

**Attachment A – Council detail assessment of the Response to Submission Report and supplementary material
State Significant Development Application - Telopea Stage 1A and Concept Proposal**

Contents

Table 1 – Land Use, VPA and Property & Legal Matters

Table 2 – Urban Design, Public Domain and Open Space

Table 3 – Traffic and Transport

Table 4 - Tree Management

Table 5 – Social Impact

Table 6 – Sustainability and Biodiversity

Table 7 - Contamination, Drainage and Catchment Management, Waste

Table 1. Land Use Planning, VPA, Property and Legal matters

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Land Use Planning | | |
| 1.1 That the Clause 4.6 request to vary height not be supported for The Core. | The overall design was workshopped in conjunction with Council and SDRP. As result of the SDRP sessions, a height variance was requested to provide a better urban design outcome, whilst maintaining the same amount FSR. | <p>Not addressed</p> <p><u>Clause 4.6 variation request - Heights</u> The concerns raised in Council's submission with respect to the Clause 4.6 request has not been adequately addressed and no changes to the proposed heights have been made (refer Section 2.1 of Councils submission). The height increase variations range between 16% and 23%. These are considered significant non-compliances to a relatively recently approved master plan. It is considered that variation in heights can be achieved under a compliant scheme and that this is not a reason to exceed permissible building envelopes.</p> <p>The Clause 4.6 relies heavily on the benefits of the proposal in general, which should not be the focus a variation request. This was observed in the Land & Environment Court judgement in Initial Action Ply Ltd v Woollahra Council [2018] NSWLEC 2018, where Preston J observed: <i>"...in order for there to be 'sufficient' environmental planning grounds to justify a written request under clause 4.6, the focus must be on the aspect or element of the development that contravenes the development standard and the environmental planning grounds advanced in the written request must justify contravening the development standard, not simply promote the benefits of carrying out the development as a whole"</i></p> <p>Based on the above, the applicant has not provided sufficient justification for the 4.6 variation request and on this basis the request cannot be supported. Council requests that the applicant demonstrate through presenting a Telopea DCP / Master Plan compliant scheme and provide a comparison whereby it is understood clearly that the variation to the heights is as a result of bonus FSR relating to seniors housing and LAHC's residential development available under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021.</p> <p><u>Clause 4.6 variation request - FSR</u> The application (refer Appendix Q) does not clearly identify what variation is being sought with respect to floor space and percentage variation, instead it relies on a total GFA spread over the Core and Precincts. Council does not support this approach. A Clause 4.6 Variation to Standard must indicate where the FSR is being drawn from in relation to the PLEP 2011 FSR Map and what variation is being sought over and above the permitted FSR under PLEP 2011 (not total GFA). Specifically, in its original submission, Council considered that the proposal should not be including</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|------------------|-------------------|--|------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | FSR from the area (of public road) where no height and FSR are allocated under the PLEP 2011 and as such the applicant must justify this in its Clause 4.6 application. Clarification is required on the planning and legal implications of locating buildings over this land and the subsequent non-compliance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 The applicant presents a scheduled breakdown of the FSR and GFA allocations (including standard efficiency rates) for each lot within the Concept Area (The Core and Precincts) corresponding to accurate plans and showing that the maximum permissible FSR for each lot has not been exceeded. Noting that this will form the basis for any Concept Approval, and therefore ensuring that the approved envelopes do not risk exceeding permissible density provisions in future development applications. Furthermore, that the proposal demonstrates that it does not draw GFA from the roads shown in the Parramatta LEP 2011 with no allocated FSR. | | Not addressed Council is concerned that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">a detailed schedule of GFA with corresponding plans for the Precincts have not been provided by the applicant.The information provided in relation to The Core is inadequate and there are discrepancies between the proposed base GFA for buildings in The Core and the envelope plans presented in the application that do not match the GFA identified for that site. <u>The Core - Building Efficiencies</u> The applicant has included a list of contributing factors for a lower efficiency rate in the Core (primarily for towers C1 and C2 which have an efficiency rate of 65% and 64% respectively), however Council does not consider that the identified factors would impact on efficiencies to the extent prescribed. While the factors below would contribute in some degree to a lower efficiency rate, Council considers most would impact only the lower levels/podium of a building and are taken into consideration through a lower efficiency rate for these levels than the upper levels of a tower. The upper levels of a building, particularly towers C1 and C2 should not have a reduced efficiency due to these factors. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | <table><tr><th>Submission Report – Contributing factors</th><th>Council Response</th></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Upper Core</td></tr><tr><td>Multiple Ground Levels</td><td>This would be the case across the site due to the topography and would not have a greater impact on C1, C2.</td></tr><tr><td>Large Retail Envelopes for maximised flexibility</td><td>It is not considered that this would decrease the total efficiency for this site as it only impacts level.</td></tr><tr><td>Steep terrain impacting usability of deep envelopes on the bottom-most level</td><td>This would only impact the lower ground levels which is not enough to lower the efficiency rate as significantly as contended.</td></tr><tr><td>Additional 1m depth in residential planning for facade articulation and</td><td>This additional depth is too significant. Telopea DCP has controls that allow for a percentage of balconies or architectural elements to extend beyond the</td></tr></table> | | Submission Report – Contributing factors | Council Response | Upper Core | | Multiple Ground Levels | This would be the case across the site due to the topography and would not have a greater impact on C1, C2. | Large Retail Envelopes for maximised flexibility | It is not considered that this would decrease the total efficiency for this site as it only impacts level. | Steep terrain impacting usability of deep envelopes on the bottom-most level | This would only impact the lower ground levels which is not enough to lower the efficiency rate as significantly as contended. | Additional 1m depth in residential planning for facade articulation and | This additional depth is too significant. Telopea DCP has controls that allow for a percentage of balconies or architectural elements to extend beyond the |
| | | Submission Report – Contributing factors | Council Response | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Upper Core | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Multiple Ground Levels | This would be the case across the site due to the topography and would not have a greater impact on C1, C2. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Large Retail Envelopes for maximised flexibility | It is not considered that this would decrease the total efficiency for this site as it only impacts level. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Steep terrain impacting usability of deep envelopes on the bottom-most level | This would only impact the lower ground levels which is not enough to lower the efficiency rate as significantly as contended. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional 1m depth in residential planning for facade articulation and | This additional depth is too significant. Telopea DCP has controls that allow for a percentage of balconies or architectural elements to extend beyond the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------------|----------------|
| | | siting flexibility (i.e. 24m residential footprint, 25m deep envelope) | | building setback for these purposes. It is recommended that this additional area to each building volume be deducted from the GFA calculations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Mid and Lower Core | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Steep terrain impacting usability of deep envelopes on the bottom-most level | | This would only have an impact on Basement and lower ground levels. This should not have an impact on higher levels. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Position of through site links (Notes A & B) shown 4m South of reference design positions to provide flexibility. | | This would not affect the GFA calculations as these cut outs would only impact 1-2 levels. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Additional 1m depth in residential planning for facade articulation and siting flexibility (i.e., 21.5m residential footprint, 22.5m deep envelope) | | The extent of GFA minimised due to façade articulation is not supported. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | <u>Discrepancies of The Core GFA calculations based on lower efficiency</u> The discrepancy in GFA calculations and lack of detailed FSR schedule for each building means there is a real risk that future development applications will exceed permissible FSRs for the Core and will result in poor building envelope outcomes. The Table below indicates the significant variations due to low building efficiencies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | <table><tr><td></td><td>SITE AREA</td><td>BASE GFA COUNCIL (75% Efficiency)</td><td>BASE GFA REPORTED (69% Efficiency)</td><td>DIFFERENCE</td></tr><tr><td>CORE C1-C2</td><td>11, 898 m²</td><td>90,124m²</td><td>59,366.50 m²</td><td>30,758 m² / 34%</td></tr><tr><td>CORE C3-C8</td><td>31,210 m²</td><td>117,691 m²</td><td>90,156.14 m²</td><td>27535 m² / 23%</td></tr></table> | | | | | | SITE AREA | BASE GFA COUNCIL (75% Efficiency) | BASE GFA REPORTED (69% Efficiency) | DIFFERENCE | CORE C1-C2 | 11, 898 m² | 90,124m² | 59,366.50 m² | 30,758 m² / 34% | CORE C3-C8 | 31,210 m² | 117,691 m² | 90,156.14 m² | 27535 m² / 23% |
