

Summary and response to public exhibition of Major Project 09_0187 Atchison Street, St Leonards

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
Agencies		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Intersection of Christie Street / Atchison Lane Swept path analysis Condition to prohibit trucks longer than 6.4m small rigid vehicle from entering site Development designed so that road traffic noise from Pacific Highway is mitigated All vehicles shall enter and exit site in a forward direction Off-street parking; bicycle facilities and loading dock provided to satisfaction of Council Layout of carparking; loading docks and driveway in accordance with AS2890.1-2004 and AS2890.2-2002 Demolition and Construction Management Plan detailing construction routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangement and traffic control All costs associated with the proposed development shall be a no cost to the RTA 	RTA	<p>Refer to supplementary Traffic report prepared by CBHK dated April 2011 as part of the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“...the measures suggested by the RTA are not considered to be necessary, because:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>currently vehicles turning right into Atchison Lane do not generally cause queuing in Christie Street;</i> <i>the number of vehicles currently turning right into Atchison Lane is low; and</i> <i>with the proposed development, the number of right turning vehicles would continue to be low”.</i> A swept path analysis were undertaken and show a 6.4m small rigid truck using Atchison Lane to enter and exist the site in a forward direction – consistent with the existing situation <p>Matters 3-5 is noted. The proposed development is able to comply with these provisions and as such these matters could form conditions of consent.</p> <p>6. Required parking is a maximum of 147. The proposed development, with 146 spaces, satisfying this requirement. 15 motor cycle spaces would be required. The proposed development allows for 15 motor cycle spaces complying with Councils DCP. The proposed</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		<p>development would require 63 bicycle lockers and 15 bicycle rails. It is proposed to provide parking for bicycles in accordance with these requirements.</p> <p>Matters 7-9 is noted. The proposed development is able to comply with these provisions and as such these matters could form conditions of consent.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bicycle parking and facilities 2. Travel packs 3. Construction Management Plan should identify impact on surrounding transport network and provide mitigation measures 4. Further consideration of pedestrian impacts 	NSW Transport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EA at Section 4.15 addresses Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling (2004). The proposed development as amended by the PPR provides well in excess of 57 secure bicycle parking for residents within the basement and 5 bicycle spaces for visitors parking within the public domain with easy access to bike paths. 2. A Traffic Access Guide can be made available at the front desk of the hotel / service apartments. 3. A traffic management Plan within includes traffic management measures to mitigate and monitor traffic during construction can form part of a condition of consent should the application be worthy of approval. 4. It is considered that the proposed development will improve pedestrian access by providing a pedestrian through site link between Atchison Street and Atchison Lane.
<i>"...RailCorp has no further requirement for specific conditions in relation to the CBD Rail Link corridor..."</i>	RailCorp	Noted
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water – sufficient capacity 2. Wastewater – sufficient capacity 3. Trade Waste – written permission from 	Sydney Water	<p>Noted</p> <p>An appropriate condition of consent requiring a Section 73 Certificate application prior to Construction Certificate can be</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
Sydney Water – Permit - S73 certificate		imposed
Council		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development does not satisfy the aims of the LEP 2001 Proposed development does not satisfy the objectives (b) and (c) of Mixed use zone Proposed development does not satisfy Clause 14 Unacceptable breach of Clause 29 (building height) Proposed development fails to satisfy St Leonards/ Crows Nest Character Statement Proposed development does not satisfy SEPP 65 – in particular proposed height; large floor plate; site coverage Does not satisfy NSDCP 2002 specifically <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Communal area Dwelling mix Visual privacy Setbacks Context Skyline Laneway frontage podium Balconies Bicycle storage Garbage storage Cumulative traffic impacts 	North Sydney Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Aims of LEP 2001 – Clause 3(a) and (b) <i>The specific aims of this plan are:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>in relation