

The Trustee for LegPro 70 Unit Trust
C/- NSW Department of Planning, Housing and
Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcy Street
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

REFERENCE

Date

DE-2026/17

27 March 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

EXHIBITION OF STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

CORRIMAL COKE WORKS - STAGE 2A - BUILT FORM

Development	State Significant Development - Corrimal Coke Works - Stage 2A - Built Form - Request to Provide Advice on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (SSD-83789711)
Location	Lot 101 DP 1301632 Lot 4 DP 1313981 Lot 3 DP 1313981 Lots 3 and 4 DP 1313981, Lot 101 DP 1301632 Railway Street, CORRIMAL NSW 2518

Thank you for providing Council with the opportunity to comment on the proposed development. Relevant staff have reviewed the EIS, plans and associated documents and the following comments are provided for the Department's consideration in the assessment of the application. Council welcomes the opportunity to provide further input throughout the assessment process including relevant conditions for any consent granted.

1. Background and Staging

I note that the EIS for Stages 2-4 Early Stage (Civil Works) has also recently been exhibited (SSD-86131212) and there have been several applications determined or under consideration for various parts of the broader former Cokeworks site, some of which also relate to the portion of the site to which this application pertains.

The works proposed in SSD-86131212 will need to be conducted prior to the works proposed in this SSD. I note Council will be making a separate submission in relation to that SSD. The bulk earthworks approved under DA-2023/823 will also need to be completed in full (including practical completion certificate) prior to the carrying out of works associated with either SSD-86131212 and SSD-83789711, inclusive of the remediation works and site validation required by that consent. It is recommended that the Department impose conditions requiring the completion of all works approved by DA-2023/823 and SSD-86131212 prior to the commencement of works associated with this development.

2. Planning

Clause 7.20 WLEP 2009/ Overshadowing of Central Park

- Clause 7.20 of the WLEP is a site-specific standard that provides that consent must not be granted to development that results in overshadowing to land mapped as the "Southern Park" between 11am and 2pm on 21 June. The EIS notes that Building 2.4 overshadows between 19.7% and 28.9% of the area mapped as the Southern Park with the prescribed timeframe. Council is strongly opposed

to this departure from Clause 7.20 and to the extent of overshadowing generally on the park as a result of the development. The unreasonable level of overshadowing impact on the Park will compromise the amenity of the park and its future users, and will impact Council's ongoing maintenance.

- The intent of the masterplan for the site was to provide multiple open spaces of various scales to create a high quality public domain and cater for a wide range of user needs.
- The proposed variation to Clause 7.20 of the Wollongong Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2009 is not adequately justified and is inconsistent with the objective of the clause.
- The applicant notes "The community garden will not provide a substantial contribution to the primary principles of the Southern Park to serve the day-to-day recreational needs of the public, nor will it serve as a trafficable or passive recreational area for the community." This argument is not sufficient to support a variation to the clause, as the functionality and useability of a community garden to grow food will be impacted by overshadowing. Overshadowing could also impact use of the park long term, should the proposed community garden transition to another form, such as an unprogrammed open space.
- The proposed variations to building height, FSR and Clause 7.20 should be considered holistically.
- The arrangement of the built form should be reconfigured to avoid overshadowing the mapped areas in accordance with Clause 7.20.

Parks and Open Space

- As noted within the EIS, the earlier Stage 2A Civil Works SSDA will deliver key elements of the public domain, including the Southern Park, Central Park and bicycle park. These will need to be embellished and available at the required times as specified within the endorsed Planning Agreement. It is recommended that construction of the parks be completed prior to the occupation of the buildings within Stage 2A to avoid ongoing construction impacts on the residents of the Stage 2A buildings, and to ensure access to public recreation space for those residents.

