

818 Pacific Highway, Gordon NSW 2072
Locked Bag 1006 Gordon NSW 2072
T 02 9424 0000 F 02 9424 0001
DX 8703 Gordon TTY 133 677
E krg@krg.nsw.gov.au
W www.krg.nsw.gov.au
ABN 86 408 856 411



Contact: Peggy Wong

Ref: SSD-98363228
S15235
12 August 2026

Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124

Via: NSW Major Projects portal

Attention: Liz James

Dear Ms James,

RE: SUBMISSION TO SSD-98363228, SENIORS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
Address: 19-25 College Crescent and 9-15 Link Road, St Ives

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on State Significant Development (SSD) application (SSD-98363228) for demolition of existing structures, construction of a seniors housing development consisting of 4 buildings ranging between 5 to 8 storeys comprising of 126 independent living units and 48 bed residential care facility, ancillary amenities including a club lounge, swimming pool, gym, café and allied health services, two levels of basement care parking for 260 car spaces, tree removal and vehicular access from College Crescent and Link Road at 19-25 College Crescent and 9-15 Link Road, St Ives.

This submission should be considered as an **objection** to the proposal.

Attachment 1 provides a detailed explanation of the grounds for Council's objection. In summary, the key issues include:

- i. Pedestrian entry and access
- ii. Use of ground floor commercial tenancies
- iii. Residential amenity
- iv. Traffic impacts
- v. Bushfire risk
- vi. Landscaping
- vii. Biodiversity impact
- viii. Waste management
- ix. Acoustic assessment
- x. Water management
- xi. Geotechnical investigation
- xii. Insufficient information

It is requested that the Applicant's Response to Submissions (RtS) is forwarded to Council for review prior to a determination being made. Council will be able to provide recommended conditions of consent following review of the RtS, unless there are substantial unresolved issues.

Subject to satisfactory resolution of the issues raised in this submission, Council may withdraw its objection to the proposal.

Should you have any further enquiries, please contact Peggy Wong, Executive Assessment Officer on 02 9424 0999.

Yours sincerely,

Selwyn Segall
Team Leader, Development Assessment

ATTACHMENT 1

Ku-ring-gai Council's objection to SSD-78775458, Residential Flat Building with In-fill Affordable Housing at 3-9 Park Avenue, Gordon

A. PEDESTRIAN ENTRY AND ACCESS

It is noted that pedestrian entries and access are provided via stairs and ramps from College Crescent to the entry of Building C and the centrally located landscaped communal open space between Buildings A, B, C and D. However, further design consideration should be investigated to demonstrate additional or alternative pedestrian ramps that will enhance legibility and accessibility from College Crescent to the buildings.

While there is a clear physical connection and sightlines that identifies pedestrian access between the lobbies of Buildings C and D, the proposal should demonstrate that convenient pedestrian movement whilst maintaining suitable building security. Similarly, pedestrian approaches to Buildings A and D from College Crescent could be made more intuitive through improved pathway alignment and landscape design.

B. USE OF GROUND FLOOR COMMERCIAL TENANCIES

The proposal includes ground floor tenancies at the south-eastern corner of Building C nominated as a beauty business and tenancies on the ground floor of Buildings A and B consisting of a physiotherapist and gym, a residential care facility shop, office areas and communal facilities such as the club lounge and cinema. Given the ground floor non residential areas are proposed to be occupied by uses that are ancillary to the residential care facility, the proposed uses are permissible under the SEPP (Housing) 2021 (Housing SEPP). However, Council would not support use of the ground floor areas for commercial or retail uses that are not categorised as ancillary to the residential care facility and recommend that, should the proposal be granted approval, a condition be imposed restricting the use of the ground floor of the buildings for ancillary uses to the residential care facility.

C. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Common corridor design

Open ended corridors within buildings are commended as the provision of natural light, ventilation and outlook will enhance residential amenity, assist with wayfinding and reduce reliance on artificial lighting. It is recommended that glazed smoke doors are incorporated into the design to achieve required fire compartmentation whilst maintaining sightlines and visual openness within communal circulation spaces.

Cross ventilation

Additional information is required to be submitted to clarify which of the plenum options identified to enable centrally located apartments to achieve cross ventilation will achieve the best performance and which option is likely to be selected for the proposed development. Whilst alternative solutions to maximise cross ventilation of apartments is supported in principle, further details to enable a proper assessment and consideration of potential implications such as impacts on proposed floor to ceiling heights within apartments or communal areas are required.

Further information should also be provided regarding the required operational measures of plenums, the long-term effectiveness and maintenance compared with an apartment that does not need to rely on such a solution.