to the character of North Sydney's neighbourhoods, to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>promote the character of the neighbourhoods and development which is compatible with neighbouring development in terms of bulk, scale and appearance, and</i> <i>maintain a diversity of activities while protecting residential accommodation and local amenity, and</i> <i>ensure that development on foreshore lands or land visible from the harbour or any public place does not adversely affect the appearance of that foreshore land, or the views of that land from the harbour or public place, and</i> <i>in relation to residential development, to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>protect and enhance the residential use and amenity of existing residential neighbourhoods and new residential development, and</i> <i>maintain and provide for an increase in dwelling stock, where appropriate, and</i> <i>prevent the expansion of non-residential uses in residential neighbourhoods, and</i> <p>The proposal is considered to deliver significant residential stock within 100m of a major bus/rail interchange which in turn is 10-12minutes from the City. The residential stock at</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		<p>affordable prices offers minimal environmental impacts to its neighbours and the precinct. The proposal allows for a new through site link and activation of laneway; as per the St. Leonard's Strategy as well as the opportunity to allow public domain improvements not available under the current controls. The revised application results in minimal amenity impacts on existing properties and is considered an appropriate and compatible development within the Specialised Centre of St Leonards.</p> <p>2. Objectives b and c of mixed use zone</p> <p><i>(b) create interesting and vibrant neighbourhood centres with safe, high quality urban environments with residential amenity, and</i></p> <p><i>(c) maintain existing commercial space and allow for residential development in mixed use buildings with non-residential uses at the lower levels and residential above, and</i></p> <p>The design has emerged from a close and detailed analysis of this unique St Leonards site, having regard for the streetscape, environmental effects and urban form. The proposed building (as amended by the PPR) would create no additional overshadowing and be contextually consistent with the scale and form of development in the vicinity. The pedestrian through site link allows for further activation on the ground floor, creating an interesting, safe and vibrant environment, consistent with objective b.</p> <p>The proposed building includes residential and non-residential uses, with non residential (cafe, gym and "hotel") at lower levels and no residential at ground level (except access). The proposed uses would not limit the commercial</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		<p>development opportunities within St Leonards. Moreover the proposed non-residential uses were located on the lower levels to ensure activation of the pedestrian environment consistent with the objective c.</p> <p>3. Clause 14 Refer to point 1 & 2 above</p> <p>4. As part of the Preferred Project Report the proponent undertook additional urban design analysis which established the massing and yield potential of the St Leonards Centre. This analysis demonstrates a height potential on opportunity sites.</p> <p>The PPR amends the proposed height consistent with the additional urban design analysis at 96.5m</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed building, is taller than the maximum building height control but it only has a site cover of approximately 33%.</p> <p>The proposed bulk is considered compatible with existing surrounding developments in particular the Linea Building at No. 2-4 Atchison Street which has a FSR of 13.6:1 with a non-complying non-residential FSR component. More importantly the existing Linea Building provides for 100% site cover. It is considered that an appropriately located (allowing for separation between buildings) high rise tower with a smaller footprint is considered more beneficial in terms of shadow impact compared with a squat lower building which complies with the height and FSR provisions.</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		<p>5. St Leonards character statement</p> <p>The PPR has amended the height of the building to 96.5m. this allows for a transition in building height from the Forum to the IBM and Abode buildings with the Forum remains as the highest building within the skyline</p> <p>Accordingly the amended design satisfies the St Leonards character statement as the proposed built form allows for the <i>"scaling down in building height from the 'Forum' building to Willoughby Road"</i>.</p> <p>6. An assessment of the Project Application against the Residential Flat Design Code is contained in the plans by FJMT at Appendix 4 as well as a peer review of the SEPP 65 assessment prepared by Peter John Cantrell at Appendix 5 submitted as part of the EA. The peer review concludes that other for building separation the proposal is considered to achieve the objectives of the rules of thumb. It recommended that where building separation is not fully compliant, careful designed screening could meet the objective.</p> <p>7. As part of the part, additional privacy screens has been introduced to the eastern facade as part of the PPR – refer to Architectural plans.</p> <p>8. DCP</p> <p>a) Communal area</p> <p>The proposal allows for private open spaces to all units whilst a common area shared as a public plaza is provided at ground floor (1,178m² in size). In the</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE										