Waste Management

- Whilst Council is pleased to see that waste management will be managed within the sites of Buildings 2.2 and 2.3, it is noted that waste and other service vehicles utilising the loading zone will not be able to manoeuvre on site – thus necessitating a reverse manoeuvre either into or out of the site. The Department should consider potential impacts arising from this arrangement on vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Affordable Housing Contribution

- It is noted that the Planning Agreement in respect of the broader former Cokeworks site includes an obligation on the developer for an *Affordable Housing Contribution*, as per the terms set out in the Planning Agreement. The Planning Agreement specifies that the *Affordable Housing Contribution* means, "the sale of land to a registered community housing provider to allow delivery of a minimum of 35 affordable housing dwellings". This is to occur prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate for any residential flat building within Stage 2, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by Council.
- Stage 2A includes 57 affordable housing units. The EIS states that of these 57 units, 35 are required by the Planning Agreement. This is inconsistent with the Planning Agreement which requires the land (with notations on title etc.) to be transferred to a community housing provider for the provision of affordable housing. This inconsistency is noted for the Department's consideration.
- If consent is granted to the development, please ensure appropriate conditions are imposed requiring the affordable housing units to be managed by a registered community housing provider for the required timeframes specified in the Planning Agreement and s21 and s156(2)(b) of SEPP (Housing) 2021.

Planning Agreement, HPC and Development Contributions

- The required HPC should be calculated by the DPHI and appropriate conditions imposed on the consent if the SSDA is approved.

- There is an endorsed Planning Agreement (PA) in effect, which requires certain commitments to be met at certain stages of the development (see Schedule 3 of [getContent](#)). The PA requires the central village park works be completed prior to the release of an Occupation Certificate for any residential flat building in Stage 2 of the development. If consent is granted, please ensure that appropriate conditions are imposed in this regard.
- Additionally, the PA requires the sale of land to a registered community housing provider to allow the delivery of a minimum 35 affordable housing dwellings, prior to the release of an Occupation Certificate for any residential flat building in Stage 2 of the development.
- The Planning Agreement excludes the application of sections 7.11 and 7.12 to the “Development” as defined by the PA. Council considers that, where additional yield is assessed and approved by the DPHI, it lies outside the definition of “Development” in the Agreement, and thus a condition should be imposed requiring contributions under sec 7.12 to be paid to Council.

3. Design Matters

Street Address and Building Entries

- It is recommended that all services (hydrant boosters, substations, etc) be integrated and concealed within the built form where possible, or otherwise integrated into the landscaping treatment of the site.
- Ensure the proposed substations (in the north-western corner of Building 2.1 and Building 2.3) are not visually dominant across the streetscape and are well screened by surrounding landscaping. Ensure the location and orientation of the substation avoids the requirement for blast walls. This has not been demonstrated on the plans or reflected in any elevations and 3D views.
- The fire booster assembly (located at the front of Building 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4) appear visually prominent along the streetscape. Consider providing an enclosure for the assembly that compliments the built form and architectural elements across the facades, to ensure it is well screened from the streetscape and well-integrated in the overall landscape design.
- Council encourages the Department to ensure that all rooftop plant and equipment is concealed and/or integrated into the built form as far as is practicable.

Built Form and Materiality

- There appears to be a heavy reliance on painted and rendered finishes across the building facades, which is not supported from a sustainability and long-term maintenance perspective. In addition, the finishes indicated on the elevations are non-committal, with references such as “or similar”, which is not supported. Greater certainty should be provided regarding the proposed material palette. Preference is given to pre-finished materials that support durability, longevity and reduced ongoing maintenance. A clearer and more definitive specification of external finishes should be provided to ensure the delivery of a high-quality, robust and durable façade outcome to all buildings.
- The proposed roller shutters in each of the buildings are visually dominant along the main street frontages and read as large voids within the built form. Whilst these zones are required for vehicular access and loading, the visual appearance and finish of these doors/shutters should be more discrete and ensure they are well integrated with the surrounding built form, and avoid a generic, BOH, utilitarian appearance.
- The 11m setback of Building 2.2 from the eastern boundary with the rail corridor, should be examined in the context of the nominated view corridor within Chapter D19 of Wollongong DCP 2009, and with reference to acoustic and vibration impacts arising from the rail corridor.
- Each of the buildings has a distinct identity in terms of architectural façade expression and colour pallet which is commended.
- The roof form of Building 2.1 proposes something unique compared to the other buildings which is commended. The applicant however is encouraged to explore options to better integrate/conceal lift overrun and rooftop plant.