It is recommended that further design investigations be undertaken to maximise natural cross-ventilation through building design (including naturally ventilating lift lobbies and common areas) to reduce reliance on mechanical or hybrid ventilation solutions.

Communal open space

The proposed communal terraces on Levels 1 and 7 in Building A for the use of (ILU residents) are extensively overshadowed between 9am and 3pm in midwinter and do not achieve a minimum of 2 hours of direct sunlight to the seating areas and will not contribute to good amenity. Whilst the terraces are not identified as a principle communal open space in Drawing No. DA-602, the seating and bbq areas on Levels 1 and 7 provide opportunities for a range of uses and privacy that differ from the 'Village Heart' and 'Village Green' open spaces. As such, it is recommended that the location and design of the communal terraces in Building A are reviewed and amended to optimise direct solar access and amenity for future occupants to demonstrate compliance with objectives and design guidance in Objectives 3D-1 and 3D-2 of the ADG.

Overshadowing of adjoining properties

The submitted shadow diagrams indicate that Buildings A and B will result in additional overshadowing of buildings and open spaces at the Chabad North Shore site immediately to the south between 9am and 3pm at midwinter. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the extent of potential overshadowing to existing buildings and open spaces of the adjoining property and consideration of any amendments to the proposed building envelope (ie. building height and setbacks) that could mitigate unreasonable amenity impacts on occupants of the adjoining property.

D. TRAFFIC IMPACTS

Whilst Council accepts the traffic generation rates and operational assessment of the proposed development, concern is raised that residents of independent living units (ILUs) may become "complacent" and rely solely on the College Crescent access to enter the basement car park. To minimise the potential for this to occur, Council recommends that the proponent is required to develop mechanisms and strategies to encourage residents of independent living units to access the basement car park via Link Rd as far as practicable.

The proposed residential parking provision meets the requirements of the Housing SEPP and the Kuring-gai DCP however, there is an overprovision of ILU car parking as well as RACF staff and visitor car parking. Council considers that there are opportunities to reduce the number of car parking spaces and footprint of the basement.

Access point – Link Road

The proposed vehicular access point from Link Road is intended to be used by residents and servicing of the ILUs, and provides access to the drop-off/pick up area, which can be used by ILU residents, their visitors and the on-site minibuses. Access is proposed to be restricted to left-in/left out movements, and swept oaths indicate suitable access by passenger vehicles, minibus and medium rigid trucks and the occasional fire appliance. As waste collection is intended to be undertaken by Council's large waste collection vehicle, swept paths would need to be provided demonstrating satisfactory access by up to a 12.5m long large rigid truck.

Compliance with the left-in/left out arrangement is unlikely under the proposed configuration, which would need to be reviewed in light of Transport for NSW comments, which recommended a central raised concrete median island be installed on Link Road, subject to a compliant median being able to be accommodated. This would require modification to the kerb and footpath on the eastern side of Link Road, and potentially the property boundary. If a central median cannot be accommodated in Link Road at the access point, consideration should be given to a splayed access point with splitter island, and accompanying regulatory signage advising of no right turn into the site, and no right turn out/left out only from the site.

Access Point - College Crescent

The southern College Crescent access point provides vehicular access to the residential aged care facilities and allied health facilities including visitor car parking, minibus parking space and ambulance bay. Swept paths show satisfactory access for vehicles up to the size of the dedicated minibus. To maintain accessibility, a 16m length of 'No Stopping' restrictions (affecting approximately unrestricted 3 kerbside parking spaces) have been recommended by the proponent on the frontage of the site.

The northern access point provides an additional access point for the ILU car park. Swept paths show satisfactory access for the 99% passenger vehicle, and a 12m length of 'No Stopping' restrictions (affecting approximately unrestricted 2 kerbside parking spaces) have also been recommended by the proponent on the frontage of the site to maintain accessibility.

Please note that any requests for changes to parking restrictions on College Crescent to accommodate the development would need to be referred to the Ku-ring-gai Local Transport Forum and approved by Council.

Public Transport Accessibility

In accordance with the requirements of the Housing SEPP, bus stops should be located at a distance of not more than 400m from the site. The walking distance to the bus stop on Link Road opposite the site is greater than 400m as a person is required to walk to the traffic signals at the intersection with Mona Vale Road to safely cross Link Road.

While bus stops in Yarrabung Road (after College Crescent and at Catherine Street) would be located within 400m walking distance of the site, there is currently no footpath in College Crescent connecting to these bus stops, and no safe crossing facilities of Yarrabung Road to access the bus stop at Catherine Street. Footpath connections, safe crossing facilities and accessible boarding points should be provided by the proponent to facilitate access to public transport. Details of proposed new footpaths and safe crossing facilities should be submitted as part of the application to enable Council to review and provide comment.