		<p>context of the Specialised Centre, the communal area provided within the high density area is considered appropriate.</p> <p>b) Dwelling mix</p> <table><tr><th>Required under DCP</th><th>Proposed</th></tr><tr><td>studio apartments maximum 15%</td><td>17.3 %</td></tr><tr><td>1 bedroom apartments maximum 30%</td><td>37%</td></tr><tr><td>2 bedroom apartments minimum 40%</td><td>38%</td></tr><tr><td>3 bedroom+ apartments minimum 15%</td><td>7.5%</td></tr></table> <p>The proposal provides marginally more studio and 1 bedroom units. The mix of housing types allows a choice consistent with more single/lone person households and single professional people within the area and is considered appropriate response to market trends.</p> <p>c) Visual privacy</p> <p>The urban design analysis undertaken by CPUD as part of the PPR as well as the comments made by Peter John Cantrell as part of the EA demonstrates that the proposed separation between buildings is appropriate. The PPR does introduce privacy screens to the lower levels of the building on the Northeastern and southwestern façades in order to mitigate any overlooking and thus ensuring visual</p>	Required under DCP	Proposed	studio apartments maximum 15%	17.3 %	1 bedroom apartments maximum 30%	37%	2 bedroom apartments minimum 40%	38%	3 bedroom+ apartments minimum 15%	7.5%
Required under DCP	Proposed											
studio apartments maximum 15%	17.3 %											
1 bedroom apartments maximum 30%	37%											
2 bedroom apartments minimum 40%	38%											
3 bedroom+ apartments minimum 15%	7.5%											

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE																
		<p>privacy.</p> <p>d) Setbacks</p> <table><tr><th>Required</th><th>Proposed</th></tr><tr><td>Streets setback 3m from street frontage to building alignment</td><td>5.6m from Atchison Street to building</td></tr><tr><td>1.5m at ground level, from laneway frontage to building alignment.</td><td>4m from Atchison Lane to building</td></tr><tr><td>Setback of 3m, on the street frontage from the building alignment, above podium except as follows: iv. Atchison Street and southern side of Chandos Street, between Mitchell and Oxley Streets setback 1.5m from the building alignment above podium.</td><td>4.5m from Atchison Street to building above-podium</td></tr><tr><td>Setback of 1.5m, on the laneway frontage from building alignment, above podium.</td><td>3.0 metres from Atchison Lane to building above podium</td></tr><tr><td>Side setback of 3m, above podium.</td><td>Min. of 6m metres above podium level to the side boundaries;</td></tr><tr><td>Separation of 6m, above podium, between windows and balconies.</td><td>6-12m to windows of adjoining buildings – no adjoining balconies</td></tr><tr><td>Provide retaining walls only where necessitated by slope of site and limit to 1mmaximum height.</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table>	Required	Proposed	Streets setback 3m from street frontage to building alignment	5.6m from Atchison Street to building	1.5m at ground level, from laneway frontage to building alignment.	4m from Atchison Lane to building	Setback of 3m, on the street frontage from the building alignment, above podium except as follows: iv. Atchison Street and southern side of Chandos Street, between Mitchell and Oxley Streets setback 1.5m from the building alignment above podium.	4.5m from Atchison Street to building above-podium	Setback of 1.5m, on the laneway frontage from building alignment, above podium.	3.0 metres from Atchison Lane to building above podium	Side setback of 3m, above podium.	Min. of 6m metres above podium level to the side boundaries;	Separation of 6m, above podium, between windows and balconies.	6-12m to windows of adjoining buildings – no adjoining balconies	Provide retaining walls only where necessitated by slope of site and limit to 1mmaximum height.	N/A
Required	Proposed																	
Streets setback 3m from street frontage to building alignment	5.6m from Atchison Street to building																	
1.5m at ground level, from laneway frontage to building alignment.	4m from Atchison Lane to building																	
Setback of 3m, on the street frontage from the building alignment, above podium except as follows: iv. Atchison Street and southern side of Chandos Street, between Mitchell and Oxley Streets setback 1.5m from the building alignment above podium.	4.5m from Atchison Street to building above-podium																	
