

Summary of submissions received on the Department's assessment and recommendation

Submissions	How dealt with in assessment / recommendation
<p>Two public submissions (Attachment A), raising the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for clarification about the proposal and Department's recommendation. 2. General impacts of the proposal on properties to the south (corner of Barber Avenue and St Helena Parade). 3. Traffic impacts, in particular the impacts of additional traffic from the exit Barber Avenue exit on the junction with Barber Avenue and St Helens Parade. 4. Impacts of signage on the southern boundary of the site. 5. Privacy impacts for properties to the south. 6. Noise impacts from loading docks (request to retain loading dock hours until 9pm instead of 10pm), waste removal and plant. 7. Loss of value to surrounding properties. 	<p>The Department notes that these submissions do not raise any new issues, not already considered as part of the Department's assessment, as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submitters have been contacted and directed to the appropriate section of the Department's assessment report on the website. 2. Section 6.3 notes that the proposal was amended to reduce upper level building massing at the southern end of Building J. The proposed building now presents as a 5 storey façade to the south onto Barber Avenue, which is similar in height to the approved building. 3. Section 6.5 notes that traffic modelling submitted with the proposal shows the proposed modification would only result in a modest increase in traffic generation compared to the approved development, equivalent to one additional two-way vehicle movement in the surrounding streets every minute during peak times, and that surrounding intersections would operate at a good level of service. 4. Section 6.10 notes that insufficient information has been provided to enable the Department to determine if the size or location of the proposed signs could have an adverse impact on the character of the area, and that the proposed signage zones should not be approved as part of this application. 5. Section 6.4 notes that the proposal was amended to locate buildings further away from the site edges and that no reduction in building separation from the approved development is proposed. 6. Section 6.9 notes that the Department does not support to extension of loading dock operation hours between 5am and 7am as it would result in sleep disturbance impacts. It also notes that existing conditions and additional measures recommended in the updated acoustic assessments would ensure noise from the loading docks between 7am to 10pm and the additional waste collection hours would be effectively managed and would not cause additional disturbance to residents. 7. Impacts to the value of surrounding properties are not a consideration under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.

Mervyn Peay 18/06/2020

Summary of additional submissions received in response to the Proponent's response to submissions

Submissions	How dealt with in assessment / recommendation
<p>The Department was also made aware of three additional postal submissions received in response to the Proponent's response to submissions (Attachment B), raising the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impacts of additional building height on solar access for Eastlakes Reserve and surrounding buildings. 2. Traffic impacts as a result of increased number of apartments. 3. Existing mature trees should be retained 4. Noise impacts for new and existing residents from extension of loading dock, waste removal and trading hours. 	<p>The Department notes that these submissions do not raise any new issues, not already considered as part of the Department's assessment, as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 6.4 notes that while the proposed buildings on the South Site are higher than the approved buildings, the buildings are located further away from the boundary with Eastlakes Reserve, resulting in an overall reduction in overshadowing of the reserve compared to the approved development. It also notes that while the modification results in some additional shadows cast on the residential flat buildings on Barber Avenue to the south and east of the site, shadow diagrams demonstrate that all affected buildings would continue to receive in excess of 2 hours of solar access at midwinter, which is consistent with the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). 2. Section 6.5 notes that traffic modelling submitted with the proposal shows the proposed modification would only result in a modest increase in traffic generation compared to the approved development, equivalent to one additional two-way vehicle movement in the surrounding streets every minute during peak times, and that surrounding intersections would operate at a good level of service. 3. Section 6.3 notes that the Department does not support the proposed removal of two mature trees and additional canopy pruning within Eastlakes Reserve. No changes are therefore proposed to the existing condition which protects the trees in Eastlakes Reserve has been recommended. It also notes that existing street trees along Barber Avenue are shown to be removed on the approved landscape plans, therefore are not protected under the original approval. 4. Section 6.9 notes that the Department does not support to extension of loading dock operation hours between 5am and 7am as it would result in sleep disturbance impacts. It also notes that existing conditions and additional measures recommended in the updated acoustic assessments would ensure noise from the loading docks between 7am to 10pm and the additional waste collection hours would be effectively managed and would not cause additional disturbance

<p>5. Insufficient on-site parking provided, resulting in additional parking on the surrounding streets.</p> <p>6. Impacts on aviation safety.</p>	<p>to residents. It also notes that the Department does not recommend approval of the proposed general trading hours for the Centre as part of this application, as the exact acoustic impacts cannot be assessed until the tenants are identified.</p> <p>5. Section 6.5 notes that the proposed car parking rates for all proposed uses are either consistent with the original approval, Council's DCP and the RMS Guide to Traffic Generated Development, and that sufficient parking to cater for the additional demand created by the modification and therefore would not result in any unacceptable consequences for on-street parking in the surrounding locality.</p> <p>6. Section 6.10 notes that the Proponent amended the proposed building heights to comply with CASA and Sydney Airports maximum allowable height of 60.6m AHD, which CASA and Sydney Airport have approved, subject to providing obstacle lighting.</p>
--	---

Murray Rg 18/06/2020