| | | | SITE AREA | BASE GFA COUNCIL (75% Efficiency) | BASE GFA REPORTED (69% Efficiency) | DIFFERENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | CORE C1-C2 | 11, 898 m² | 90,124m² | 59,366.50 m² | 30,758 m² / 34% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | CORE C3-C8 | 31,210 m² | 117,691 m² | 90,156.14 m² | 27535 m² / 23% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Information requested</u> The application provides no details on the proposed GFA for the Precincts. Like GFA calculations for the Core, there is a concern that proposed GFA for the Precincts will be less than the GFA calculated on the envelope plans. This could result in future development applications that will exceed permissible FSR for the Precincts. Additional building depth should not be added to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>building envelopes for articulation/balcony purposes as this will further mismatch the building envelopes with allowable GFA.</p> <p>Therefore, as requested in Council's submission, further information including a more detailed breakdown of GFA calculations for each building and GFA diagrams (both The Core and Precincts) must be provided to adequately assess the lower efficiency rate proposed, reconcile a potential mismatch between the proposed GFA and the approved building envelopes. This will reduce any flow-on impacts at DA approval stage.</p> |
| <p>1.3 Council recommends that the Design Excellence Strategy be revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate compliance with Clause 6.12 Design Excellence of the Parramatta LEP 2011 • That a Council representative is nominated for all Design Competitions, and not just the future Council library site. • That the Government Architect of NSW nominate their preferred process and timing for Design Review and that the strategy be updated to reflect GANSW requirements. • Design Juries should have an odd number of members and should not be dominated by parties representing the applicant. | <p>The Design Excellence Strategy enclosed in Appendix H has been updated to address the design excellence provisions of the PLEP 2011 and comments from Council including their Technical Assessment. A detailed assessment against the provisions of Clause 6.12 of the PLEP 2011 has been provided in Section 5.1 of the Submissions Report.</p> | <p>Not addressed.</p> <p>In considering whether a development exhibits design excellence, a consent authority must have regard for the matters in Cl 6.12(4) of PLEP2011. It is recommended the Design Excellence Strategy be updated to ensure compliance with PLEP 2011. Key issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capital value for Stage 1A triggers a design competition as set out in Clause 6.12(5) of the PLEP 2011. Neither the Design Excellence Strategy nor Response to Submissions Report has directly addressed why this area should be exempt from the Clause 6.12(5). • Within the Concept Proposal, blocks C1, C2, C3 and C4 all propose a tower element above the height trigger of 55m as set out in Clause 6.12(5) of PLEP2011. The application is seeking exemption from running a future Design Competition for block C4, however it is not clear why this is being sought or whether there is any compelling justification for Council to agree to any such exemption. In the context of this precinct, Council is of the view that LEP requirements for Design Excellence should be consistently applied in all cases where the threshold is met to ensure the best design outcomes possible for those sites. • Further, the locations of the sites in the northern and southern precincts have not been provided and this gives no certainty to the determining authority that the competitions will be carried out as no sites have been identified. Council considers the PLEP 2011 is clear in its requirements and thresholds for holding design competitions. The application should clarify if they are seeking an exemption from Council in relation to holding competitions in this area. <p>Council considers that the Design Excellence Strategy should be updated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address directly why exemptions from design competitions are being sought from Council and / or demonstrate compliance with Clause 6.12(5). It is noted that Council, not the consent authority (DPE) has the power to provide exemptions from design competitions. • Confirm a Council representative on the Jury for all design competitions; |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Juries should have an odd number of members and have equal representation of Proponent's and other representatives on the panel (not heavily weighted to the applicants, as it is proposed); and Confirmation by Government Architects NSW of their nominated and preferred process for the post competition design integrity phase, timing and method of design review at the key project milestones that are required. <p>Refer to Council's Submission, Section 2.3 Attachment B for further detail.</p> |
| 1.4 That the SDRP provide written certification that the submitted Detailed Development Application for Stage 1A has appropriately addressed the panel's recommendations. | Written advice was prepared by the SDRP following the design review session held on 12 August 2021. This advice confirmed that the SDRP were generally supportive of the design development of Stage 1A, including proposed architectural character, material strategies and diversity of apartment types is generally supported by the SDRP. | Noted. |
| 1.5 That the delivery timeframes for new housing in Stage 3 should be reconsidered to be brought forward, based on current condition of the existing housing stock in this area. | The current timing is based on both market conditions and obligations to LAHC. The staging has been designed to ensure that affordable housing proposed in Stage 3 is not isolated surrounding services. | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>Council requests that the proposal reconsider the staging of delivery of new housing based on current condition of the existing housing stock in Stage 3 areas Refer to Council Submission, Section 2.4 for original comment. Further justification is sought from LAHC is requested to be provided in relation to this matter.</p> |
| 2. State and Local Contributions (VPA Letter of Offers) Recommendations | | |
| 2.1 The development should contribute to the provision of local infrastructure to meet | | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>The quantum of development contributions calculated of ~ \$47,071,506.75 (refer Table 4, Section 3.12 of the Submissions Report) is not agreed to by Council. Specifically, the seeking off existing dwelling offset or credit for existing social housing on LAHC land is not supported as it is type of</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|---|
| the demand from increased residential and worker population as a direct result from the development. This contribution should be equal or greater in value than the development contributions payable under the Parramatta (Outside CBD) Contributions Plan 2021. | | development that does not generate development contributions. The matter of potential contributions payable is part of the ongoing negotiations in relation to the VPA. |
| 2.2 That negotiations continue between LAHC/ Frasers and Council in relation to the Revised Letter of Offer (VPA). | Noted | VPA negotiations are ongoing. |
| 2.3 That no approval be issued for the development prior to the agreement of Council to enter into a VPA with the applicant. | This is noted by the Proponent, however both the Proponent and Council have expressed the ability to draft a condition of consent to bond contribution to avoid VPA negotiations delaying the overall planning approval. | VPA negotiations are ongoing. |
| 2.4 Transport for NSW and the Department of Education and/or School Infrastructure NSW, consult with Council in relation to | This is noted by the Proponent. Ongoing discussions with other state agencies form part of the State VPA | Noted. |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|--|
| the allocation of funding which may be of co-benefit to the local community. | | |
| 3. Property and Legal Matters | | |
| 3.1 That in accordance with Section 8 of the SEARs the legal mechanisms which guide the process for NSW LAHC to acquire Council's roads and Council's property at 21 Sturt Street should be outlined. | The preferred approach by both parties is compulsory acquisition with the precursor being the land is nominated in the VPA and/or a separate Deed is entered into. | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>In relation to public roads, clarity is required from the applicant as to whether an agreement is reached between Council and LAHC on the transfer of public roads, or it will be undertaken by compulsory acquisition (e.g. Section 30 agreement). It is noted that the avenue in which the applicant chooses will involve different methods and timeframes.</p> <p>In relation to 21 Sturt Street Council has now received written confirmation on 29 March 2022 from LAHC advising Council that it <i>"supports the compulsory acquisition of 21 Sturt Street, Telopea, as part of the Telopea Urban Renewal Project."</i></p> |
| 3.2 That 21 Sturt Street and the proposed 'land swap' be removed from the VPA letter of offer. | This is noted. The agreed approach by both parties is compulsory acquisition, and will form part of ongoing negotiations between the Proponent and Council. | <p>Addressed, noting planning agreement negotiations ongoing.</p> <p>In relation to 21 Sturt Street Council has now received written confirmation on 29 March 2022 from LAHC advising Council that it <i>"supports the compulsory acquisition of 21 Sturt Street, Telopea, as part of the Telopea Urban Renewal Project."</i> Council maintains that the property shall not form part of the VPA and be removed from the Letter of Offer.</p> |

