
<p>State Design Review Panel Meeting Minutes – 31 May 2019 <i>[Note – only addressed matters not covered by the responses above]</i></p>	
<p>The current proposed modification seeks to increase gross yield on the site by approximately 30%. While the need for increased housing supply and employment opportunities is appreciated, concerns remain at the impacts of the proposed increases in terms of bulk, height and overall scale of the development, streetscape quality and amenity, increased car traffic, and the limited access to public transport near the site.</p>	<p>The proposed increase in gross yield has been further decreased by this Preferred Project submission and represents a 19% increase compared to the Project Approval.</p> <p>The impacts associated with the proposed modifications have been assessed in the RtS and PPR report and are found to be reasonable.</p>
<p>Additionally, the panel recommends the following modifications and additional information to be supplied:</p>	
<p>Indicate how the proposal will balance public benefit with commercial considerations, for example through innovation in improved public domain or public access, sustainability, residential amenity, provision of affordable housing or other innovation.</p>	<p>The proposed modifications provide a highly active ground plane, and level 1 podium including ground floor improvements through improved edge and integration with Eastlakes Reserve, creation of a more 'open to air' ground level, creation of an 'eat street' to Barber Avenue and through building links to improve permeability across the site. It also seeks to improve residential building forms and apartment amenity and results in a high-quality architectural design with significantly improved features and finishes compared to the approved development.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>Furthermore, the proposal makes a voluntary planning contribution offer to be used toward public domain upgrades, community facilities and open space and affordable housing. The quantum of the contribution is considered commensurate to the density uplift sought and will enable Council to utilise the monetary contribution toward centre wide initiatives it identifies as part of their own strategic studies.</p> <p>A copy of the Public Benefit Offer is attached at Appendix W.</p>
<p>Further reduce the height, bulk and scale of towers to reduce overshadowing, visual impacts and traffic load.</p>	<p>The built form massing of Building D-J has been substantially reduced to 9 storeys (Building J) and 10 storeys (Building D) above the podium and divided into two separate building forms along the park edge.</p> <p>The amended built form has been assessed in the RtS and PPR Report, and in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposal provides significantly greater solar access to Eastlakes Reserve during mid-winter compared to the approved development by approximately 50% and all dwellings surrounding the site are capable of achieving a minimum of 2 hours of solar access in mid-winter. • compared to the 2018 Exhibited Scheme, the Preferred Project has reduced building heights which typically mean proposed buildings are more in keeping with skyline views (existing and on the North Site) and surrounding context (refer to Visual Context Analysis at Appendix I). • the proposed modifications would result in only modest increases in traffic on surrounding roads and the surrounding road network and intersections in the vicinity of the site will continue to operate at satisfactory or better levels of service during peak periods (refer to Traffic and Parking assessment at Appendix K).
<p>Adopt a finer grained, articulated response for street elevations and ensure that Barber Avenue to the south and east does not feel like a 'back door';</p>	<p>The ground level has been amended to ensure retail activation is maximised where possible. The extent of retail tenancies along Evans Avenue and Eastlakes Reserve has been amended and is now similar to or greater than the approved scheme. Additional non-residential uses have been added along the northern elevation at Level 1 which further enhances activation along this elevation.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>The frontage adjacent to Racecourse Plaza has been curved in plan to improve the pedestrian and visual connections from inside to outside. An escalator and lift is proposed at Racecourse Plaza to provide access to Level 1 and will further heighten the activation and use of this plaza area.</p> <p>An 'eat street' is proposed off Barber Avenue. This provides increased activation along this eastern portion of the site and improves the east west connectivity through the site.</p> <p>The location of the back-of-house areas remains consistent with the positioning approved under the Project Approval. The footprint and street impact of back of house facilities and loading dock along Barber Avenue have been minimised where possible. All dimensions have been reviewed again with consideration of the comments as provided. However, there is no scope for further reduction.</p> <p>Overall the proposal results in activation to 70% of the sites street frontages which is considered a good level of activation.</p>
<p>Ensure terraces to the park support a mix of community and food and beverage business;</p>	<p>The tenancies fronting the park are intended to be used for retail premises. The use and operation of these tenancies will be subject to a future application. Use as community and food and beverage businesses will be favourably considered by the Proponent.</p>
<p>Review the location of the parking entry and the design of the public square in this location to ensure usability and safety;</p>	<p>The location of the carpark driveway is consistent with the Project Approval. A series of other access options were investigated as part of the Project Approval but were not considered feasible.</p> <p>As discussed in the Traffic and Parking Report (refer Appendix K), the preferred access arrangements were selected based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the access points to the southern site are located to easily and quickly capture traffic accessing the centre without using local streets; • the size of the southern car park requires two access points. They have been located at the western end of the site to minimise traffic effects on Evans Avenue (east) and Barber Avenue (east);