- Building 2.2 presents a positive and distinct response in terms of material selection and articulation, particularly along the northern façade, which helps differentiate it from the other buildings. Further refinement of the western, southern and eastern facades is encouraged to reduce the visual impact of the currently proposed monochromatic treatment along a substantial portion of the building. Greater incorporation of the brick finish across these elevations may assist in breaking down the building mass and reducing the reliance on white and black cladding. Opportunities may exist to extend the brick materiality to the south-western corner of the building across the first 4 levels and wrap this treatment around the corner. This approach may introduce a more asymmetrical and articulated outcome, similar to the more successful expression achieved along the northern façade.
- Buildings 2.3 and 2.4 present as large homogenous built forms with limited articulation along the eastern and western facades and little variation in roof form and overall composition. The buildings maintain a relatively consistent footprint across all 6 levels, with no meaningful recesses or modulation to break down the perceived bulk or create a recessive top to the building. Consideration should be given to introducing greater articulation at the upper levels in some areas to reduce the visual bulk and improve the overall built form response. For example, the upper 2 levels of the northern portion of Building 2.3 could be recessed (with a material/colour change) to create a more articulated built form (similar to that provided on Building 2.2) establishing a clearer proportion of a 4 storey base with recessed upper levels and allowing the building to better relate to the scale and height proportions of adjacent Buildings 2.1 and 2.2. A similar approach could also be explored for the southern portion of Building 2.4, where a recessive upper level may provide a more sympathetic transition to the open parkland and gardens to the south, particularly given the prominence and exposure of this façade.
- Explore opportunities for further articulation of the western elevation of Buildings 2.3 and 2.4. This may include shifting the central dual orientation apartments further east and create a building recess along the western façade. A recess of at least 1m is recommended to achieve a meaningful visual outcome. Further material, colour, and/or balustrade modifications may also assist in differentiating the central element and reinforcing its recessive appearance. It should be noted that the lowering of the central roof form over these units does assist in reinforcing this visual recursiveness.
- AC condensers on roofs should be collocated with lift overruns and other services and consider an integrated built form response. They must be well screened from the public domain and considered in the overall built form and roof design. An arbitrarily shaped screened plant enclosure on top of a flat roof (as currently proposed) is not considered to be an adequate design response and should be reconsidered.

Amenity

- 3.2m floor to floor dimensions have generally been provided across all residential levels which is accepted.
- In Building 2.1, more than 8 units have been provided off a single circulation core which does not comply (Objective 4F-1 of the ADG). Up to 12 units off a single core could be accepted however the applicant is encouraged to consider creating some more generously sized, well lit, naturally ventilated, flexible circulation zones that can enhance opportunities for socialisation between residents.
- All lobbies and common circulation corridors appear to be provided with operable windows to promote natural light and ventilation which is commended.
- A small, dedicated waste room on each residential level should be provided in lieu of a series of individual cupboards off the main corridor. This room should be large enough to accommodate space for a recycling bin, FOGO receptacle, problem waste receptacle and access to the garbage chute and must be well-ventilated.
- Some units (eg. Unit 2.1G02) provide living area widths less than ADG minimum requirements. This is to be reviewed across all buildings and adjusted accordingly where required.
- Several units include bedroom and/or bathroom doors directly off living/dining areas. Internal modifications are suggested to ensure compliance with Objective 4D-3 of the ADG (*Design*

Guidance: Access to bedrooms, bathrooms and laundries is separated from living areas minimising direct openings between living and service areas).

- Study areas have been included in a number of units which is to be commended.
- Ground floor units must provide larger POS areas with a min area of 15sqm and min depth of 3m (Objective 4E-1 of the ADG). This has not been demonstrated.
- 20% of units in each building are required to be livable (which have not been clearly demonstrated or identified on the plans).
- A minimum of 10% of units in each building are required to be adaptable, noting all buildings meet this requirement apart from Building 2.1 which provides 3 out of 31 as opposed to the required 4. All unit layouts do not rely on major internal wall or plumbing changes between pre and post adaption which is to be commended, with the exception of Building 2.2 which shows some relocation of plumbing and fixtures required in bathrooms (however the same bathroom layout between pre and post appears achievable and should be adjusted accordingly).
- Several west facing units in Building 2.1, and all of the central dual orientation apartments in Buildings 2.3 and 2.4, are claimed as achieving 2hours of solar access by the applicant, but views from the sun demonstrate that this is incorrect due to self-shading of living areas occurring from west facing balcony shapes, depths and articulation. This non-compliance should be remedied.