Setback of 1.5m, on the laneway frontage from building alignment, above podium.	3.0 metres from Atchison Lane to building above podium																	
Side setback of 3m, above podium.	Min. of 6m metres above podium level to the side boundaries;																	
Separation of 6m, above podium, between windows and balconies.	6-12m to windows of adjoining buildings – no adjoining balconies																	
Provide retaining walls only where necessitated by slope of site and limit to 1mmaximum height.	N/A																	

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		<p>Accordingly the proposed building complies with all the DCP setbacks.</p> <p>e) Context A detailed site analysis and urban context analysis were undertaken by the Architects and within the EA. The proposal responds to the site context and opportunities presented by the site, being located 100m from St Leonards Station within the “Specialised Centre” earmarked by State policy for increased densities.</p> <p>f) Skyline The proposed development provides a distinctive landmark on the skyline. This is achieved through the splitting of the building mass into two separate vertical elements, further contributed through the utilisation of vertical lines and change of materials on the eastern and western elevations. The amended design as part of the PPR reduces the overall height of the building – Forum remains the highest visible point</p> <p>g) Laneway frontage podium A laneway podium (“wall to wall” consistent with the adjoining) is considered to be counterproductive eliminating the potential for pedestrian through site linkages.</p> <p>h) Balconies NS DCP requires balconies to have a minimum depth of 2m and an area of 8m² whilst SEPP 65 RFDC does not specify</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE																
		<p>a minimum area, it does however, specify a minimum depth of 2m.</p> <p>All hotel and residential apartments are provided with a balcony or winter garden. The balconies range in size between 4m² (for a studio unit) and 18.8m² (for a 3 bedroom unit) with all balconies having a minimum depth of 2m. The non-compliance with the NSDCP is considered minor as the minimum depth is still achieved to all balconies which allows for a usable private open space.</p> <p>i) Bicycle storage</p> <table> <tr> <th>Control</th><th>Required</th><th>Proposed</th></tr> <tr> <td>Provide on-site, secure bicycle parking spaces and storage at the following rates for residential:</td><td>173units/3= 57</td><td rowspan="3">Refer to traffic report at Appendix 5: <i>"The provision will be met as part of the proposed development"</i></td></tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bicycle locker per 3 dwellings • visitor parking 1 bicycle rail per 12 dwellings* </td><td>173/12=14</td></tr> <tr> <td>and for mixed use/commercial:</td><td>2,902m²</td></tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bicycle locker per 600m² of gross floor area (GFA) • visitor parking 1 bicycle rail per 2 500m² GFA* </td><td>GFA/600 = 5 2902/2500 = 1</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>77</td><td>77</td></tr> </table>	Control	Required	Proposed	Provide on-site, secure bicycle parking spaces and storage at the following rates for residential:	173units/3= 57	Refer to traffic report at Appendix 5: <i>"The provision will be met as part of the proposed development"</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bicycle locker per 3 dwellings • visitor parking 1 bicycle rail per 12 dwellings* 	173/12=14	and for mixed use/commercial:	2,902m ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bicycle locker per 600m² of gross floor area (GFA) • visitor parking 1 bicycle rail per 2 500m² GFA* 	GFA/600 = 5 2902/2500 = 1		Total	77	77
Control	Required	Proposed																
Provide on-site, secure bicycle parking spaces and storage at the following rates for residential:	173units/3= 57	Refer to traffic report at Appendix 5: <i>"The provision will be met as part of the proposed development"</i>																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bicycle locker per 3 dwellings • visitor parking 1 bicycle rail per 12 dwellings* 	173/12=14																	
and for mixed use/commercial:	2,902m ²																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bicycle locker per 600m² of gross floor area (GFA) • visitor parking 1 bicycle rail per 2 500m² GFA* 	GFA/600 = 5 2902/2500 = 1																	
Total	77	77																