Issue Raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> if not located at the western end of the site, the access points would have to be located on Evans Avenue (east) and Barber Avenue (east). Access from either of these locations would increase traffic on these streets compared to the project approval access arrangements and would impact on pedestrian linkage between the northern and southern sites. <p>Furthermore, an analysis of pedestrian walking routes from the various directions surrounding the centre indicate that a pedestrian visiting the centre will approach the site generally as per the image below, avoiding the location of the Evans Avenue vehicular driveway.</p>  <p>Notwithstanding, a further review of the Evans Avenue driveway has been undertaken. As a result, the driveway ramp has been moved 3m south relative to the exhibited scheme to allow for</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>improved pedestrian amenity, ie: cars will not be approaching the cross over immediately after ramping.</p> <p>As illustrated in the below perspective view looking south toward the Evans Avenue driveway, FJMT have designed the area around the driveway to direct pedestrian travel up and over the driveway to Racecourse Plaza and the Eastlakes Reserve. Appropriate signage and footpath treatments will be installed, as well as the walls around the driveway to deter people from using this as a pedestrian crossing.</p>

Issue Raised	Response
	
<p>Provide detail supporting the market square concept and how this will support existing businesses in staying in the precinct;</p>	<p>As part of the Response to Submissions process, Crown have undertaken a comprehensive review of the retail strategy. This study sought to ensure that the retail offering is of a high quality, can accommodate future flexible and is aligned with community requirements. In parallel, the</p>