Electric Vehicles (EVs)

The Transport Impact Assessment report notes that three shared spaces for EV charging have been included for ILU residents in the Basement 1 – North level. While this may cater for short term electric vehicle charging demands, EV readiness is required to be provided for all ILU car parking spaces within the development, with design and construction (provision for conduits, switchboards, electrical capacity etc) to enable installation of electric vehicle charging points that are linked to each individual dwelling electricity meter.

Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities

The TIA notes there is no requirement under the Housing SEPP or the KDCP to provide bicycle parking and end of trip facilities but identifies open space communal areas on-site as possible locations to add bicycle racks to accommodate any future demand. Council raises no objection to the proposed provision of bicycle parking within communal open space areas.

The provision of a staff bicycle store room and end of trip facilities on Basement 1 – South is supported in principle, however amendments are required to ensure the bicycle storeroom and amenities are located adjacent or in close proximity to ensure convenience for cyclists.

E. BUSHFIRE RISK

Council acknowledges that the subject site is not identified as bushfire prone land however it is the vicinity of Bedes Forest (approximately 16m to the south-east of the site) and Digley Dell Conservation Park (approximately 126.5m to the south-east of the site), and are identified as a bushfire buffer and Vegetation Category 1 lands, respectively.

Whilst section 96 of the SEPP (Housing) 2021 is not strictly applicable to the site and the development does not trigger a Bushfire Assessment, Council raises concerns that the proposed development which is identified as a Special Fire Protection Purpose development (SFPP development) under Part 6 of the Planning for Bushfire Protection – 2019, would be impacted by bushfire risk as the south-eastern corner of the site is mapped as being affected by radiant heat impacts in Council's RedEye bushfire scenario modelling (see **Figure 1** below).



Figure 1: Council's RedEye bushfire scenario modelling indicating radiant heat impacts at the south-eastern corner of the site

Specifically, concern is raised that the south-eastern portion of the Building B footprint would be subject to radiant heat impacts of up to 18KW/sqm which exceeds the maximum allowable radiant heat impact of 10KW/sqm for seniors housing developments and will be subject to risks of significant ember attacks. Given that the proposed development consists of independent living units in multi-storey buildings and residential care facilities, occupants are likely to be more vulnerable to bushfire impacts and detailed consideration of suitable building design, construction and management of any potential evacuation of occupants should form part of the application to demonstrate that adequate provisions have been incorporated into the design and operations to ensure safety of occupants.

F. LANDSCAPING

Basix Certificate

The submitted BASIX Certificate is inconsistent with the landscape plans and is required to be amended to address matters as follows:

- i. The BASIX Certificate nominates no private lawn or garden areas for individual units which is inconsistent with the architectural and landscape plans which include planters to units on Levels 1-7 that are only accessible from the units and contribute to their private amenity. As planters are not defined as common landscape under BASIX, these areas are to be nominated as private landscape areas.
- ii. The BASIX Certificate does not include details of common taps required for the irrigation of common landscape areas, bin/waste rooms and car wash bay.
- iii. The BASIX Certificate does not accurately reflect the proposed water usage of the development.

Deep Soil Area

The proposed deep soil area is nominated as 3,435m² (24% of the site area) and has been incorrectly calculated as areas with dimensions of less than 3m and areas covered by structures have been included as deep soil and is inconsistent with the definition for deep soil area under the Housing SEPP.

Council has calculated the proposed deep soil area, as per the definition in the Housing SEPP, to be approximately 2,881m² (19.9%). The deep soil area calculations are required to be revised to ensure compliance with the definition for deep soil area and demonstrate compliance with Section 107 and 108 in Part 5 of the Housing SEPP.

In addition, Council identifies that the proposed deep soil for the site is inconsistent with the requirements for deep soil in Part 6.1 of the Greener Neighbourhood Guide (July 2026) which requires 25% deep soil to be provided, equating to an area of 3624.25m², or Part 7A.6 of the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan for a minimum deep soil area equating to 50% of the site (7248.5m²) with minimum dimensions of 2m.

Tree removal and impacts

The proposed removal of Tree Nos. T198, T197, T200 and T206 is not supported as tree retention is achievable as follows:

- i. Tree No. T197 is not impacted by the proposed works and can be retained.
- ii. Tree No. T198 can be retained by locating proposed driveway equally between Tree No. 199 with a NRZ 7.6m and Tree No. T198 with a NRZ 7.2m.
- iii. Tree No. T200 is located between the road (College Crescent) and proposed footpath. The entry path to the site can be retained without impact to the tree. A path from the footpath to the road kerb is not required in this location as it is not a drop off point and should be deleted from the plans to enable retention of the tree. The ramped access to the north of the entry is clear of trees to allow for a kerb ramp opposite the ramp. The proposed path is 3m wide and could be reduced in width if required to provide a path directly opposite to kerb.
- iv. Tree No. T206 can be retained. Removal is proposed to access proposed substation and for substation trenching. The proposed Substation can be relocated where it will have no or minimal impact to existing trees.