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		<p>The basement levels allow for appropriate areas for the provision of motorcycles and bicycle spaces and as such the requirement can form an appropriate condition of consent.</p> <p>j) Garbage storage</p> <p>Basement level B1 allows for a large area for a garbage storage. The plan currently shows a total of 94 bins. This is more than enough to satisfy Council's DCP control. Moreover an appropriate condition of consent may be imposed to address this issues should the application be worthy of approval</p> <p>9. The likely additional traffic generated from the increase in yield for the St Leonards area was estimated by CBHK. The CBHK report concludes as follows:-</p> <p><i>"The traffic generation of development in St Leonards, including planned development plus additional development, would therefore be some 220 to 340 vehicles per hour two-way during peak hours".</i></p> <p>The effect of an additional 340 vehicles (noting this is the anticipated maximum) was tested on the operation of intersections for the weekday morning and afternoon peak period. The CBHK report concludes as follows:-</p> <p><i>"Therefore, the road network will be able to cater for the additional traffic from the proposed development, as well as other development in St Leonards".</i></p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
1. Height appears excessive 2. Minimisation of overshadowing of residential premises within surrounding neighbourhoods	Lane Cove Council	<p>As part of the Preferred Project Report the proponent undertook additional urban design analysis which established the massing and yield potential of the St Leonards Centre. This analysis demonstrates a height potential on opportunity sites.</p> <p>The PPR amends the proposed height consistent with the additional urban design analysis at 96.5m</p> <p>The shadow analysis submitted with the EA demonstrates minimal impact to existing residential premises in Lane Cove LGA.</p>
Neighbours submissions		
Sunlight/Overshadowing due to height	Laura Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Alex Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Laura Ee – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Kaitlynn Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Wei Li – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Ting Loong Chin – 902/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Linea Building Management Committee and Owners Corporation Executive (Contact: David Carter, Chairman), 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Anonymous – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Nyun Mui Lee – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Roman Lichacz and Sandy Nguyen – 901/2-4 Atchison St Deborah Kwan – 1304/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Ben & Jacqueline Buchanan –	<p>The PPR amends the proposed height consistent with the additional urban design analysis at 95m.</p> <p>The supplementary shadow diagrams submitted as part of the PPR demonstrates no/minimal impact by way of overshadowing to residential premises with in Lane Cove LGA.</p> <p>In addition, the PPR include additional shadow analyses of the Abode. The proposed additional shadow as a result of the proposed development is limited to less than 30min at mid-winter, and as such still allows the affected units of the Abode to maintain access to sunlight well in excess of 2 hours required (within high density areas).</p> <p>Accordingly, the additional shadow as a result of the</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	602/2-4 Atchison St Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Barry Davis – 2903/The Forum, 1 Sergeants Land, St Leonards Andre Stephan – 2901/The Forum, 1 Sergeants Land, St Leonards Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards Anonymous (x3)	proposed development is considered negligible.
Negative Visual Impact of Proposed Development (Height, Bulk and Scale)	Linea Building Management Committee and Owners Corporation Executive (Contact: David Carter, Chairman), 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Nyun Mui Lee – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Audrey Pena – 904/2 Atchison St, St Leonards Anonymous – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Alex Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Laura Ee – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Kaitlynn Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Wei Li – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Deborah Kwan – 1304/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Ben & Jacqueline Buchanan – 602/2-4 Atchison St Creswell & Annette Eastman – 1503/2-4 Atchison St	<p>The PPR amends the proposed height consistent with the additional urban design analysis at 96.5m</p> <p>Articulation of the tower mass by separating the form with a smaller “slot” element allows the 2 forms to be perceived as 2 separate buildings minimising bulk and scale.</p> <p>The development has significant capacity to be visually absorbed into the existing locality without detrimentally altering the character. The proposal produces a development of a character consistent with what could be anticipated for the St Leonards Centre which allows for higher densities and heights as well as the new adopted heights and densities under the Lane Cove LEP 2009.</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	Anonymous (x3) Isabelle Moeller – 24/29 Holtermann St, Crows Nest Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Andre Stephan – 3408/The Forum, 1 Sergeants Land, St Leonards	It is considered that the Architectural design allows for a high quality visual appearance.