Issue Raised	Response
	<p>review sought to address previous feedback from the Department and the Government Architect NSW, SDRP in regard to street activation and public domain.</p> <p>This retail review recommended increased activation at the edges of the site, including the creation of an 'east street' off Barber Avenue to provide increased activation along the eastern elevation of the site and improve the east west connectivity though the site. The retail review also recommended that the internal spaces, including the previous market square be compressed to create a more intimate internal retail experience. These adjustments are designed to ensure the centre's edges and publicly accessible spaces are highly activated.</p>
<p>Detail Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) commitments with Council;</p>	<p>A revised Public Benefit Offer (PBO) has been drafted and was issued to Bayside Council for consideration on the 7 May 2019. The revised PBO has been simplified and takes into consideration the comments received by Bayside Council in their submission. The revised PBO proposes a total contribution of benefits equal to \$4,650,000 comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public domain upgrades surrounding the site (with the extent to be agreed with Council); • Monetary contribution to be used for upgrades to established or new community facilities and public spaces within Eastlakes; • Affordable housing contribution equivalent to 10% of the total number of additional apartments proposed in this Modification Application. <p>Reference should be made to the PBO submitted at Appendix W.</p>
<p>Increase the active street frontage on Barber Avenue facing east. Detail strategies for mitigating loading dock impact on neighbours;</p>	<p>The amended plan sees the addition of an 'eat street' off Barber Avenue. This provides increased activation along this eastern portion of the site and improves the east west connectivity though the site.</p> <p>For the remainder of the eastern elevation along Barber Avenue, activation is proposed to be enhanced through landscaping, public art opportunities and inclusion of a building managers office to increase activation and opportunities for casual surveillance.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>Detail ESD strategy and green-star commitments.</p>	<p>A revised Ecologically Sustainable Development Report including a revised BASIX and NatHERS Certificate has been prepared by WSP and is submitted under separate cover. The report confirms that the buildings meet the statutory requirements for single occupancy dwellings under Section J and BASIX and describes how best practice ESD principles will be incorporated in the design of the development.</p>
<p>CASA, Philip ACT and Sydney Airport</p>	
<p><i>Airservices:</i> at a maximum height of 74m (243ft) AHD the property development will affect the RNAV GNSS RWY 25 instrument procedure at Sydney Airport. The maximum height of the property development without affecting any procedures at Sydney Airport is 60.6m (199ft) AHD. Therefore, this property development - a permanent structure, as proposed cannot be supported by Airservices.</p> <p><i>CASA:</i> construction of the proposed tallest building at the site will present an unacceptable effect on the safety of existing and future air transport operations at Sydney Airport.</p> <p><i>Department of Infrastructure & Regional Development & Cities:</i> Given the CASA and Airservices response to this application, could you please check and advise if the Proponent would like to withdraw the application (with a view to resubmitting at a later date). If not, we will move to prepare a formal refusal.</p>	<p>The height of Building D (the tallest building) has been reduced by 12.4m from RL 73.0m to a maximum height of RL 60.600m. An Aeronautical Assessment has been prepared to support the proposed modifications (refer Appendix V).</p> <p>The assessment concludes that an application to the aviation authorities for infringement of the Inner Horizontal Surface of the OLS will be required to be submitted to SACL. However, it identifies that because the development site is located in an area that is not used regularly by aircraft and has a maximum height that does not infringe the PANS OPS surfaces, the application should be successful.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
Transport for NSW	
<p>The relevant reports and drawings should be updated to illustrate the number and location of the proposed bicycle parking and end of trip facilities for residents and staffs/visitors.</p>	<p>Refer to the Basement Level 1 Drawing submitted at Appendix D.</p> <p>The basement provides a 74sqm male and female end-of-trip facility and a 69.1sqm bike storage room (proposed to accommodate up to 50 bicycles) for use by visitors and staff associated with the non-residential uses.</p> <p>Bicycle storage for the residential apartments will be contained within the individual storage cages at Basement Levels 3 and 4.</p>
<p>The application documents (i.e. Traffic and Transport Assessment and the CMP) should include information in relation to bus services and bus service frequency and include the principal of minimising any disruption during construction. The CMP should also consider minimizing construction related traffic movements during the commuter peak periods to minimize impact on bus services and general traffic.</p>	<p>CBRK have amended the Traffic Report to include a detailed assessment of the existing public transport services and the expected demand of the proposed modification. This finds the following:</p> <p><i>This MOD 4 would result in an increase of some 24 trips by bus in the AM peak hour and some 30 trips by bus in the PM peak hour. These trips would be spread over the four bus routes that service the area which provide an average 16 buses per hour in the peak periods. When these additional trips are spread across these services, it would result in increases of 1 or 2 passengers per bus. Such an increase would not be noticeable in the daily variation of demand for bus services in the area.</i></p> <p><i>Sydney Buses has advised that bus routes in the area will be reviewed following the completion of the light rail. It is anticipated that the completion of the light rail will result in a change in travel patterns to the CBD with passengers having a choice between a trip by bus or by bus/light rail. Sydney Buses advised that this will result in a more trips being each direction along Gardeners Road rather than in the current peak direction, thus increasing capacity.