Table 2. Urban Design and Public Domain

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|---|
| 4. Urban Design | | |
| 4.1 That the applicant revise the design of the Core to more closely reflect the Telopea Master Plan 2017 and controls within the Parramatta LEP 2011. | Further assessment of the proposed scheme against the Telopea Masterplan forms part of the Concept Response to Submissions Report prepared by Bates Smart (Appendix F). Overall, the scheme is considered in comparison to an LEP compliant scheme, the additional height proposal better celebrates the built form principles established in the 2017 Telopea Masterplan | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>While minor alterations were made to some building envelopes to comply with the ADG, there has been no significant redesign of the Concept Plan to better reflect the Telopea Master Plan. As per Council's submission, The Concept Area should be redesigned to align with the LAHC and Council endorsed Telopea Masterplan 2017, which ultimately informed the Parramatta LEP 2011 and DCP 2011 controls relating to the Telopea Precinct.</p> <p>Refer Attachment B for specific commentary on the Design Guidelines. The commentary below details the inconsistency and inadequacy of information submitted as part of the RTS and recommended amendments.</p> <p><u>Key inconsistencies with the Telopea Master Plan</u></p> <p>The current Concept Plan results in irregularly shaped and overscale buildings that have insufficient relationships with each other, with the site topography or with surrounding development. Key inconsistencies between the Concept Plan and the objectives of the Telopea Master Plan, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Building Envelopes:</i> Proposed building envelopes are excessive for the site and do not provide a human-scale to the street. Building envelopes are irregularly shaped, with acute angles to buildings, upper-level setbacks are cut-off by tower elements, there are elongated facades, and excessive building depths and footprints. This results in an incoherent, awkward approach to siting and aligning the built forms within their context. For example, building C4 which has a podium at two separate levels and a tower which intersects irregularly with the podium and building C5 which has two different setbacks at ground level resulting in an incohesive building form that impacts view lines up Manson Street. • <i>Tower Heights</i> - The information does not demonstrate how variations to tower heights in comparison to the maximum heights contained in the PLEP 2011 are of greater benefit. The height of buildings C5, C6 and C7, all currently at a height of 13-14 storeys, should be decreased to acknowledge the height transition away from the light rail. ‘ • <i>Overshadowing</i> - The proposed variations to height appear to result in additional overshadowing to Telopea Public School and Sturt Park at key times during mid-winter which is not supported (Concept RTS Report, p. 32). • <i>Amenity impacts:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Amenity benefits for building residents as a result of additional building height (more views, greater solar access on higher levels) have been detailed, however |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>consideration of how these heights impact the experience and amenity at street level and within the public domain has not been provided. No visual impact assessment, wind impact assessment or detailed solar analysis has been provided along the streets and in open spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There has been no consideration of the interface of the building envelopes adjoining the public spaces at street level and how high quality, active public spaces will be delivered. No details on the activation, accessibility and design of building envelopes along the Eyles pedestrian link have been provided, despite the ~280m long strip being a key focus of the Concept Plan. • <i>Ground Level & Setbacks:</i> Plans and street elevations do not clearly identify where ground level uses are commercial/retail or residential. This usage determines the appropriate setback at ground level and therefore must be identified in the documentation. Where street frontages at ground level are activated with retail or commercial uses a 0-3m setback is required, and where residential uses are at ground level a greater setback of 3-6m is required. Ground level setbacks are not consistent along the length of a street block. For example, C5 has varying setbacks along one building façade. • <i>Solar Analysis:</i> Solar analysis centres on the number of hours of sun access to spaces but does not consider the time of day these spaces may receive additional overshadowing from the proposed buildings. Hourly solar diagrams should be provided for each open space to assess when overshadowing may be happening (i.e., if there is additional overshadowing during the lunch period this is a concern). • <i>Street Widths:</i> Proposed streets are not wide enough to cater to the density proposed refer below for recommended widths. • No details on how the footpaths, street verges, through-site-links and interfaces with adjacent buildings will be designed to deliver a pedestrian friendly environment. • No details have been provided on how the design deals with the lack of delineation between public and private spaces throughout the Core. This must be provided in a plan identifying clear boundaries, use and site area. <p><u>Inadequate information</u></p> <p>The documentation for The Core is incomplete with information missing from street elevations and plans and discrepancies between different sets of drawings. Alongside this, some key documentation has not been provided. An updated set of documentation is required which should amend/ include the following:</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The envelope control plan for the Core does not provide sufficient dimensions for proposed envelopes. The length and depth of all proposed envelopes (including podiums) and all ground floor and upper-level setbacks should be dimensioned. • Maximum RLs for each building envelope should be included on the envelope control plan. The inclusion of height in metres from ground level does not take into consideration the topography of the site. • Individual buildings and towers should be labelled on all plans (i.e., Building C1 should be labelled with Lot C1.1 and Lot C1.2A, etc. to better match labelling on street elevations.) • A site plan for the Core should be provided that includes the street widths for all proposed streets (not just building envelope to building envelope), on-street parking, designated public and private open spaces and their site areas. • The height of lower ground and upper ground levels are not dimensioned on elevations. • Basements and the full extent of lower levels should be included on all street elevations or provided in sections and in plans. • There are discrepancies between building envelopes in plan and in elevation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Street elevations show Lot C1.1 with an upper-level setback above level 1 to the east which is not shown in plan. ○ Street elevations show Lot E2 at 7 storeys (22m) with no upper-level setback and in plan as 28m tall with an upper-level setback of 3m to each side at 25m height. ○ Street elevations show Lot C3.1 with a setback to level 14 on one elevation and a setback to levels 13 and 14 on another elevation. These setbacks are not shown in plan at all. ○ Building C2 is shown in street elevations with a podium at level 1 that extends between the two towers and is higher than the podium setbacks to the boundary. In plan C2 is shown as having one continuous podium with no level changes. ○ Plans show a 3m upper-level setback to Shortland Street for tower C2.1 but in street elevations no upper-level setback is shown. ○ Plan shows no difference in roof height on building C2.2 in the articulation zone, whereas street elevations show a lower roof along the articulation section. ○ Street elevations for C4.1 do not show a setback above podium which can be seen in plan. • Some building envelopes in the Concept Master Plan do not comply with the proposed Design Guidelines for the Core (Appendix K) or there has not been enough information provided to assess whether the envelopes comply, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Length of Building facades should not exceed 45m (as per Guidelines) without building breaks:</u> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are still several facades that exceed 45m with no architectural articulation or breaks (C1.1 – 53m, C1.2 – 47m, C2.1 – 67m, C5 – 57m, C6 – 66m, E1 – 77m) ○ <u>In the upper core (bounded by Sturt St, Shortland St and Manson St) buildings should adopt a podium and tower typology with a street wall of 2-4 stores and a tower set back a minimum of 3m:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C2.2 has been described as a ‘mid-rise street wall typology’ in an area where buildings should adopt a podium and tower typology. ▪ Buildings C1.2 and C2.1 have a 0m setback to some street walls where they should apply a 3m setback. ▪ Building C4.1 exceeds the maximum street wall height of 4 storeys as it has not included the upper ground level which is of a considerable height. ▪ Building C5.1 does not have a streetwall with upper-level setback and instead has 9-12 storeys from ground level as the ‘street wall.’ ○ <u>Street setbacks within the Core should be between 0-3m for retail/commercial uses and 3-6m for residential:</u> Building uses have not been identified ○ <u>Minimum floor to ceiling heights:</u> Minimum floor to ceiling heights have not been provided ○ Communal open space has not been clearly defined from the public domain ○ Buildings with apartments located below the street level have not been identified ○ Driveways and building entries have not been identified on plans ○ Rooftop communal spaces have not been identified on plans. <p><u>Recommended key amendments/design controls</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eyles Street should be retained as a public street between Benaud Lane and New Marshal Street. It should be a public shareway or laneway dedicated to Council to reflect its primary ‘access’ purpose and accommodate additional street parking. Council requests that the applicant submit revised drawings to reflect this or the DPE condition this as part of any approval. • Height of buildings are required to be adjusted to ensure there should be no additional overshadowing to Telopea Public School or Sturt Park. This overshadowing occurs between 1pm and 3pm during mid-winter, a time of high activity in these areas when protection of solar access is incredibly important. • Building facades of perimeter buildings should not exceed 50m without building breaks: There are still several facades that exceed 50m with no architectural articulation or breaks (C5 – 58-84m, C6 – 66m, E1 – 77m) |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All other building facades should not exceed 50m in length. There are several buildings that exceed this length (C1.1 – 53m, C2.1 – 68m, C2.2 – 67m, C3 – 55m, C4 – 58m) • In relation to the tower/podium buildings (C1, C2, C3 and C4), Council considers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C1 & C2 & C3 – as the podium is retail (or community facilities) and only 2-3 levels high, it is acceptable to be a