Loss of Privacy for surrounding apartments	Roman Lichacz and Sandy Nguyen – 901/2-4 Atchison St	<p>St Leonards is a Specialised Centre. It has been earmarked for high density development in close proximity to public transport. The expectation to retain privacy at the same level as you would for low residential areas is unrealistic.</p> <p>The building has been design to include sunshade devises ensuing that visual privacy is maintained.</p> <p>Nonetheless the PPR included privacy screen devises to the eastern facade to reduce the potential for overlooking further.</p>
Height non-compliance with NSLEP 2001	Creswell & Annette Eastman – 1503/2 Atchison St Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards	<p>The PPR amends the proposed height consistent with the additional urban design analysis at 96.5m</p> <p>The reduced building height is considered to respond to the existing and potential future built forms within the Centre. It also allows for a transition in height from the Forum to other</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	<p>W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Sebastian Pena – 902/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards</p> <p>Anonymous (x1)</p> <p>Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards</p>	<p>surrounding buildings (in particular the IBM and Abode buildings).</p> <p>It is noted that the subject site is located at the top of the ridge, and the building would form the new focal point of St Leonards; no higher than the "Forum" and providing potential for 4 other sites in the immediate vicinity to have "increased heights" to achieve Metro Strategy goals.</p> <p>The supplementary shadow diagrams submitted as part of the PPR demonstrates minimal impact by way of overshadowing to the Abode.</p>
FSR Excessive	<p>Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards</p>	<p>The PPR provides for a total GFA of 20,819m² or a FSR of 11.9:1</p> <p>Total residential GFA = 16,035m²</p> <p>Total non-residential GFA = 4683m² (2.7:1) consisting of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hotel – 4,223m² arguably non-residential floor space • Gym – 222m² non-residential floor space • Cafe – 238m² non-residential floor space <p>The Linea Building at No. 2-4 Atchison Street which has a FSR of 13.6:1 with a non-complying non-residential FSR component. Forum has an existing FSR of 10.6:1 (Source: North Sydney Design Excellence Panel report dated 11 November 2009).</p> <p>Accordingly the proposed development allows for a total FSR consistent with that of existing buildings in the immediate</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
		area.
Setbacks Inadequate	Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards	The building complies with the setback provisions within NS DCP allowing appropriate separation between buildings.
Loss of Office Space in this location is not consistent with strategic controls and objectives	Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards	<p>The mixed use zoning of the subject site together with the larger site area and the required amenity to attract residential development such as potential to address overshadowing, outlook, privacy and solar access, contributes to a residential land use being more appropriate.</p> <p>North Sydney Council at its meeting on 11 December 2006, resolved to rezone the sites listed below from 'Mixed Use' to 'Commercial':-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 601-657 Pacific Highway • 94-106 Christie Street • 75-81 Christie Street • 1 Chandos Street <p>North Sydney Council upzoned these site to ensure appropriate employment lands (office space) are retained within the St Leonards Centre, freeing up other sites for higher residential densities.</p> <p>A residential land use (including the "Hotel" which arguably can be considered as a commercial use) within an existing Centre identified for increased density and activity as well as its close proximity to public transport nodes and employment potential is considered consistent with State policy. Accordingly, the proposed uses would not limit the commercial development opportunities within St Leonards.</p>
Loss of views	Ting Loong Chin – 902/2-4 Atchison St, St	The view analysis prepared and submitted as part of the EA

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	Leonards Anonymous – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards	demonstrates that the proposed buildings sit comfortably within the existing and future anticipated skyline. This will ensure that the views to and from the site are not detrimentally compromised. More importantly, the views of the centre are enhanced.