</i></p> <p>Refer to Traffic and Parking Report at Appendix K for further details on construction related traffic movements.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>Page 6 of the CMP indicates that “there will be some 20-40 trucks per day removing demolished material and 50-80 trucks per day during the excavation phase. These trucks will be loaded on site via the use of an excavator”.</p> <p>Clarification is required on whether the figures refer to truck movements (i.e. trips) or trucks in use. Nevertheless the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan should take into consideration truck movements arriving at the site and provide mitigation measures to ensure no queuing of construction vehicles on public roads that would impact on bus services and general traffic.</p>	<p>The “20-40 trucks per day removing demolished material and 50-80 trucks per day during the excavation phase” refers to truck movement (trips).</p> <p><i>As per Page 5 of the CMP, under no circumstances (except in an emergency) shall any trucks be permitted to queue and wait on public spaces, public streets or any road related area (e.g. footpath, nature strip, road shoulder, road reserve etc) prior to entering the site.</i></p> <p>A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate in accordance with Condition B29 of the Project Approval.</p>
<p>Roads and Maritime Services</p>	
<p>SIDRA modelling required to verify at the proposed increases in trip generation will have a negligible impact to the network.</p> <p>Reference is made to the SEARS which requests an assessment of key intersections, and confirmation that both the right turn bay and left turn slip lane on Gardeners Road into Racecourse Place will not be affected.</p>	<p>CBRK have amended the Traffic Report and updated the SIDRA modelling. In terms of traffic impacts the amended Traffic Report concludes that the proposed modification results in a modest increase in traffic generation and is therefore considered to result in negligible additional traffic impacts. The report concludes that as a result of the proposed modifications sought by the amended application, the surrounding road network and intersections will continue to operate at satisfactory levels of service during peak periods consistent with the approved development.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
Sydney Water	
Recommended conditions of consent.	Noted. No response required.
Ausgrid	
Ausgrid has no further submission.	Noted. No response required.
Department of Planning Industry and Environment – Key Issues Letter dated 30 July 2019	
<p>It is noted Mod 4 now includes amendments to the buildings on the north site. However, it is unclear from the submitted documents what is changing from the approved development. Please amend Appendix Z of the RTS and clearly describe and indicate all proposed internal and external changes.</p>	<p>The Architectural Plans submitted at Appendix Y have been amended to clearly articulate the proposed amendments to the North Site.</p> <p>The plans were issued to the Department for review and feedback on the 26 August 2019 and no additional requests for changes were requested.</p>
<p>The Department considers the scale and density of the development is still inconsistent with the future desired character of the locality and has not been informed by the constraints and capacity of the site. The proposed GFA results in a poor urban design outcome, adverse visual impacts and increased traffic congestion. As such, the overall scale and density of the proposal should be reduced.</p>	<p>As documented above, the scale and height of Buildings D and J have been substantially reduced to respond to this comment by DPIE.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>Please also consider the proposed development against the strategic direction for Eastlakes Town Centre as defined in the draft Eastlakes Local Town Centre Masterplan currently on exhibition by Bayside Council.</p>	<p>The proposed development has been considered against the strategic direction for the Eastlakes Local Centre as outlined in Bayside Council's <i>Draft Eastlakes Local Town Centre Masterplan</i>. Refer to commentary contained at Section 1.6 of the RtS and PPR report and in the commentary contained throughout this response.</p>
<p>The reduced height of Buildings D and J is supported, however the height of building J is still inconsistent with the site's context. Building J should be further reduced in height to provide an appropriate transition to neighbouring sites and reduce the visual impacts of the development.</p>	<p>Building J has been significantly reduced in height to a maximum of 9 storeys above podium level. Building J is also stepped in height to the rear southern boundary where the building has an interface with the residential flat buildings along Barber Avenue.</p>
<p>Streetscape outcomes on Barber Avenue to the east and south of the centre are not supported. The extensive blank walls and loading docks result in a lack of activation and passive surveillance opportunities, and adversely impacts on the amenity and streetscape of the area. The proposal should be amended to eliminate blank walls and provide additional street activation along these frontages.</p>	<p>The amended plan sees the addition of an 'eat street' off Barber Avenue. This provides increased activation along this eastern portion of the site and improves the east west connectivity though the site.</p> <p>For the remainder of the eastern elevation along Barber Avenue, activation is proposed to be enhanced through landscaping, public art opportunities and inclusion of a building managers office to increase activation and opportunities for casual surveillance.</p> <p>Cumulatively, the proposal results in activation to 70% of the sites street elevations. The remainder of the site is used for servicing with the overall positioning being consistent with the approved scheme.</p>
<p>The proposal should be amended to improve the permeability and accessibility along the western facade of the development.</p>	<p>The levels along the west of the site have been amended such that there is an improved relationship between the proposal and Eastlakes Reserve. The western area has been lowered such that there are no steps at the southern end of the site. A new centrally located ramp has been introduced to ensure equitable access (refer to image extracts below).</p>