General Landscape Design Issues

Council has identified additional and/or amended details that are required to be incorporated into amended architectural and landscape plans to address the following:

- i. Retaining walls indicated in Landscape plans are to be reflected in the architectural plans to ensure all details on plans are consistent.
- ii. Indicate north points on all landscape plans.
- iii. Existing tree are to be numbered on plans in accordance with Arborist report.
- iv. The basement is not contained under the footprint of the building to the western side and the treatment of the landscape as it crosses over the basement has not been fully resolved.
- v. The planting over the basement to the northern, eastern and western central communal open spaces is to be resolved by providing planter walls and resolve levels where planting areas cross from deep soil to over basement. Amended plans are required to show finished floor level and top of wall levels that demonstrate adequate soil depth can be provided.
- vi. Top of wall levels to the proposed retaining walls are to be provided on plans to allow for full assessment of impacts to streetscape.
- vii. Additional levels are to be provided to the eastern central ramp and stairs to enable a proper assessment.
- viii. Top of wall levels are to be provided to all planters over basement and to Levels 1-7. Planter depths are to be provided to ensure soil depths are suitable for the proposed planting and are in accordance with 4P of the ADG and Part 23.5 of the DCP.
- ix. Planters over basement are to have walls against proposed buildings to ensure soil is not against walls of buildings and to have return walling where over basement, as some planters are open ended.
- x. Clearly indicate line of basement on landscape plans.
- xi. Several planters to Level 1-7 are not accessible for maintenance and should be considered for removal. Only provide planters that can be maintained for long term viability of planting.
- xii. OSD and stormwater to be indicated on all plans and proposed landscape works integrated with stormwater.
- xiii. Existing levels are to be maintained within 2m of the boundaries in accordance with Part 21.1 of the DCP. Ensure proposed retaining walls are setback from boundaries.
- xiv. Provide minimum 2-4 additional native trees to southeastern corner.
- xv. Location of the proposed trees are to be setback a minimum of 3m from dwellings and located clear of structures and services. Some of the trees to the western setback are within 1-2m of buildings.

G. BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS

The BDAR acknowledges that the subject land contains a combination of remnant, naturally regenerated, self-sown, planted native and exotic vegetation. The information relied upon by the BDAR also identifies the Link Road frontage as containing a mixture of remnant endemic trees, naturally regenerated and self-sown endemic trees and planted endemic trees.

The principal development area consists predominantly of a cleared and maintained playing field. Established vegetation occurs along the western boundary and Link Road frontage, between the Masada College buildings and the playing field, along College Crescent and along the southern boundary adjoining Chabad North Shore.

The Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) is not supported in its current form and additional and/or revised information is required to enable a proper ecological assessment. The following matters and additional information are required to be provided:

- i. The BDAR has applied the Appendix D planted native vegetation module. However, it has not clearly and comprehensively distinguished the planted vegetation from the remnant and naturally regenerated native vegetation across the subject land.
- ii. Table 3 of the BDAR contains inconsistencies between the stated total number of trees and the number identified as remnant, planted, self-sown or unknown. For example, the total number of *Syncarpia glomulifera* does not reconcile with the listed origin categories. The vegetation data should be corrected and reconciled with the supporting source information relied upon by the BDAR. The absence of consistent tree-origin data further limits the ability to determine whether the Appendix D module has been correctly applied.
- iii. The percentage of native vegetation cover identified in the BDAR states that there is 28.2% vegetation cover however calculation based on the figures provided result in approximately 25.2% vegetation cover. This inconsistency is required to be corrected.
- iv. The BDAR contains inconsistent statements regarding prescribed and indirect impacts particularly as the BDAR identifies potential prescribed impacts associated with human-made structures, non-native vegetation, habitat connectivity, vehicle strike and increased traffic then later in the report, it is stated that no prescribed impacts are anticipated. The contradictory statements are not acceptable.
- v. The assessment should more clearly address lighting, bird collision risk from glazing, changes to fauna movement, excavation and dewatering, changes to surface and subsurface drainage, soil compaction, overshadowing, long-term pruning pressure and construction impacts upon retained native vegetation.
- vi. The information relied upon by the BDAR identifies the Link Road frontage as containing a mixture of remnant, naturally regenerated, self-sown and planted endemic vegetation associated with Sydney Turpentine–Ironbark Forest. The BDAR does not provide sufficient spatial mapping or evidence to demonstrate which vegetation is eligible for assessment under Appendix D and which vegetation is required to be assigned to PCT 3262 and assessed under the standard BAM.
- vii. The BDAR acknowledges that remnant native vegetation occurs within the subject land and that vegetation within the western area includes remnant, self-sown and planted native trees. The BDAR concludes that the vegetation proposed to be impacted does not occur within a mosaic of planted and remnant native vegetation. This conclusion is not adequately demonstrated.
- viii. The proposed Link Road access requires the removal of Tree 76, a mature *Acacia binervia*, and introduces access works through this vegetated area. The assessment should not be based solely upon whether the individual tree proposed for removal was originally planted. The relevant consideration under Appendix D is whether the planted vegetation occurs within a mosaic of planted and remnant native vegetation that can reasonably be assigned to a PCT. The BDAR does not provide sufficient spatial mapping or analysis to demonstrate that the Link Road access vegetation is separate from the surrounding remnant and naturally regenerated vegetation.
- ix. The BDAR primarily characterises the direct impact as the removal of eight trees and is inadequate as the subject land is to include both the operational footprint and the construction footprint of any additional clearing associated with temporary or ancillary construction facilities and infrastructure. The assessor is required to determine the direct impacts based on the final boundary of the proposal and to consider the spatial and temporal extent of the impact.
- x. The BDAR should clearly identify the full extent of excavation, retaining walls, stormwater infrastructure, services, access construction, cut and fill, temporary construction areas and all works within the root zones of retained native trees.
- xi. The BDAR presently relies upon an assumption that servicing can be designed to avoid major

disturbance to retained trees. That conclusion is dependent upon future detailed design and assumptions regarding the treatment of redundant services. The BAM assessment must be based upon a defined and coordinated development footprint rather than an assumption that impacts can be avoided at a later stage.

- xii. The BDAR does not clearly quantify the total area of PCT 3262 within the subject land, the extent of the NSW-listed ecological community, the area subject to direct impact, the area subject to indirect impact or the area proposed for retention.
- xiii. The BDAR also does not clearly demonstrate whether root-zone disturbance and associated construction works affect trees forming part of PCT 3262.
- xiv. The submitted information is insufficient to determine the full extent of impacts to PCT 3262 and Sydney Turpentine–Ironbark Forest.
- xv. The BDAR does not provide a detailed vegetation-origin plan for the Link Road access area. There is insufficient information to confirm that the Link Road access has been assessed under the correct BAM pathway. Specifically, the BDAR does not clearly identify the boundary between planted vegetation eligible for assessment under Appendix D and remnant or mosaic vegetation requiring assessment under the standard BAM.
- xvi. The BDAR and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) contains inconsistencies particularly in regard to the site areas that form part of the Link Road access. The BDAR identifies an area of 1060m² whilst the AIA identifies 2,224m². The inconsistency is relevant and must be reconciled across all submitted documentation as it will impact the extent of vegetation that is assessed in the calculation of biodiversity impacts.
- xvii. A coordinated biodiversity impact plan is to be provided showing the complete development footprint, all retained and removed native trees, the vegetation-origin categories, the boundaries of PCT 3262 and Sydney Turpentine–Ironbark Forest, basement excavation, retaining structures, access roads, stormwater infrastructure, service trenches, proposed cut and fill and all temporary construction impacts. The plan is also to identify all works occurring within the root zones of retained native trees where those impacts are relevant to the persistence of PCT 3262.

H. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The proposed seniors housing development is categorised as residential property type, therefore waste services will be provided by Council, twice per week, with access required to be provided for Heavy Rigid Vehicle (HRV) in accordance with Part 25A.5 of the KDCP and AS 2890.2.

If a HRV is able to access and service the development, Council will accept 1100L bins under the chute with minimum waste services requirements as follows:

Minimum waste service requirement

Waste Type	Litres per week	Bin size	Bin Numbers- twice weekly service
General Waste	15,120	660	12
Care beds – general waste	3,840	660	3
Container Recycling	7,560	240	16
Paper Recycling	7,560	660	6
Food	4,350	240	9
Bulky Waste	22m ²		
Medical waste		240	4

Council's DCP does not currently have provisions for waste management of food organics and garden organics (FOGO). Therefore, Council's current practice is to apply the best practice identified in the *Better practice guide for resource recovery in residential developments* by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), the *NSW Guide to Best Practice FOGO*, and Section 12 Waste Management of the *NSW governments Seniors Housing Design Guide*.