generally longer. The towers above should be no longer than 50m as measured from the horizontal façade. ○ C4 – Assume this is a full residential building, therefore the podium level is excessive in length and will result in poor residential amenity. The building envelope needs to be refined to ensure the building length (as measured both for podium and tower) does not exceed 50m. Upper level setbacks are required for the tower above this podium. • In relation to perimeter buildings (C5-C9 and E1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C5 – the building length along Manson Street is not acceptable and some form of building break or articulation, and resolution of the building setbacks and form is required. ○ C6 – the 66m+ length façade is not acceptable and the stepping down of height is not a way to address articulation. Some form of cut out on this elevation must be incorporated. ○ In relation to C6, C7 and C8 - cut outs proposed are acceptable on the condition that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ They must be located so that buildings facades do not exceed 50m in length without a cut out (refer plans Notes which states that the cut out locations may vary this is not acceptable). ▪ Cut outs are applied to all levels of the proposed building ▪ Through site links that are open to sky are preferred for safety and amenity reasons. Semi-enclosed through site links 1-2 storeys high must incorporate the principles of CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) to ensure these links are safe and secure. ○ E1 – the 77m+ façade is excessive and some form of building break or articulation on this elevation must be incorporated. There are opportunities for fine-grain articulation along this façade. • Building C2.2 is not supported and should be redesigned as a tower-and-podium with a maximum tower façade length of 50m. Stepping down in height of the towers is not considered appropriate articulation of these facades. • Residential floorplates should not exceed 1000sqm. Building depth and length should be reduced to align with this control (for example, tower C2.2 has a building length of 67m and a |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>depth of 25m, and a floorplate size of 1519sqm – resulting in a tower that is overscale for the site and potentially poor occupant amenity).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The placement of upper levels on building C4 should be revised. The upper levels should not intrude into the street setbacks. The intersection of the upper levels and lower levels at the corner of Manson Street and Shortland Street is not supported. • The height of buildings C5, C6 and C7, all currently at a height of 13-14 storeys, must be decreased to acknowledge the height transition away from the light rail. • The proposal must identify usages at ground level within the Core and provide appropriate setbacks to these buildings. Additional setbacks to retain or provide mature trees is supported. • Ground level front building setbacks 3m ground floor front setbacks in Wade, Manson Streets and Benaud Land and 6m front setbacks in Sturt and Shortland Streets. • Minimum street widths should align with the Telopea DCP which requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wade Street (proposed as 10m) - a 13m carriageway (including roadway and on-street parking) of 13m and a footpath with landscape verge of 3m on each side ○ For an extension of Eyles Street a 10m carriageway (including roadway and on-street parking) with a 4-5m footpath and landscape verge on each side ○ For Benaud Place a 9m carriageway (including roadway and on street parking) and a 3m footpath and landscape verge on each side, and ○ For any additional new road connections, a minimum 7m carriageway and a minimum 2.5m parking indented parking bays to one side of the street and a minimum of 3m verges (Fig Tree Lane is 8.5m wide, Manson Street 10m wide in proposal) • Grading and footway crossfalls at 3% do not confirm to AS1428.1:2021 or council standards and are not acceptable. Advice - Council reiterates that footway (kerb to property boundary line) crossfalls between 1% and 2.5% must be in accordance with council standards and AS1428.1:2021. <p>Refer Attachment B for specific commentary on the Design Guidelines.</p> |
| 4.2 That the applicant revise the design of the Precincts consistent with the Telopea DCP. | As this project is designated as State significant, in accordance with Clause 11 of the SDR SEPP, DCPs do not apply to any State significant development and are not a relevant matter for consideration for the SSDA. | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>Council recommends the Precincts should be delivered in accordance with the controls contained in the Parramatta DCP for the Telopea Precinct to achieve consistency across the precinct. Refer Attachment B for specific commentary on the Design Guidelines and additional site testing in the Precinct.</p> <p>The Concept Plan for the Precincts does not provide a holistic approach to development for Telopea and may result in an inconsistent and unequitable approach between sites being redeveloped by</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>LAHC/Frasers and those which are privately owned, resulting in piecemeal development through the Precincts that is at odds with the Telopea Master Plan 2017.</p> <p>Application of planning controls in the Telopea DCP is imperative to allow for the significant renewal of the area with new buildings and places that are designed to maintain existing site characteristics such as scale, proportion, setbacks, human scale, trees and topography. The proposed built forms for the Precincts do not consider the existing topography, subdivision or curvilinear streets that are unique to Telopea. A coherent or consistent built form has not been applied which results in a disconnect with the surrounding context. The proposed development is of a scale and bulk that is excessive for the area.</p> <p>Attachment B Design Testing indicates the additional benefit of deep soil provision and tree retention if the Precincts were designed in accordance with the controls contained in the Telopea DCP.</p> <p><i>Recommended key design amendments / design controls (as per DCP)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street wall heights – Provide a maximum 6 storey street wall, and a 3m or 6m setback for the upper levels of a 7 or 8 storey building respectively.\ • The 0m side setbacks result in excessive façade lengths. While some articulation zones have been included on building envelopes in the Precinct, there are several facades that still reach between 70-100m. Such long facades may lead to issues of excessive excavation and large retaining walls, as well as impact the desired finer grain resolution for the streetscape. • The proposed development of isolated lots via party walls with LAHC development will also needs to be considered, as these developments could create building lengths of up to 65m. • Front setbacks – New development must provide a 6m setback to the street to align with the existing streetscape, increase deep soil zone (DSZ) and improve amenity for residents. • Side setbacks – A minimum 3m setback to the side boundaries for part of the length of the building, increased to 6m where habitable rooms only face the side boundary. • Rear setbacks – A rear setback of 15% of the site length or 10m (whichever is greater) to allow for larger portions of uninterrupted DSZ of a reasonable width and depth. This will allow a continuous deep soil network formed with adjacent lots. • Deep Soil Zones (DSZ) – Provide a minimum 30% of DSZ on the site area, with half of the total deep soil area located at the rear of the site. Minimum dimensions for area to be considered as deep soil are 4m x 4m as per the Parramatta DCP and 6mX 6m as per the ADG. • Deep Soil area and basement plans showing all proposed basement outlines aligned to recommended front and rear setbacks and remaining deep soil on private land only and not under proposed roads |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|---|---|
| <p>4.3 The Applicant revises the isolated lots study which demonstrates development outcomes consistent with Council's Telopea DCP</p> | <p>The current isolated lot study prepared by Bates Smart as part of the original EIS Package has considered the relevant DCP controls for sites outside of the Telopea Concept Plan Area and demonstrates that the potentially isolated sites are not isolated as they can be reasonably developed either as standalone sites or amalgamated with neighbouring sites. It is noted that further assessment of potential isolated lots would form part of future detailed development applications. Given the size of the Telopea Concept Plan Area, parts of the site are unlikely to be developed for ten years and undertaking further work now is considered unnecessary to assess the proposed concept envelopes.</p> | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>Council reiterates the points raised in its original submission in relation to this matter. Site isolation is an important issue that needs to be addressed before any determination is given. The proponent needs to consider the purchase of these properties and not defer this matter to a future development approval process.</p> <p>Council refutes the ascertain in the Submissions Report that these sites are not in fact 'isolated' as there is no minimum lot size requirement under Parramatta LEP 2011 and therefore a six-storey development could be feasibly developed. The Parramatta DCP 2011 requires a minimum site frontage of 24 metres for sites without two street or lane frontages for residential flat buildings. This is to ensure that future development is on a site area great enough to deliver high amenity outcomes for the occupants, deep soil zone requirements and adequate building separation from neighbouring lots. <u>All isolated sites within the Precincts have a site frontage less than 24m and therefore a residential flat building under the DCP would not be able to be developed on these sites.</u></p> <p>The Isolated Sites Study notes the only way the proposed envelopes are possible is to share a party wall with LAHC development to the southern of each site. This creates several issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in already excessive façade lengths (between 50 and 60m) with limited to no breaks in the façade, The development of 19 to 28m tall buildings to the property line with little consideration of the impact on those isolated sites prior to future development; and Sets an undesirable precedent for future development in Telopea through the nil setback to the boundary. <p>Furthermore, the Isolated Lot Study is not considered adequate as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applies a nil setback on LAHC sites to the south of the isolated sites. This does not comply with the DCP, will hinder the redevelopment potential of neighbouring sites, and therefore is not supported. Does not provide parking, basement or lobby details to demonstrate compliance. the Isolated Sites Study does not provide internal layouts for the proposed development on these sites to ensure compliance with the ADG. Does not provide a detail level of compliance with the ADG, including details on solar access and natural ventilation to apartments. <p>The redevelopment of these isolated sites under the proposed Concept Plan would lead to suboptimal residential flat buildings with decreased amenity to building occupants and neighbours. It would also significantly increase the scale and bulk of the streetscape through the use of a party wall. Prior to</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>redevelopment the proposed Concept Plan will also cause amenity issues for these privately owned lots as they are built to the boundary. Therefore, it is not realistic to assume that these sites can be reasonably developed as standalone sites.</p> <p>The applicant has suggested further testing of these sites should occur at DA stage however, it is critical prior to any approval which 'locks in' building envelopes, that it must be proven that these sites can be reasonably developed in the future.</p> <p>Attachment B provides further urban design testing which demonstrates the development and design benefits of amalgamating lots with the LAHC proposal compared to redevelopment as isolated sites.</p> |