Issue Raised	Response
	



Issue Raised	Response
<p>The design of the junction at Evans Avenue should be amended to improve its function and address safety concerns</p>	<p>Refer to responses about this issue above.</p>
<p>Reducing the bulk and scale of Building J and increasing the separation between Buildings D and J would improve internal privacy and amenity and reduce the visual impacts associated with the proposal.</p>	<p>The bulk, scale and height of Building D and J have been substantially reduced, as documented in the RtS and PPR and discussed throughout this table. The separation distances between Building D and J are now ADG compliant as discussed at Section 4.3.1 of the RtS and PPR.</p>
<p>The proposal should be amended to improve the residential amenity of the apartments.</p>	<p>The amended scheme is now fully ADG compliant in terms of solar access and cross ventilation. Supporting diagrams are included within the drawing set that forms part of this submission. Reference is also made to the Design Report at Appendix E which documents the proposals consistency with the design criteria contained in the ADG.</p>
<p>Some studio apartments provide separate sleeping space from the kitchen/living areas and therefore do not meet the 'Studio apartment' definition in the ADG.</p>	<p>All studio apartments meet the definition of the ADG, and do not contain a separate sleeping space from the kitchen/living areas.</p>
<p>Please ensure apartments are provided with private open space that achieves the minimum ADG requirements.</p>	<p>All apartments are provided with private open space. Reference is also made to the Design Report at Appendix E which documents the proposals consistency with the design criteria contained in the ADG.</p>
<p>The proposal includes several corridors servicing more than 8 units and exceeding 12m in length. It is noted the ADG design guidance allows up to 12 units per core, but only where good amenity</p>	<p>The plans have been amended to allow for incidental spaces and seating adjacent to lifts. All such lobbies have been provided with natural daylight and views to landscaped spaces.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>and safety can be demonstrated. Please show how the proposed corridors are articulated, provide incidental spaces and can properly service the number of apartments. Design solutions include a series of foyer areas with windows and seating spaces and/or wider areas at apartment entry doors.</p>	
<p>Please provide a report that tests the existing capacity of the surrounding roads and intersections, compared with the expected impact from the approved Eastlakes development under current conditions, and that proposed in the amended Mod 4.</p>	<p>This has been addressed in the Traffic and Parking report submitted at Appendix K, and is summarised in the responses contained elsewhere in this Table.</p>
<p>The submitted report does not assess the existing capacity of the public transport network, to enable an analysis of whether capacity is available to service the proposed development.</p>	<p>This has been addressed in the Traffic and Parking report submitted at Appendix K, and is summarised in the responses contained elsewhere in this Table.</p>
<p>Government Architect Office Feedback – Email dated 2 October 2019</p>	
<p>Density: The reduced height and GFA has made improvements to the previous submission. However, the development is still too large and tall and should be reduced further. GANSW are of the view that further reductions in the southwest corner will yield the greatest results in terms of offsite impacts and providing an</p>	<p>The bulk, scale and height of Building D and J have been substantially reduced, as documented in the RtS and PPR and discussed throughout this table.</p>



Issue Raised	Response
<p>appropriate transition to neighbouring properties. It is also noted the building still encroaches within the OLS, and cannot be supported without approval from the appropriate authorities.</p>	
<p>Western façade relationship with the public domain: The relationship with the reserve along the western façade has been improved. The detailed design of this elevation should demonstrate the functionality of the retail frontages across the changes in level.</p>	<p>The levels along the west of the site have been amended such that there is an improved relationship between the proposal and Eastlakes Reserve. The western area has been lowered such that there are no steps at the southern end of the site. A new centrally located ramp has been introduced to ensure equitable access.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed to ensure these retail tenancies are functional.</p>
<p>ADG Compliance: The increased separation between buildings D and J is supported. If the bulk of building J is reduced further as per item 1 above, the solar access for building F will be further improved.</p>	<p>The bulk and scale of Building J has been further reduced by the removal of an additional level, and stepping toward the southern boundary. In addition, Building D and J have been replanned to ensure full ADG compliance. The amended scheme is now fully ADG compliant in regard to building separation, solar access and cross ventilation. Refer to the Design Report at Appendix E for further details.</p>
<p>Barber Ave streetscape: The streetscape improvements (manager’s office and the reduced setback of the live/work units along the eastern elevation) are improvements. However, the lack of activation along the southern façade is still concerning. Further consideration of the southern elevation is required, demonstrating at a minimum that the loading dock is appropriately designed and the logistics are properly managed (noise etc) and justifying proposed measures to improve the visual amenity and safety along this façade.</p>	<p>Further consideration to activation and treatment of the blank wall along the eastern elevation to Barber Avenue has been undertaken, and the following treatments are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional glazing via the introduction of a new glazed administration area to accommodate centre management. • integration of public artwork zones within the walls along the southern portion of Barber Avenue. These artworks will be developed within a framework agreed by the approval authority and are proposed to focus on issues of local and community interest. • increased planting to soften the impact of these walls.

Issue Raised	Response
	<p data-bbox="824 387 1973 480">Integration of the above measures greatly improve the appearance of the blank wall and will enhance activation and opportunities for casual surveillance. The following street elevation image illustrates the improvements proposed to the eastern elevation.</p>  <p data-bbox="1077 1018 1368 1042">new glazed section of facade</p> <p data-bbox="1431 1018 1615 1042">increased planting</p>

Issue Raised	Response
<p>Pedestrian conflict at northern basement access: the argument indicating a reduced pedestrian desire line in this location is noted. However, there will still be some activity that must be considered. The treatment in this location is important, and if this access point is pursued please provide further justification outlining how pedestrian safety will be maintained. This may include 1:100 landscape plans demonstrating the treatment of this area.</p>	<p>The car park area entry point has been further refined at the junction of Racecourse Place and Evans Avenue to ensure safe pedestrian access.</p> <p>The below diagram shows the improved ramps to the west of the car park entry point and adjusted steps and landscaping to the east.</p> 