Parking & Loading/Waste

- No separation has been provided between visitor and residential parking areas (possible security issue).
- Secure residential bicycle parking is to be included for all buildings and noted on drawings (ideally in basement carpark). See further comments below under the 'Traffic & Transport Planning' heading.

Landscape – Including Communal Open Space (COS)

BUILDING 2.1:

- The arbour structures provided at the gated entrance between ground floor COS and adjacent central park is supported as it improves wayfinding.
- The inclusion of informal workout spaces on the Ground floor COS directly adjacent to POS areas is questioned given the proximity to one another and potential for amenity of POS areas to be compromised. More quiet /passive functions may be more appropriate in this location.
- Level 3 northern rooftop COS has no clear function and is presented as a circular pathway around an island planter. More meaningful program is recommended in this location that differs to the COS offering elsewhere.

BUILDING 2.2:

- There is limited program/offering to ground floor COS consisting of lawn and planting only. Consider other uses that could improve/encourage social interaction between residents such as fixed tables/seating, a BBQ area or a small vegetable /herb garden. Communal clothes drying areas can also offer opportunity for social engagement.

BUILDING 2.3 & 2.4:

- The combination and distribution of COS offering at ground floor is commended and provides both buildings with good secure access to all facilities.
- The arbour structure proposed between the 2 buildings as an option for secure convenient access for residence is supported (improves pedestrian circulation and wayfinding).

4. Heritage Matters

- Council is concerned that the development is inconsistent with the objectives and provisions of Chapter D19 – Former Corrimal Coke Works Site of Wollongong DCP 2009, particularly those which

seeks to ensure that future development of the site is undertaken in a manner that is sympathetic to the heritage character of the site.

- The proposed development site is noted as including areas that form part of the Heritage Curtilage of the State Heritage Register listed Corrimall Coke Works, which is also listed as an item within the Wollongong Local Environmental Plan.
- The proposed development has an extensive background of Heritage considerations and assessment that have informed the previous Planning Proposal and Master planning processes.
- The site is subject to a complex set of "Site Specific Exemptions" under the NSW Heritage Act 1977 that are tightly linked to commitments around the delivery of the Conservation Management Strategy for the site, as well as the Heritage Interpretation Plan. These exemptions rely on compliance with the existing approved master plan and do not cover variations.
- It is essential that the past commitments of the proponent/site owner in relation to the delivery of agreed Heritage Conservation and Heritage Interpretation Outcomes are enforced and delivered through the increasingly complex staged approval and delivery program and it is noted that the proponent has already sought variation of these previous agreements through separate development applications for the site including a current assessment process to reduce the commitments to restore the onsite Coke Ovens.
- The views of the NSW Heritage Council should be sought and considered in relation to this proposal and the issues raised above and below.
- In regard to the proposed Stage 2A Built form proposal, it is noted that the proposed deviations to the LEP height limits across the site are substantial and rely on a range of SEPP allowances and variations in order to propose development heights well above the LEP height limit of 15m (for the majority of the site).
- The LEP height limits were carefully defined, in consultation with the community, and with strong consideration to the heritage significance and context of the site, and in particular to issues relating to the visual presence and prominence of the Brick Stack, and the steel chimney which represent significant local landmarks that continue to identify and interpret the historic significance of the Coke Works operations on the site.
- The visual presence of these historic, state heritage listed, built forms within the surrounding area should be regarded as a key issue in the assessment of the application.
- It is noted that the VIA provided within Appendix E of the Urban Design Report does not provide photo-realistic visuals of the proposed development, and fails to clearly articulate which of the forms shown correspond with the proposed development being considered under this application. This makes assessment of the actual visual impact based on this limited assessment difficult.
- In regard to heritage impacts, strong consideration should be given to the likely and potential impacts of the proposed built form on the key heritage views identified for the site and in particular the view along the main access road to the subdivision, which was deliberately aligned to highlight the Brick Chimney as a central visual feature. The VIA presents one visual showing this view, however this is located only on the southern side of the entry road and does not clearly distinguish the built form that is proposed under this application.
- It is recommended that a revised VIA be requested that seeks photorealistic montages that clearly indicate the visual impact of the proposed development, and which shows the view along the main access road from both the eastern and western footpaths.
- The proposed development should aim to maintain the Brick Chimney Stack as a central, standalone feature, with sufficient 'breathing space' from any backdrop of built form, to allow it to retain its central and significant prominence within the site.
- The proposed height of Building 2.2 in particular presents significant heritage concerns. It is noted that this building is proposed with a height well above the LEP height limit of 15m, and that it is the development envelope situated closest to the major visual heritage feature on the site (being the brick stack and powerhouse).