| 4.4 That the applicant prepares a site purchase strategy to demonstrate that efforts will be made to acquire any isolated sites and potential amalgamation to occur. | The overall scheme has been designed based on land currently owned by LAHC and does not burden the future redevelopment of land not incorporated into the proposal. Requiring the Proponent to demonstrate attempts to acquire additional lots is beyond the scope of the SSDA. The proposal does not burden existing land owners from redeveloping sites surrounding the Telopea CPA. | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>The Council submission in relation to this matter still stands – refer to Section 5.4 of Council's Submission regarding the creation of isolated sites. This remains a significant issue in the Precinct and the response provided indicating that the proposal does not burden existing land owners from redeveloping sites is rejected by Council. It is likely the redevelopment of these lots will be assessed by Council through the DA process. Based on Council's urban design testing for the Northern Precinct, very poor urban design and planning outcomes will result from the identified potential site isolation. The application does not provide sufficient justification for their isolation and has not been fully tested against the PDCP 2011 controls, for which these sites would be likely assessed. Given the sheer size of LAHC land holdings, only a few sites that will be isolated and the timeframe in which LAHC can achieve this, it is not unreasonable for the site purchase strategy to be demonstrated and potential future amalgamation to occur.</p> |
| 4.5 The applicant presents urban design testing of the Evans Road (Waratah) shops block (bounded by Evans Road, Benaud Place, Shortland and Sturt Streets) to demonstrate that the proposal does not adversely impact on the realisation of | Refinements to the design described in Section 3.2 include the reduction of upper level setbacks along Benaud Lane to ensure compliance with the ADG can be achieved. Further urban design testing is not considered appropriate at the Concept Stage and will likely form part of future detailed development | <p>Addressed</p> <p>The upper-level setbacks submitted as part of the revisions to The Core now comply with ADG building separation and visual privacy requirements. The built form is stepped so that levels above 25m are all 12m from the centreline along Benaud Lane and Sturt Street, and there is 24m between these buildings and the proposed development to the west along Fig Tree Lane.</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|---|--|
| development potential in line with the controls of the Parramatta LEP 2011 and Telopea DCP. In particular, that the building separation and visual privacy distances contained Apartment Design Guide (ADG) of SEPP 65 are able to be satisfied, as measured from the centre of Benaud Lane. | applications for Buildings C7 and C8. | |
| Council's comments in relation to Stage 1A revisions made as part of the RTS | | <p><i>Basement Carparking and Alignment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council supports the removal of basement access via Winter Street, however the resultant extent of basement decreases deep soil located south of the Neighbourhood Park and the avenue of trees aligned to Mews Street. By reducing deep soil, it reduces the growth of mature canopy sizes which impacts heat island effect. • The connection of the car park basement between Building C and D should be redesigned as two separate structures on site. The driveway access point from the south of Building D is sufficient to allow for vehicle movement into the carpark. <p><i>Building C – blank wall</i></p> <p>The extent of large brick walls to the substation on the corner of Building C presents a large blank wall without any planting to screen it. Council recommends a tree planted edge sitting in front of the substation and brick wall to help conceal and create visual interest.</p> <p><i>Ground level Setback- Sturt Street</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current 2.7m ground level front building setbacks in Sturt Street do not reflect DCP requirements (of 6 metres) and are not supported. In the context of the proposed high density and scale of development Council reiterates that the provision of generous space in street corridors is key to the creation of an amenable and comfortable neighbourhood for people.. <p><i>Footpath widths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sturt Street cross sections alignment is shown inconsistently across the submitted drawing sets. The provision of a 3m minimum width concrete shared path on the south side of Sturt Street |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>which forms an important connection to the Parramatta Light Rail and Active Transport Link. A 1.8m minimum concrete pedestrian path connection to Adderton Road is required on the northern side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mews Street footway at 1.7m is not supported (kerb to property boundary) and should have a minimum overall width of 3.5m in accordance with the Paramatta Public Domain Guidelines. This does not include parking lanes. All footpaths should be in situ concrete, min width 1800mm. It is recommended that the existing drawings be revised to reflect the amended pedestrian footway width. <p><i>Tree Retention</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised plans submitted as part of Stage 1A have raised concerns in relation to further tree removal as a result of the extent of basement, road alignment, OSD storage tank alignment and building layout. There are two trees that were originally shown as retained in the previous submitted envelope plan that are now shown as removed and trees shown as retained that will consequently be removed due to the building envelope impacting on the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) and Structural Root Zone (SRZ) of trees. Council recommends that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant submit revised and aligned landscape, civil and architectural plans and examines and compares the number of trees removed and demonstrates ways more mature trees can be retained. Plans should indicate that the basements must be set down so that trees can be planted at ground level in large contiguous planters with no lightweight soils. Site and building sections should be provided clearly showing the extent and depth of basement parking under, in particular Mews Street. In order for the proposed avenue of trees wrapping around Mews Street (which will create ample canopy cover and privacy for residents for this environment) to be realised, the current basement and Civil basin positions must be reconsidered. The basement connection between Building A and B should be removed or have a sufficient slab setdown to allow for a 1.8m depth of soil below grade to ensure trees can grow with adequate soil volume to support a large mature tree. The applicant provide updated drawings to relocate or reconfigure the OSD tank so it does not jeopardise the ability to achieve the proposed landscape (tree planting) design. The current location of the OSD tank conflicts with other delivery commitments of street trees in |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Mews Street. It will not be suitable to have these trees planted in planter boxes at the side of the (narrow) road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The building be realigned so the existing trees can be retained in the south west of the site. The Basement and building encroachment is more than the 10% allowable into the TPZ and sits within the SRZ of existing trees Similarly, the tree next to the end of Winter Street is also impacted by the proposed building. |
| 5. Public Domain | | |
| <p>5.1 The public domain plans should be revised in relation to the comments provided in Technical Assessment at Attachment B, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of all public domain works that will be delivered as part the Stage 1 approved DA, • Clarification of public domain works that will be delivered as part the Stage 1 approved VPA Offer, • That the design and documentation meet the requirements as set out in Chapter 2, 2.3 Development Application of the Parramatta Public Domain Guidelines | <p>Public domain plans have been updated by Hassell (Appendix M) to reflect Council's comments with the overall design and documentation meeting the requirements as set out in Chapter 2, 2.3 Development Application of the <i>Parramatta Public Domain Guidelines</i>.</p> | <p>Stage 1A - Not addressed, recommended conditions of consent (Stage 1A)</p> <p>In relation to Stage 1A and the public domain – the proposed public domain finishes do not currently reflect the requirements of the Parramatta Public Domain Guidelines (e.g. stone paving on footpaths, street light types, bin types etc). Therefore, any development consent for Stage 1A must be on the basis that final public domain fixtures, materials and finishes for council parks and footpaths are to be negotiated with, and approved by, Council during detailed design phases as follows:</p> <p><i>Prior to any Construction Certificate or similar approval:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notwithstanding any development approval all Stage 1A public domain alignments, fixtures, materials and finishes for Council parks and footpaths are subject to final Council approval. Submission (to Council) of fully resolved Public Domain Construction Drawings in accordance with the requirement of the <i>Parramatta Public Domain Guidelines (refer PPDG Section 2.3 and 2.4)</i> is required prior to any CC approval. <p>The following submission information must be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Detailed finished spot levels and refined contour design for all pavements. b) <u>Longitudinal sections</u>: - Long sections cut along property boundaries. The longitudinal public footpath gradient must remain smooth and continuous. If local level changes are required to suit zero lot building finished floor levels and building entry points the transition must be handled within the private development site. c) <u>Civil cross sections</u> (building to building) at 20m intervals and at critical building interfaces (entries). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) surface levels and falls (refer PPDG Section 2.3 for compliance) ii) interface with adjacent buildings (beyond the project boundary line right up to the adjacent building façade) or adjoining surface finish; iii) basement car parking structure under any public domain area if and where appropriate, iv) adjacent building finished floor levels. d) <u>Access</u> design generally in accordance with DDA, AS1428 requirements and to the satisfaction of council's access consultant. |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|---|--|