Capacity of existing infrastructure services (water, sewerage, gas, electricity and telecommunications)	Linea Building Management Committee and Owners Corporation Executive (Contact: David Carter, Chairman), 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Anonymous (x2) Isabelle Moeller – 24/29 Holtermann St, Crows Nest Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Nyun Mui Lee – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Alex Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Laura Ee – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Kaitlynne Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Wei Li – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Ben & Jacqueline Buchanan – 602/2-4 Atchison St	Refer to Sydney Water referral which confirms that adequate water capacity and wastewater service is available to serve the proposed development. In addition written permission from Sydney Water will be obtained for trade waste and a S73 certificate will be obtained at CC stage.
Capacity of Public Transport Services	Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards	Refer to supplementary Traffic report prepared by CBHK dated April 2011 as part of the Preferred Project Report.
Traffic congestion/Lack of Parking	Linea Building Management Committee and Owners Corporation Executive (Contact:	The likely additional traffic generated from the increase in

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	<p>David Carter, Chairman), 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Anonymous (x2) Isabelle Moeller – 24/29 Holtermann St, Crows Nest John Clarke – 19 Chandos St, St Leonards Creswell & Annette Eastman – 1503/2 Atchison St Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Andre Stephan – 3408/The Forum, 1 Sergeants Land, St Leonards Andre Stephan – 2901/The Forum, 1 Sergeants Land, St Leonards Nyun Mui Lee – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Edgar Ng – 18/45 Chandos St, St Leonards Roman Lichacz and Sandy Nguyen – 901/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Sebastian Pena – 902/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Audrey Pena – 904/2 Atchison St, St Leonards Anonymous – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Alex Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Laura Ee – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Kaitlynne Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Wei Li – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards Barry Davis – 2903/The Forum, 1 Sergeants</p>	<p>yield for the St Leonards area was estimated by CBHK. The CBHK report concludes as follows:-</p> <p><i>"The traffic generation of development in St Leonards, including planned development plus additional development, would therefore be some 220 to 340 vehicles per hour two-way during peak hours".</i></p> <p>The effect of an additional 340 vehicles (noting this is the anticipated maximum) was tested on the operation of intersections for the weekday morning and afternoon peak period. The CBHK report concludes as follows:-</p> <p><i>"Therefore, the road network will be able to cater for the additional traffic from the proposed development, as well as other development in St Leonards".</i></p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	Land, St Leonards Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards Deborah Kwan – 1304/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Ben & Jacqueline Buchanan – 602/2-4 Atchison St	
Noise resulting from mixed use development/hotel	Laura Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Anonymous – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Alex Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Laura Ee – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards	<p>An acoustic report accompanies the EA at Appendix12. The report includes external noise criteria. In this respect the environmental noise limits for mechanical plant, applicable at the boundary of the nearest receivers, are presented in Table 1 of the Acoustic Report. Complying with the noise limits for the closest residential receivers to each site will ensure compliance with the noise limits at all other residential receivers, plus all commercial receivers. The Roof top plan will be enclosed or screened as required.</p> <p>The noise report also states that “<i>If necessary, additional environmental noise control methods may include in-duct attenuators, acoustic louvres for plant rooms, and enclosures for noisy plant items</i>”.</p> <p>Noise at the site has been measured and noise goals have been set in accordance with the requirements of the local council and relevant statutory/regulatory authorities. Accordingly, the noise for the proposed mixed use building at the time of operation will need to meet these criteria</p>