Council has identified that the proposed waste management plan contains incorrect calculations for FOGO bins and revised calculations are required to be consistent with FOGO requirements. Specifically, FOGO bins requirements are to be calculated at a rate of 25L per unit, requiring a total of 9 bins to be provided for the development. Whilst the required number of bins have not been correctly

identified in the submitted documentation, there appears to be sufficient room within allocated bin storage areas to accommodate the FOGO bins.

Additional information is required to be provided to enable a proper assessment of waste management within the buildings and waste collection for the site, including the following:

- i. The proposed number of bins contained in the Waste Management Plan is incorrect and does not demonstrate compliance with the number of bins required for the development in accordance with the KDCP.
- ii. For FOGO, bins are to be calculated at a rate of 25L per unit, resulting in a total of 9 bins for the development. Whilst the number of bins has been incorrectly calculated, there appears to be sufficient space within the proposed bin storage rooms to accommodate the required number of FOGO bins.
- iii. Amended architectural plans and Waste Management Plan are required to demonstrate compliance with the waste requirements.
- iv. Additional bins are required for medical waste. Storage areas for medical waste bins in addition to bins from kitchen areas are required to be shown on architectural plans.
- v. generation rates need to be adopted per unit for FO.
- vi. The location of the chute within waste rooms on each floor level and aligned throughout the buildings must be clearly identified on the architectural plans.
- vii. Depending on the location of the chute within the waste rooms, there may be sufficient space to provide 3 x recycling bins as required in Control 3 in Part 25A.1 of the KDCP.
- viii. Ensure bin linear is constructed to allow the flow of bins across the rails ie a 2 bin linear needs space for 3 bins with the chute aligned to the middle bin. 1100L bins are acceptable on the chute system.
- ix. The bulky waste storage area in Basement 1 South (Building A and B) is located at the south-western corner and access to the closest lift (Lift 3/4) is constrained by the vehicle ramp and aisle, and structural columns. It is recommended that the bulky waste storage area in Basement 1 South be reviewed to ensure unimpeded access between the storage area and lift required to transport bulky waste items to the ground floor for collection.
- x. The waste collection point /loading dock has been designed for a Medium Rigid Vehicle (MRV) and not a HRV which Council will use to service the development. The design for vehicular access to the loading dock for all bin collection is to include the following:
 - o Confirmation that unimpeded access of 4.5m is provided
 - o A separate waste loading dock
 - o Swept paths that demonstrate a 12.5m long vehicle can be accommodated in the site from the Link Road access point.
 - o Should a mechanical turn table be proposed, clearance of 12.5m + 2m is to be demonstrated, with no impediments.
 - o Waste management areas internal of the building must be separated from car parks.
 - o Bin rooms and bulky waste rooms must be separated from one another.
- xi. The Waste Management Plan is to be revised to include amendments required to address the matters raised above.

I. ACOUSTIC ASSESSMENT

The submitted acoustic assessment report is insufficient and is not supported by Council for the reasons identified below.

The acoustic assessment report advises that unattended noise monitoring was undertaken at one representative location on the southern side of the site.

It is unclear why additional unattended noise monitoring was not undertaken at other site boundaries (adjoining a mix of residential dwellings, residential apartment developments and schools) to provide a more representative assessment of the existing background noise environment. Given the site area of approximately 14,480m², the proposed multiple land uses and the potential for 24-hour operation across parts of the development, additional monitoring would provide greater confidence that the acoustic environment has been appropriately characterised.

A review of the architectural plans identifies numerous uses within the development that may generate noise capable of impacting surrounding residential properties. These include, but are not limited to, a café, clubhouse, swimming pool, hydrotherapy pool, gymnasiums, beauty salon, cinema, communal

open spaces, consulting rooms and other ancillary facilities intended for use by both residents and members of the public. In addition, the site provides multiple vehicle access points which may generate vehicle movements and associated noise affecting neighbouring properties. The acoustic report does not adequately assess the potential operational noise generated by these land uses or the cumulative impacts associated with vehicle access, circulation and patron activity.

The acoustic report discusses mechanical plant, the on-site loading dock, external road traffic noise and traffic generated by the proposed development. However, the report provides limited detail regarding the proposed noise mitigation measures to demonstrate how compliance with the relevant acoustic criteria will be achieved. Furthermore, no assessment has been provided regarding the proposed central cooling and heating systems servicing the development, including the location of associated plant equipment shown on the architectural plans and the potential acoustic impacts arising from their operation. The architectural drawings relied upon by the acoustic consultant are dated 20 April 2026, whereas the architectural plans currently exhibited are dated 25 May 2026. It is unclear whether the acoustic assessment has been prepared using the current architectural design and may contain inconsistencies between the assessed proposal and the submitted plans.