| <p>with dimensions, materials, typical details etc, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • full resolved alignment plans. • Both the approved DA and VPA layout design and documentation should be fully coordinated and any subsequent adjacent stages (layout plans at 60% resolved design plus preliminary civil engineering design). | | <p>Access to parks should be inclusive and equitable. Where steps are used, graded walkways (min 1:20 grade) should be provided also. Use of ramps (1:14 grade) should be avoided or minimal.</p> <p>Access to buildings should be inclusive and equitable. Where steps are provided, graded walkways (min 1:20 grade) should be provided as well. Use of ramps (1:14 grade) should be avoided or minimal.</p> <p>e) <u>Soil volume calculations</u> demonstrating soil depth and volume compliance to ADG requirements for all plants planted on podium or basement. Soil depth calculations are to be based on soil fill material only - excluding any mulch and drainage layers.</p> <p>f) <u>Furniture Elements</u>: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the allocation of fixed bench seat types and other fixtures and fittings according to detailed design. Seats and benches with backrests and arm rests at minimum 30-50 distances are required for the Light Rail Plaza Park. Additional benches and seats without backrests and armrests are permitted. ii) Seats and benches to be accessible and comfortable, robust and vandal-proof with strong frames and battens, and materials must be to Council approval. For seats, benches and all other elements refer to the requirements of the PPDG (Sections 5.2). iii) Bin type – must conform to Council's waste management collection system requirements – to be resolved with Council officers. iv) Fixing details for all proposed furniture elements must be provided. <p>g) <u>Unit Paving</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Construction details in accordance with the relevant Council Standard details – DS 40-45 (except paving layout which may vary). ii) Jointing plans showing the co-ordination of all construction joints in the upper slab with the stone unit paving jointing over must be included. iii) For all unit paving areas - detailed paving layout and set-out plans are required to resolve detailed paving orientation/alignments and to minimise cut pavers at pram ramps, driveways and other fixtures. <p>h) <u>Inlet pit lids and frames</u> - High quality, heel safe, Class C load capacity is required for all pedestrianised areas. Cast iron or stainless-steel finishes should be included in unit paved areas. Drainage grates on an accessible path of travel and within common areas are to have slots or circular openings with a maximum width of 13mm. Slots are to be laid with the long dimension at right angles to the paths of travel.</p> <p>i) <u>Infill pit lids</u> – to match surrounding pavement type with no concrete surround in unit paved areas.</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>j) <u>Lighting levels</u> – to meet AS1158.3 design requirements.</p> <p>k) <u>Street light poles</u> – Endeavour Energy standard galvanised steel poles. Alignment and set-out to be shown.</p> <p>l) <u>Trees</u> – confirm proposed street tree strategy and species.</p> <p>The submission is required to be submitted to Council for approval prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate. The submission is to be provided to and approved by Council's Group Manager of Development and Traffic Services Unit (DTSU). Reason: To ensure achievement of high-quality public domain, which will be the long term assets of Council, are compliant with Council standards and policies.</p> <p>2. Pre and post sealant applications are required for all stone pavements prior to the issuing of any Occupation Certificate by Council. A natural look penetrating sealant is to be specified. The applicant will need to provide test results (after applying paving sealant) to prove all pavement material and finishes used in Telopea are non-slip surfaces that comply with a V5 rating (according to AS4586:2013) in both wet and dry conditions. Details of this are to be provided to Council for its records. Reason: to ensure a consistent sealant treatment of stone pavement is used across Council's public domain assets.</p> <p>3. Notwithstanding any approval of DA drawings, the number, species and size of trees proposed for Council owned public places is subject to Council review and refinement in consultation with Council officers. Final tree species for public streets and parks to be approval by Council.</p> <p>4. All trees supplied must be grown in accordance with AS2303:2018 (Tree stock for landscape use). Certification is to be forwarded to the Principal Certifying Authority upon completion of the planting, certifying the trees have been grown in accordance with AS2303:2018. A copy of this certificate is to be forwarded to Council with the relevant Occupation Certificate. The requirements for height, calliper and branch clearance for street trees should be in accordance with AS2303:2018. Reason: To minimise plant failure rate and ensure quality of stock utilised.</p> <p>5. A structural pavement system is required around proposed trees in paved areas in the public footway and publicly accessible pedestrian areas to mitigate against soil compaction and to maximise aeration and porosity in the tree root zone. Suitable systems include suspended concrete slabs or structural cells such as strata cells. Granular structural soil is not acceptable.</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Tree grates may be required depending on the detailed design of the selected pavement structure system. The base of all tree pits will need to incorporate a drainage layer and pipe that connects to nearest stormwater pit and must be shown on the Public Domain Construction Drawings. The invert level of the storm water pit receiving the drainage water from the tree pits is also to be shown on the Public Domain Construction Drawings. Documentary evidence of compliance with these requirements is to be confirmed in the Public Domain Construction Drawings and submitted to and approved by Council's DTSU Manager prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure high quality street trees are provided.</p> <p>6. An automatic irrigation system is to be provided to all trees and understorey planting in parks and streets. Irrigation design information is to be provided in the Public Domain Construction Drawings.</p> <p>Reason: To provide best conditions to achieve healthy, thriving, long-lived trees in Telopea.</p> <p><u>Concept Area – The Core – Not addressed</u> Council's concerns in relation to the public domain have not been addressed by the RTS, specific concerns relate to:</p> <p>a) <u>Inconsistencies</u> - The drawing sets provided in the RTS show inconsistencies which indicate the design is still not final and/or fully coordinated across disciplines. For example proposed tree retention and proposed public open space (ref Appendices E & L).</p> <p>b) <u>Lack of adequate information</u> - The orderly delivery of land development via separate DAs in the Core Area relies on rigorously resolved holistic master planning and certainty of site wide design outcomes to inform assessment of incremental DAs submissions. Therefore clarity is required in relation to the proposed building levels, stormwater design, deep soil, groundwater movement, tree canopy networks, legible side wide strategies (WSUD, services, dual reticulation, cycle and bus connections), ground level setbacks and consistent and legible public domain outcomes. Detailed levels interfaces between sites need to be addressed now so that potential problems and undesirable outcomes are not forced down the line for surrounding development. For example typical street sections shown at Appendix I are depicted flat which does not realistically convey complex site and project conditions. This level of information is not satisfactory to support future assessment of individual DA's</p> <p><i>Information requirements</i></p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional design documentation is required to satisfactorily support future incremental delivery of land via separate development applications for the Core including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Site wide bus, pedestrian and cycle connection</u> strategy diagrams. b. <u>Whole of street front and rear building setbacks</u> diagrams. c. Diagram clarifying proposed road reservations, carriageway and footway (kerb to boundary line) widths for all streets. d. <u>Site-wide deep soil/basement plan</u> diagram confirming deep soil setbacks at front and rear of lots (coordinated with the building setback diagram). e. <u>Indicative building finished floor levels</u> to inform assessment of interfaces between submitted DAs and future undeveloped sites. 2. A comprehensive subdivision DA submission for all streets and public places in the Core Area to inform assessment of incremental development applications (to be approved before any single site DA approval can be made) including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Full engineering grading plans (already provided). o Integrated services designs. o Regular street cross sections at 20m intervals for all streets showing existing and proposed levels and interface to the adjacent properties (minimum 5m) showing indicative, not typical, sections. o Longitudinal sections o Existing trees fully contained within contiguous deep soil zones (ie full drip line). o Public Domain finishes and embellishment in accordance with the requirement of the Parramatta Public Domain Guidelines (refer Chapter 2 for submission requirements and Chapters 3 to 6 for design requirements). o Soil strategy <p>Refer Appendix B for recommended design controls relating to the Concept Area – The Core and Precincts</p> |
| 5.2 Public domain improvements directly adjacent to development sites should be included as Conditions of Consent of any approval and not be part of local contributions or the VPA. | This is not agreed to by the Proponent. The proposed public domain improvements are considered well above the average streetscape expectations for a residential development. Overall, the streets have been designed to have noticeable public benefits | <p>Not addressed, recommended conditions of consent as above</p> <p>As per Council's submission, upgrades to the public domain are delivered via a condition of an approved development application and extends from the site boundary and or building entry to the kerb and for the full length of the site's street(s) frontage. Public domain works beyond the approved DA scope of work are typically delivered by the Planning Agreement.</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|-----------------|
| | and are vital to the overall public domain strategy for the CPA (refer to Appendix E). Public domain improvements include street furniture, public art installations, cycle ways and generous street tree planting for connected canopies and shade. | |