- Building 2.2 relies not only on the affordable housing SEPP to suggest a varied maximum building height of 22m, but seeks a further variation to this control to allow for additional height exceedances. Whilst the Affordable Housing SEPP is noted and acknowledged as an important policy to encourage Affordable Housing outcomes, it remains necessary and appropriate to consider this proposed height variation in the context of the surrounding site constraints, and past commitments provided through the recent and substantial site considerations made as part of the Planning Proposal process.
- Council maintains significant concerns that the proposed height of Building 2.2, and the additional variation sought, must be assessed with consideration to their location within the curtilage of, and within the immediate visual context of the State Heritage Listed Cokeworks and its key visual component, the brick chimney stack, and that the retention of this important State Heritage feature as the most prominent and key visual feature must be retained.
- The existing VIA and documentation within the Heritage Impact Statement does not, in Council's opinion, adequately address these concerns. It is recommended that the height of Building 2.2 be reconsidered to provide a LEP complaint height limit within the State Heritage Curtilage, consistent with the carefully considered Urban Design Strategy that supported the Planning Proposal that led to these height limits, and that other areas of the site more removed from the heritage features (and outside the Heritage Curtilage) be considered more appropriate for these height variations.
- We also note that Building 2.3 also proposed similar height variations that extend into the Heritage Listed Curtilage and should also be carefully considered, though these are noted as being more remote from the Heritage features and potentially of less concern.
- The placement of built form well in excess of the defined LEP height controls, within the Heritage Curtilage of the State Heritage Site, and impacting on the visual fields of this item from surrounding areas remains of concern.

5. Traffic & Transport Planning

- It is noted that the proposed development is for Stage 2a of the Former Coke Works Site which seeks consent for the construction of 4 residential flat buildings, providing a total of 206 residential apartments (including 57 x affordable housing units).
- The previous stage which required the construction of the Railway Street/Harbinger Street/Site Access roundabout and internal bus loop was Court-approved and is currently under construction.
- In terms of traffic network impacts, a cumulative traffic assessment modelling for the 850-unit development proposal for the entire site demonstrated that the roundabout at Railway Street/Harbinger Street/Site Access will operate effectively to at least 2036.
- A Level Crossing (ALCAM) Assessment has been carried out by the applicant's traffic engineer which will require consideration by Sydney Trains and TfNSW.
- The proposed road cross sections must be provided strictly in accordance with Chapter D19 - Former Corrimal Coke Works Site of Wollongong DCP 2009
- Car parking must be provided in accordance with the specified rates in Wollongong DCP 2009. It is noted that the development is located within 400 metres of Corrimal Rail Station which allows the use of lower car parking rates cited in the DCP. While not mandatory, these rates are preferred for the development given the accessible location, being near to a railway station, existing and proposed cycling links, and good bus links to Wollongong and the surrounding area.
- It is noted that the City Centre car parking rates (Chapter E3 of the DCP) are proposed for Building 2.1, the Housing SEPP is utilised for the car parking proposed for Building 2.2 as these dwellings are to be affordable, and Buildings 2.3 and 2.4 have car parking proposed in accordance with the rates specified in DCP Chapter D19. There are no objections to the above car parking rates being used.
- It is noted that motorcycle and bicycle parking has been proposed as per Council's DCP.