Concerns relating to safety, health, amenity and disturbances resulting from operation of mixed use development/hotel	Laura Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Alex Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Laura Ee – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards Kaitlynne Teo – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St	<p>The site is zoned mixed use pursuant to North Sydney LEP 2000.</p> <p>Adjoining the site to the west is a 17 level mixed-use (serviced apartment) development at No. 2-4 Atchison Street known as “Linea Building”. Adjoining the site to the east is a</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	<p>Leonards</p> <p>Wei Li – 805/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards</p> <p>Edgar Ng – 18/45 Chandos St, St Leonards</p> <p>Anonymous – 2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards</p>	<p>3 storey commercial building, No. 20 Atchison Street. To the north of the site on the opposite side of Atchison Lane are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a 11 storey mixed use development No. 11 Chandos Street known as “Habitat”, • 2 x 3 storey commercial buildings No’s. 21 and 23 Chandos Street, and • a 7 storey commercial development No. 33 Chandos Street (see photo 4). <p>South of the site on the opposite side of Atchison Street are 2 storey and 7 storey commercial buildings at No. 617A Pacific Highway, and a prominent 17 storey commercial building at No. 601-609 Pacific Highway known as the “IBM” building (see photos 5 & 6).</p> <p>The area is characterised by a mix of uses. The operation of a mixed use building incorporating serviced apartments the nature of which can also be construed as a residential use would not result in a “disturbance” of the mixed use nature of the Centre as a whole.</p>
Impacts of construction phase (noise, traffic, air pollution, crime)	<p>Ting Loong Chin – 902/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards</p> <p>Sebastian Pena – 902/2-4 Atchison St, St Leonards</p>	The Construction Management Plan includes noise vibration and disruption management measures; as well as a construction safety plan (See Appendix 7 of the PPR).
Lack of public/open spaces to accommodate new residents	<p>Isabelle Moeller – 24/29 Holtermann St, Crows Nest</p> <p>Creswell & Annette Eastman – 1503/2 Atchison St</p> <p>Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards</p>	In addition to private open space (balconies), a communal shared open space of 1,178m ² or 67.7% of site area are available as a public open space / plaza to the residents.

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
Wind Tunnel/"Wind effects" on streetscape/local area	<p>Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Edgar Ng – 18/45 Chandos St, St Leonards</p> <p>Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Anonymous (x1)</p>	<p>St Leonards in general experience significant wind effects due to the east west orientation of the street grid and topography. The proposed development will not alter this existing situation.</p> <p>An amended Wind Impact Study was undertaken by Heggies as a result of the PPR (reduced height) and is attached at Appendix 9.</p> <p>The amended wind report concludes as follows:-</p> <p><i>"The previous recommendations for ground level landscaping remain as before and are shown in Figure 1 with the revised Ground Floor plan.</i></p> <p><i>It is expected that wind mitigation recommendations will be reviewed and further refined (ie specific dimensions for landscaping, any vertical screening, etc) during the detailed design stage of the development (following development approval) to ensure that wind comfort goals are achieved".</i></p>
Impact on lifestyle of existing residents/character of the area (eg. loss of "quiet and tranquil environment")	<p>Bob Usher – 1302/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Rodney & Eileen Rodwell – 1705/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>W.G. Parry & P.M. Quirke-Parry – 1803/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Abode Building Owners' Corporation Executive Committee (Contact: Pat Quirke-Parry), 599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p>	<p>St Leonards is not a typical residential suburb but rather the heart of a "Specialised Centre". Describing St Leonards as a "quiet tranquil environment" is erroneous.</p> <p>The St Leonards Strategy identifies the subject site as being located on the boundary of the "Urban Centre" and the 'Eastern Mixed Use Transition Area'. The Urban Centre is described as "the heart of the centre, focused on the station and Forum Plaza". The role of the precinct includes the</p>

ISSUE	SUBMISSION FROM	RESPONSE
	<p>Sharyn Whitten – E704/599 Pacific Highway, St Leonards</p> <p>Barry Davis – 2903/The Forum, 1 Sergeants Land, St Leonards</p> <p>Holtermann Precinct Committee – 124 Atchison St, St Leonards</p>	<p>provision of “<i>opportunities for businesses and residents seeking high public transport accessibility, and ‘CBD-type’ amenities to serve the whole centre and surrounding area</i>”.</p> <p>Accordingly the subject site is ideally situated for the proposed uses.</p>
Proposed Development will block flow of natural air	Anonymous (x1)	The proposed development does not hinder attainment of natural ventilation to surrounding properties.