A revised acoustic assessment report demonstrating additional unattended noise monitoring at adjoining properties, more detailed assessment of noise generated impacted and clarification that the acoustic assessment has been undertaken against the submitted architectural plans is required to enable a proper detailed assessment of the proposed development.

J. WATER MANAGEMENT

On Site Detention and Rainwater

The proposed combined on site detention (OSD) and rainwater tank of 210m³ and 15,000L, respectively, is located below the deep soil area within the central "Village Heart" communal open space. The location of the OSD and tank is not supported and is required to be amended to be contained within the building footprint or paved areas to minimise impacts on deep soil areas.

The overflow from the detention system is proposed to discharge to existing Council drainage pipe at College Crescent through construction of a new kerb inlet pit. Flows from upstream areas are proposed to be collected through a 375mm diameter RCP pipe and connect to Council drainage pipe at College Crescent through construction a new kerb inlet pit further downstream.

Additional information is required to be submitted to enable a proper assessment of water management for the site including the following:

- i. Supporting documents and hydraulic calculations are to be provided that satisfy the requirements of Part 24B.2 of KDCP. It is required to demonstrate that the hydraulic grade line of the inground drainage system (to which connection is proposed) is lower than the outlet of the property drainage system during the 5% AEP event.
- ii. A pump-out tank is to be designed based on the 100 year 2 hour storm as required under Part 24B.5 of the KDCP.
- iii. Plans are to show the rising main from the pump out pit to discharge to the OSD.
- iv. Water balance model is to be provided to satisfy Council's streamflow objectives under Part 24C.3 of the Ku-ring-gai DCP for 50% reduction in runoff days.
- v. Details of any reuse rates on rainwater tank are to be provided.
- vi. Any bypass from the site water quality measures is required to be included and modelled as bypass in the MUSIC model.
- vii. The MUSIC model is to be provided to Council.
- viii. To satisfy the requirements of Clause 6.6 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021, it must also be demonstrated that the proposed water quality measures achieve the natural or beneficial (NorBE) condition for water quality.

Stormwater Quality Control

Compliance with the pollutant load reduction targets prescribed under Part 24C.6 of the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (DCP) has been demonstrated through MUSIC modelling. The proposed stormwater quality treatment strategy comprises 10 Atlan Stormscak, 50 Atlan Filter (full height) within

the water quality chamber. Collectively, these stormwater quality measures are proposed to achieve the required pollutant reduction targets and improve the quality of stormwater runoff discharged from the subject site.

Notwithstanding the above, further information is required to adequately assess the proposed stormwater quality treatment strategy. Specifically, the applicant is requested to provide the following:

- i. Details of any reuse rates on rainwater tank.
- ii. Details of MUSIC catchment plans. The site area is approximately 1.5ha while the catchment modelled in MUSIC according to the MUSIC link is 1.195ha. Any bypass from the site water quality measures is required to be included as bypass in the MUSIC model.

To satisfy the requirements of Clause 6.6 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021, it must also be demonstrated that the proposed water quality measures achieve the natural or beneficial (NorBE) condition for water quality.

Impacts on Council Infrastructure

The application proposes to connect to existing Council's drainage network at College Crescent. It is recommended that the design engineers liaise with Council's Drainage Engineer, as the proposed works within the public road reserve will require approval from Council.

K. GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

The geotechnical report prepared by JKGeotechnics dated 03 June 2026 has been submitted to assess the subsurface conditions and provide preliminary recommendations for the excavation of the basement. It is inferred that approximately 5m to 8m of excavation is required for the proposed development.

Council requests that further information is provided to enable a proper assessment of groundwater and any permanent dewatering requirements, in which case, the application may require referral to NSW Office of Water for licensing conditions (Integrated), to address the following:

- i. The report states that given the expected low permeability of the soil and bed rock, drained basement structures appear geotechnically feasible. Long term groundwater flows would be expected to be of limited volume and would be able to be controlled by draining them to a sump for periodic pumped disposal to the stormwater system, or, where possible, for beneficial reuse such as for irrigation. Whilst this may be the case, in the event that groundwater will be encountered and the fact that Council's drainage network is under capacity, a condition should be imposed that prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate, the Certifier is to be satisfied that the basement has been designed as a fully tanked structure as per the requirement of Part 24 C.3(8) of the Ku-ring-gai DCP, and any Dewatering Water Supply Work Approval has been obtained from WaterNSW.
- ii. The proposed development indicates that the lowest basement will be at RL148.05m with excavation ranging from approximately 5m to 8mBGL. Excavation for the basement levels will intercept groundwater which should be managed in accordance with the SGIA and JKG geotechnical report prepared for the site. A Dewatering Management Plan (DMP) must be prepared for the development to address WaterNSW requirements.
- iii. The JKE groundwater quality screening indicated that groundwater was impacted by concentrations of various heavy metals above the SAC adopted for potential disposal to stormwater. JKE also noted that faecal coliforms were detected in two of the monitoring wells, and the pH of the groundwater was also outside the acceptable range;
- iv. Treatment of groundwater will be necessary during construction phase dewatering prior to discharge to stormwater;
- v. The report states that a specialist contractor must be contacted to design an appropriate water treatment system to facilitate the disposal of groundwater during temporary construction dewatering, should off-site disposal of groundwater to stormwater be required.
- vi. Council approval must be obtained prior to stormwater disposal.

L. INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

Architectural plan details

Further information and amendments are required to be shown on architectural plans to enable a proper assessment of the proposed development, including the following:

- i. There is a column located at the entry to a car parking space in the Basement 2 – South level that will obstruct vehicular access. The column appears in the same location on floor levels above in Building A. The design in its current form is not acceptable and review of the configuration of the car parking space in Basement 2 or the location of the column throughout Building A is required to resolve access to the car parking space.
- ii. Insufficient information has been provided to clearly identify the location and areas (m³) of storage within each apartment type that correspond with the storage areas nominated in Drawing Nos. DA-500 to DA-506 (inclusive). The storage areas in the basement levels should be clearly labelled (m³) to enable assessment of compliance with the minimum storage area requirements and the percentage of total storage for each unit that is located within the unit and basement.
- iii. Further details are required to be submitted to clarify the nature of the proposed external material identified as “08 - Masonry Upstand” on the Materials Palette. Council recommends the masonry upstand to consist of off-form nature or pigmented concrete or natural finishes which are likely to require less maintenance (resulting in less disruptions to residents) and will age well in the long term.
- iv. There is a column located in a car parking space in the Basement 2 – South that obstructs access to the proposed car parking space and appears to be in the same location on the floor levels above in Building A. Amendments are required to either the basement car parking layout or the location of the column to enable access to the car parking space.
- v. As the car park entry ramps into the Basement 1 level have gradients greater than 1:12 or 8%, alternative transportation of bicycles to and from the bicycle storeroom is required. It is recommended that the architectural plans be amended to clearly show that the dimensions of lifts, lift lobbies and communal corridors within the buildings will enable cyclists to transport bicycles between the street level and basement without using the internal car park ramp.

Mechanical ventilation

The submitted architectural plans do not identify the proposed locations of all mechanical ventilation systems, including ventilation exhaust stacks and associated plant. In addition, it is unclear whether the design has considered and demonstrated compliance with the relevant provisions of AS 1668.1 *The use of ventilation and air-conditioning in buildings – Fire and smoke control in multi-compartment buildings* and AS 1668.2 *The use of ventilation and air-conditioning in buildings – Mechanical ventilation in buildings*.

The final design should clearly identify the location of all mechanical plant and equipment, including air-conditioning units, ventilation systems and exhaust stacks. Where plant is proposed to be located on the roof, it should be appropriately integrated into the building design through suitable screening to minimise visual impacts from the public domain and adjoining properties. The design should also demonstrate that the operation of all mechanical plant and equipment will not result in unreasonable noise impacts on surrounding receivers and will comply with the requirements of the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997*.

Clearly identifying the location of all mechanical plant and equipment on the submitted plans will enable the consent authority to adequately assess the potential visual, acoustic and environmental impacts of the proposal.

Construction and Pedestrian Traffic Management Plan

Additional information is required to be provided in the preliminary Construction and Pedestrian Traffic Management Plan to clarify the longest construction vehicle type proposed to access the site. The submitted plan identifies both truck and dog combinations and ‘B-double’ vehicles up to 19m in length which are only permitted on the state road network in the Ku-ring-gai area.

The proposed secondary construction vehicle access to the site from College Crescent to avoid conflict during school peak periods particularly during School zone times, is not supported by Council as College Crescent is used as an informal secondary drop-off and pick up area for Masada College.

Whilst it appears that construction employee parking for up to 150 employees may be able to be provided on-site, Council requests that the applicant be required to confirm all construction employee parking will be accommodate on site as part of the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan. Council does not support a proposal where construction employee parking on-site will impact surrounding residents, particularly in College Crescent, Yarrabung Road, Carcoola Road, Lawson Parade, Catherine Street and Newhaven Place.

END OF SUBMISSION