- Residential bicycle parking needs to be provided in secure cages with self-closing doors and combination keypads as per AS2890.3. Open rails without an enclosure would not comply with AS2890.3 for secure residential bicycle parking. There are concerns that the areas proposed for bicycle parking do not consider the manoeuvring requirements of cyclists getting their bicycles in and out of these enclosures. If these areas are within a cage (as required by the relevant standards), there could be issues negotiating obstructions such as other bicycles that may be locked to the rails etc. The cage walls and doors need to be shown on the plans which are an important aspect of a workable cycle cage design, with manoeuvring to be assessed by the Department of Planning assessment team.
- Visitor bicycle parking needs to be provided in accessible areas of the site (easily identified and outside of secure areas), with adequate weather protection if located outdoors.
- A series of swept path diagrams have been provided which show that vehicles are able to pass on the car park ramps. The assessment also shows the swept paths of waste vehicles making one reverse movement in or out of the loading dock as per the requirements of AS2890.2 for a minor local road. This on-street manoeuvring arrangement has also been accepted on the Court-approved development accessed from the heritage plaza bus loop.
- It will be important to ensure that the service vehicle access design is assessed to ensure that any waste vehicle driveway width and wings can accommodate the design vehicle (wholly within the extent of the driveways) so that damage to the kerb does not occur during the waste servicing of the proposed buildings. This must be demonstrated with swept paths.

6. Geotechnical Issues

- It is noted that the proposal includes excavation for the provision of basement car parking. The bulk earthworks undertaken to prepare the site for development were approved under DA-2023/823 with geotechnical conditions to address the management of coal-related products within the fill. A works-as-executed geotechnical report is required at the completion of the bulk earthworks. This report is to include confirmation that any coal related products contained within the controlled fill complies with Clause 4.4 of Chapter E19 of the Wollongong DCP.
- Excavations for the basement construction for this development may encounter coal related products blended with inert soil. Excavated material containing coal related products is not to be used as backfill for the retaining structures unless the geotechnical consultant can demonstrate its compliance with the above DCP clause. Douglas Partners have confirmed in their letter dated 3 October 2025 that, from a geotechnical perspective, this work is technically feasible with supplementary geotechnical advice to address the additional earthworks, excavation support and dewatering.
- The following conditions are recommended with regard to geotechnical matters:
 1. An earthworks plan is to be developed by a geotechnical consultant prior to start of earthworks.
 2. All excavations need to be supported during and after construction to maintain the quality of any encountered controlled fill.
 3. Should any coal related product excavated from within existing fill be considered as backfill, a treatment plan is required specifying its placement such that it complies with Council's Policy for the Use of Coal Washery Reject in Development as detailed in Chapter E19 Clause 4.4 of the Wollongong DCP.
 4. The earthworks plan may require modification considering any subsequent geotechnical reports commissioned to address unforeseen geotechnical conditions encountered during the site preparation works.
 5. Due to the sensitivity of the site to changing geotechnical conditions, all earthworks and retaining wall construction must be undertaken geotechnical supervision.
 6. At the completion of site preparation earthworks, the geotechnical consultant is to prepare a works-as-executed report detailing encountered geotechnical conditions and how the remedial

works addressed these conditions so that the residual geotechnical constraints can be accommodated within the structural designs for the development.

7. The structural designs are to be confirmed or amended by the structural engineer based on the works-as-executed geotechnical report.
8. All excavations for foundations are to be inspected by the geotechnical consultant and certified that the ground has been suitably prepared for the placement of footings.

7. Groundwater

- It is noted that the proposal includes drained basements.
- A detailed dewatering plan for the operational (post-construction) phase is required that addresses the impact of ongoing dewatering on Council's hard infrastructure (stormwater drainage network etc); adjacent and nearby waterways; dry and wet weather flooding and stormwater capacity; and long term sustainability.
- Without this information, Council cannot undertake an informed assessment of the suitability of the proposed drained basements.
- It is noted that the development approved by DA-2024/550 relating to Stage 1 requires tanked basements.
- The provision of drained basements will require Council approval to accept the waters on to Council infrastructure and land. Council does not have to accept the waters from dewatering if it burdens Council and the community.
- Please note that this request is separate to and distinct from any approvals required by Water NSW under the Water Management 2000.