Table 3. Open Space

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|--|
| 6. Open Space | | |
| <p>6.1 A plan of for all proposed open space to be dedicated to Council should be submitted which clearly indicates the extent of dedication to Council and aligns with the proposed subdivision plan, landscape and basement plans. All open space to be dedicated to Council shall demonstrate that there is no basement encroachment.</p> | <p>A Dedication Plan (DA01.MP.11 Rev 2) was prepared by Hassell. This plan has been amended to reflect the refinements to the design as part of the Submissions Report Package and can be found enclosed in Appendix T.</p> | <p>Partially addressed, subject to inclusion of Council's recommended conditions</p> <p>Council is satisfied that there is no basement encroachment under the Neighbourhood park.</p> <p>Appendix S – Subdivision Plans are inconsistent with Appendix T, whereby separate lots are not shown for the neighbourhood park, arrival plaza or pocket parks on Shortland and Sturt Streets. Council requests that revised Subdivision Plans are resubmitted, however if DPE wish to proceed without amended plans, Council recommends the following be conditioned as part of any future approval for the SSD Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to Stage 1A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All land to be dedicated to Council should be shown on a Subdivision Plan as a separate lot (should also be zoned as RE1 to reflect intended landuse), including the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neighbourhood Park; and ▪ Arrival Plaza. • In relation to Concept Plan area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All land to be dedicated to Council should be shown on a Subdivision Plan as a separate lot (should also be zoned as RE1 to reflect intended landuse), including the: ○ Sturt Street Pocket Park; ○ Shortland Street Pocket Park; ○ Community courtyard (between New Marshall Road and Wade Lane) |
| <p>6.2. Council design recommendations shall be incorporated for the Neighbourhood Park and Arrival Plaza prior to any approval and VPA agreement as outlined in the Technical Assessment at Attachment B.6</p> | <p>This is noted by the Proponent and forms part of current VPA negotiations. As part of the refined design, it is confirmed that a 2,200sqm Hilltop Neighbourhood Park is proposed to be dedicated to Council. In response to Council's comments on the Hilltop</p> | <p>Partially addressed, subject to inclusion of Council's recommended conditions</p> <p>In relation to the Arrival Plaza, Council supports the majority of design amendments. Council recommends the following be conditioned as part of any future approval for the Light Rail Arrival Plaza:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to any construction works commencing or the issuing of a Construction Certificate, a revised landscape plan and construction drawings be submitted to Council. The plans must be prepared by a suitably qualified designer and submitted to Council for approval by the Manager Open Space & Natural Resources or delegate. The landscape plan must address Council's concerns (but not be limited to) the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consolidation of the garden beds and 'opening up' the centre of the park by expansion of the lawn area and redesigning the pathway network; b) Removal of the pump track, c) Inclusion of detailed design drawings that will be used for construction, |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|---|
| | Neighbourhood Park – lists a number of changes. | <p>d) Reconfiguration of the playground and multi-use court to avoid conflict with any shade canopy structure and garden beds,</p> <p>e) Landings need to be provided at the top of all stairs,</p> <p>f) Tree protection measures consistent with conditions of this development consent.</p> <p>g) All dedicated open space will require a minimum 2 year maintenance period by the applicant following completion of each stage</p> <p>In relation to the neighbourhood park, Council supports the majority of amendments to the design including the inclusion of shelters, BBQ facilities and benches and removal of water feature. Council requests the following be conditioned as part of any future approval for the Hilltop Neighbourhood Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to any construction works commencing or the issuing of a Construction Certificate, a revised landscape plan and construction drawings be submitted to Council. The plans must be prepared by a suitably qualified designer and submitted to Council for approval by the Manager Open Space & Natural Resources or delegate. The landscape plan must address Council's concerns (but not be limited to) the following: • Increase turfed areas / reduce garden beds to maximise useable open space and reduce ongoing maintenance burden • Removal of all play equipment, • Include detailed design drawings that will be used for construction, • Tree protection measures consistent with conditions of this development consent. • All dedicated open space will require a minimum 2 year maintenance period by the applicant following completion of each stage |
| 6.3 The community/ library courtyard space shall increase in size to include Church courtyard and removal of Sturt St pocket park. | This is noted by the Proponent and forms part of current VPA negotiations. | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>Refer Section 7.2 of original submission.</p> |
| 6.4 Council supports a public shareway or laneway between New Marshall Road and Benaud Lane. | This is noted by the Proponent. | <p>Not addressed, request amended plans or recommended conditions of consent</p> <p>As outlined in Council's submission, Council does not support open space between New Marshall Road and Benaud Lane for a number of reasons. A better outcome for this area is to maintain it as a public shareway or laneway dedicated to Council to reflect its primary 'access' purpose and accommodate additional street parking. <u>Council requests that the applicant submit revised drawings to reflect this or the DPE condition this as part of any approval.</u></p> |

Table 4. Traffic and Transport

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|---|---|
| 7. Traffic and Transport | | |
| <p>7.1 That the Stage 1A scheme be revised to include additional visitor parking in line with RMS standards and Council DCP.</p> | <p>The proposed DCP residential visitor parking rate of 1 space per 5 dwellings is not considered appropriate nor sustainable in the context of the Precinct. Regarding this, it is noted that the TfNSW (formerly RMS) Guide states the following: <i>“Councils may wish to reduce this requirement for buildings located in close proximity to public transport, or where short-term unit leasing is expected.”</i> Telopea qualifies for such consideration, being immediately adjacent to the new Parramatta Light Rail (PLR) stop that is also well supported by bus services.</p> | <p>Not addressed The visitor parking shortfall has not been addressed. Refer to Council Submission, Section 8.2 Parking and Access for original comment. Council considers that those centres which qualify for reduced visitor parking rate are generally those strategic or major centres with significant interchanges such as the Parramatta CBD or Epping, not Telopea. Council Officers are aware there are significant issues currently within Telopea arising with existing residents and a high demand for on-street car parking due to increasing number of residential flat building development and insufficient visitor car parking.</p> |
| <p>7.2 Stage 1A must prepare a Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP), including management of construction worker vehicles and parking, prior to the commencement of the works in consultation with Council's Traffic and Transport Manager.</p> | <p>This is accepted by the Proponent and is recommended as a condition of consent.</p> | <p>Addressed as condition of consent</p> |



| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|---|
| 7.3 Stage 1A and all future development stages of the Concept Plan submit a Green Travel Plan. | This is accepted by the Proponent and is recommended as a condition of consent. | Addressed as condition of consent |
| 7.4 That Stage 1A be amended to remove car parking access via Winter Street and sole basement car park access be via new internal road. | An amended parking access has been provided as part of the overall refinements to the project. | Addressed |
| 7.5 Incorporate Council recommended amendments (detailed in Attachment B) to proposed road network changes and either be agreed with Council Officers prior to development approval being granted or conditions be imposed requiring Council endorsements of amended plans prior to construction commencing. | In response to the traffic recommendations from Council, a list of refinements are proposed. | <p>Recommended amendments to Stage 1A - Not addressed</p> <p>In Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 7.1, detailed traffic comments were provided on Stage 1A in relation to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Raised Crossings</i> • <i>Pedestrian Refuge Islands</i> • <i>Cycleways</i> • <i>Parking Bays</i> • <i>Wade/Mews/Sturt Intersection Design and Mews Street General Comments</i> • <i>Adderton Road</i> • <i>Other intersections</i> <p>These matters have not been addressed and remain outstanding.</p> <p>Recommended amendments to Telopea Concept Plan Area – Not addressed. In Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 7.2, Council provided detailed traffic comments on the Telopea Concept Plan Area. These matters have not been addressed and remain outstanding. The following comments are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Warrant Assessment has not been undertaken for the provision of Traffic Control Signals. This is not acceptable to Council. A warrant assessment must be undertaken prior to approval of this development as this will have significant design implications. All traffic signals proposed at intersections are subject to meeting TfNSW's warrants (ref. TfNSW Traffic Signal Design Guide Section 2 Warrants). Approval will also need to be obtained from Council and TfNSW under Parramatta's Traffic Committee process. |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Although the kerb returns at intersections have been revised to accommodate vehicles, the approach taken at Sturt/Marshall/Manson where the right turn bays have been removed is not acceptable. Furthermore, it is noted that an amended SIDRA model was provided for the Sturt/Marshall/Manson intersection, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A Phasing Summary must be provided for further review b) It is considered likely that these signals will be linked with the one at Adderton/New Link Road intersection due to its close proximity. The SIDRA model should be amended to link to the signals at Adderton Road and cycle time also needs to be amended to 120 seconds. c) It is unclear whether pedestrian protection on all approaches has been accounted for in the model. <p>The lack of right turn bays particularly on Sturt Street will cause delays and queuing at this intersection which can also adversely impact Adderton Road/New Link Road intersection. Pedestrian protection on all approaches will result in all vehicles being blocked should a vehicle be wanting to turn left or right at the stop line due to the red arrow hold. Any right turning vehicles filtering through the intersection will also block any through/left turning movements. These can all increase delays and queuing on Sturt Street/New Link Road which is part of a bus route.</p> <p>A preliminary signs and line marking plan has been provided. This is acceptable, however approval will be required post development through the Traffic Committee process and the following minor corrections addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Plans should be amended to show what parking restrictions are proposed. b) 'Give Way' signs at a number of intersections appears to be set too far back from the intersection (e.g. Sturt Street, Wade Street, Marshall Street, etc.) c) 'No Stopping' signs at some intersections are missing the arrow pointing to the other side. This is to be amended. d) At Adderton/New Link Road intersection, it is recommended a 'Do Not Queue Across Intersection' sign be installed on New Link Road on approach to the signals to advise drivers to not queue across the light rail track. e) At New Link Road/Sturt/Mews intersection, an additional 'No Entry' and 'Left Only' sign should be installed on the western side of Mews Street |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inconsistencies noted in the landscape plans have still not been resolved and should be addressed prior to approval. <p><i>Eyles Street Pedestrian Spine - Not addressed</i> The Civil Plans show raised thresholds at all intersecting roads through the Eyles Street Pedestrian Spine. Raised thresholds should not be provided unless they are signposted and linemarked as raised pedestrian crossings and meet the relevant design standards (AS 1742.13, Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4 and Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 8). Furthermore, The Traffic Report still does not comment on the forecasted pedestrian volumes to confirm if Council's interim warrants will be met as stated in Council's previous submission. Should the pedestrian volumes be too low, alternative pedestrian facilities through the Eyles Street Pedestrian Spine would need to be explored. These matters should be addressed prior to approval being granted.</p> <p><i>Bus Stop and Parking – Not addressed</i> Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 7.2. These matters have not been addressed and remain outstanding, except for Council's recommendation below which has generally been agreed to by the applicant. This recommendation should be provided as a condition with any DA approval:</p> <p>'All parking bays are to have time restricted parking to ensure that residents do not park in these spaces all day and that visitors have places to park. The parking bays are also not to be line marked as this restricts capacity. The parking bays are to be designed in accordance with AS2890.5-2020.'</p> <p><i>Wade Street – Not addressed</i> The Civil plans have been adjusted to have the median island in Wade Street start after the pedestrian crossing points at Sturt Street and Shortland Street. This is not a desirable approach as pedestrians will use the projection of the median island as a make-shift refuge island which is not safe. The design for Wade Street will need to be revised to ensure that if a median island is provided in the road that refuge islands which comply with TfNSW Technical Directions are integrated into it.</p> <p>Furthermore, the location of the crossing point in Wade Street at Shortland Street is well clear of the pedestrian desire line. As such, it is unlikely for pedestrians to</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>use this facility and are more likely to cross the road closer to Shortland Street in their direct path of travel. As noted above regarding the revised positioning of the median island on Wade Street, the approach taken to resolve this concern is not acceptable. Refuge islands provided on Wade Street should comply with TfNSW Technical Directions.</p> <p><i>Evans Road – Not addressed</i> It is still unclear when the staged upgrades at Pennant Hills Road and Evans Road intersection will occur and the proposed construction timeline. As mentioned previously, this intersection is considered critical to provide improved regional connections to the growing Telopea precinct and priority should be given at this location.</p> <p><i>SIDRA Modelling – Not addressed</i> Evans Road and Shortland Street intersection SIDRA modelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed signalisation will impact parking and access for the local residents and businesses in this area. Consultation is required with the affected residents and businesses. It is unclear why a pedestrian refuge island is proposed on Shortland Street, east of Benaud Lane given that there is a signalised pedestrian crossing approx. 40m east of this location. It is recommended that this refuge island be removed to encourage pedestrians to use the signalised crossing. Note that the pedestrian refuge will also need to meet the relevant warrants. A kerb ramp is required on the northern side of Shortland Street, west of Benaud Lane These signals will also need to meet TfNSW traffic signal warrants and approval from TfNSW. The intersection is to be designed to accommodate 12.5m HRVs. <p>Adderton Road and Manson Street intersection SIDRA modelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are concerns with sight distance to these signals for SB vehicles on Adderton Road due to the bend over the railway bridge. It is recommended that 'Prepare to Stop Traffic Signals' with flashing lanterns be installed on approach to these signals to increase driver awareness. This will require consultation with affected residents and businesses. There appears to be insufficient footpath widths behind the kerb ramps on Manson Street. |