8. Landscaping

- Site landscaping must be fully integrated with the stormwater management and drainage controls to ensure that the location and design of on-site stormwater detention systems do not conflict with proposed landscaping areas or their intended function. Planting must therefore be carefully coordinated with the placement of stormwater pits, pipes and associated infrastructure to avoid future conflicts and ensure long-term landscape viability.
- The proposal incorporates tree planting within podium-level landscaped areas, which do not constitute deep soil under NSW planning controls, as deep soil is defined as an area free of structures above and below ground and explicitly excludes planted areas over basements, podiums, roofs or slabs.
- Accordingly, the development must ensure adequate soil volume is provided for podium trees through engineered growing media. Contemporary standards indicate that small trees (4–8 m mature height) require a minimum footprint of approximately 3 m × 3 m (9 m²) and medium trees (8–12 m mature height) require approximately 6 m × 6 m (36 m²), supported by structural soils or structural cells to enable root penetration across podium structures, along with soil depths of at least 1.0 m for small trees and 1.0–1.5 m for medium trees to maintain plant health and canopy development in constrained growing environments. To ensure successful landscape outcomes, the development must demonstrate compliance with these soil volume, depth, drainage, irrigation, and waterproofing requirements to support long-term tree establishment and meaningful canopy contribution.
- In addition, careful species selection is required to avoid attracting flying foxes into residential areas. This includes avoiding fruit-bearing or fleshy-fruited rainforest species such as *Ficus*, *Syzygium* and *Livistona*, which may otherwise draw flying foxes into communal open spaces, potentially leading to amenity, health, and management issues for residents
- The Landscape Plans should cross-reference Arborist report and requirements for tree protection.

- It is also recommended that the Arborist provide an addendum to the original report to review the proposal in consideration of the current design noting that the report was prepared in September 2023.

9. Stormwater Management

The proposal has been considered by Council's Stormwater Engineers with regard to the provisions of Chapter E14 (Stormwater Management) of Wollongong WDCP 2009. Should the application be approved, it is recommended that the following conditions be applied:-

- The stormwater drainage network for the Stage 2a built form is being directed into the proposed stormwater drainage system within the subdivision's proposed road network, as shown on the Maker Engineering plans title Corrimal Coke Works Development – Civil Works Layout Plan (drawing MKR00452-16-C0101, Revision 6). Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate the following must be provided to the Principal Certifying Authority.
- "Work – as – Executed" plans and certification from a registered surveyor must be provided, detailing the construction location of the drainage network within the site. The "Work – as – Executed" plans must also confirm that the stormwater drainage network from the proposed building can be drained to an approved connection point.
- The capacity of the stormwater system receiving runoff from the development must be assessed in accordance with Chapter E14 (Stormwater Management) – Section 6.3. If any component the stormwater system is found to have insufficient capacity, that component must be upgraded or amplified to accommodate the additional flow. Calculations must also demonstrate that any flowpaths in excess of the minor system capacity are capable of safely conveying those flows without posing a risk to life or property. All overland flow paths must accommodate major system flows up to and including the 1% AEP storm event.
- Certification from a suitably qualified civil engineer is required to confirm that all stormwater drainage works have been designed in accordance with the Chapter's E13 and E14 of the Wollongong DCP 2009. These plans and accompanying certification must demonstrate compliance with all stormwater requirements outline in Chapter E13 and E14 of the Wollongong DCP 2009.

10. Sustainability

- The applicable provisions of SEPP (Sustainable Buildings) should be considered in the assessment.
- The development is encouraged to be 'all-electric', with gas not connected to the development.
- Solar PV is strongly encouraged to facilitate equitable energy access and reduce costs for future residents.
- Council suggests the inclusion of ceiling fans in all bedrooms and living areas of the residential apartments in order to improve sustainable performance, improve ventilation and reduce heating and cooling costs for future residents.
- Urban heat management should be addressed by the design.
- Rainwater reuse should be incorporated where possible.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please contact Theresa Whittaker on (02) 4227 7111.

This letter is authorised by

Pier Panozzo
 Manager City Centre & Major Development
 Wollongong City Council
 Telephone (02) 4227 7111