Table 5. Tree Management

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| 8. Tree Management | | |
| <p>Council has reviewed Appendix V1 Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement – Telopea Stage 1 and 1A Revision B prepared by Naturally Trees dated 18 June, 2021. The report recommends removal of a significant proportion of high value trees within this stage without providing any reasonable justification to suggest the development impacts have been adequately assessed in their entirety.</p> <p>In Attachment A, Section 8 of Council's submission, the application was requested to make a number of amendments to the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement.</p> | <p>Amendments were not required to the existing Arboricultural Impact Appraisal. It is noted that the original Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement considered the architectural plans, civil documentation, stormwater and services documentation and landscape documentation.</p> | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>The application has not addressed any of the recommendations made in Attachment A, Section 8 of Council's submission. The level of reporting provided is not considered satisfactory. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised documentation results in greater tree loss yet the application maintains amendments are not required to the original Arboricultural Impact Appraisal. • Inconsistency between the arboricultural reporting, landscape and civil documentation regarding tree removal/tree retention are present. • These inconsistencies must be resolved so that the extent of tree removal requested for approval can be clearly understood and assessed. An example can be provided for review between the following plans: <div data-bbox="1106 751 1644 1070">  </div> <p>Appendix K2, Drawing No. HSL_MP_L_1001, Landscape Plans (red dots indicate trees recommended for removal in either the arborist report or Civil plans)</p> <div data-bbox="1106 1078 1644 1383">  </div> <p>Appendix I, Drawing No. 110500-04-DA800, Tree Removal Plan Sheet 1. The yellow dots show the same trees shown in red in the landscape plans.</p> |


| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | |  | <p>Appendix V1 Arborist Telopea Concept Plan and Stage 1A (submitted with EIS), TMP01 B, Arborist Report indicate the same trees. Red numbering is used for trees proposed to be removed and black numbering for trees to be retained. In this excerpt, all trees located within the light rail plaza are proposed to be removed but this is not reflected in the landscape and civil plans.</p> |
| | | <p><i>Refer Table 4 - Section 4.6 above in relation to Stage 1A tree retention matters.</i></p> | |

Table 6. Social Impacts

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------|--|--|
| 9. Social Impacts | | | | | |
| As in the SIA, Council recommends that detailed design of future project stages continues to take a 'tenure blind' approach, with no external indicators of tenure type. | Tenure blind approach will be taken by not allocating specific blocks, buildings, facilities or spaces to a particular housing tenure and provides the same design quality for public, communal and private domains across the area. | Addressed The approach of not allocating specific blocks, buildings, facilities or spaces to a particular housing tenure is supported. | | | |
| Further details of how the Connecting with Country strategy will be responded to in future development is requested. | The Connecting with Country strategy provides project specific considerations for the Concept Plan with particular recommendations for Stage 1A incorporated into the landscape plans. | Not addressed It is requested the application detail the particular project specific Telopea Design Considerations recommended by the Fulcrum Agency to be implemented, at what stage, and process to monitor and report on implementation. | | | |
| Stage 1A be revised to adjust bedroom mix and inclusion of adaptable units in line with the Parramatta DCP 2011. | The current mix of dwellings is consistent with the design guidelines prepared by Bates Smart and Hassell. | Not addressed Where the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 is silent, the Parramatta DCP (PDCP) 2011 Dwelling Mix should be treated as a guide for dwelling mix provision in Telopea. The Bates Smart and Hassell Guidelines significantly departs from the PDCP 2011 as shown in the table below. | | | |
| | | | PDCP 2011 Dwelling Mix | Telopea Stage 1 A Dwelling Mix <i>(green depicts compliance, red depicts noncompliance)</i> | Number of units per bedroom number required to comply with PDCP dwelling mix |
| | | One bedroom | 10-20% | 39% (1,265) | 648 (20%) |
| | | Two Bedroom | 60-75% | 57% (1,873%) | 2,592 (70%) |
| | | Three Bedroom | 10-20% | 4% (120) | 300 (10%) |
| | | Total | | 3,704 | 3,704 |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The PDCP 2011 aims to provide equitable access to new housing that caters to different household types and people with particular housing needs (such as elderly, people with disability, low income groups).</p> <p>Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census of Population and Housing data shows that in 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least 9% of households had 5 or more persons in Telopea, with 24.5% of households comprised of four or more persons. Household sizes have increased since 2016, with the proportion of households with one lone person decreasing 16%. • Private dwellings in Telopea demonstrates that currently 80% of lone households, 93% of couples with no children, 88% of group households and 100% of one parent family, couples with children, and other families live in two or more-bedroom dwellings. <p>Council's original recommendations, that Stage 1A dwelling mix be revised adjust bedroom mix and inclusion of adaptable units in line with the Parramatta DCP 2011 have not been addressed and remain outstanding.</p> |
| Staging of the Concept Plan shall not disrupt continuous service of the existing Dundas Library and Neighbourhood Centre until such time a new Library and Community facility is operational. | This is noted and accepted and forms part of current VPA negotiations. | Noted and Council's position remains. |

Table 7: Sustainability and Biodiversity

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| 10. Sustainability Council requests the application commits to or demonstrates compliance with Council's requirements on the following sustainability matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure future buildings are Electric Vehicle (EV) ready • Ensure future development will have dual piping facilities installed in accordance with Council's requirements • Urban heat (development satisfy Council's DCP requirements for urban heat island effect mitigation strategies) • Commit to Council's recommended BASIX (Building Sustainability Index) targets | | |
| | Wording of the draft DCP in relation to sustainability requirements is fundamentally disagreed with, however: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • buildings including Stage 1A will be future proofed and have allowances for EV charging capabilities. • all buildings including Stage 1A will be future proofed and have allowances for EV charging capabilities Have advised that ongoing discussion are occurring with Sydney Water to confirm if dual piping is feasible on site and can be serviced. | <p>Not addressed, recommended conditions of consent</p> <p>The following conditions are recommended for installation of dual reticulation systems:</p> <p>Stage 1A conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to Stage 1A development that prior to CC stage, a dual reticulation (dual pipe) system is to be installed of sufficient size and capacity to supply all potable and non-potable water uses for the building, including cooling towers, and a single connection point at the boundary of the site for connection to a future recycled water scheme. In relation to Stage 1A development that prior to CC stage, it must be demonstrated that the building is to capture rainwater and provide sufficient storage for reuse of no less than 92% of the typical annual rainfall falling on the building's roof for non-drinking water uses through the dual reticulation system. In relation to Stage 1A development that prior to CC stage, the development shall confirm that all cooktops are induction type. <p>For the Concept Plan Area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to the Concept Plan Area, that future development applications demonstrate that dual piping is provided for each apartment and mixed use building in accordance with the requirements of the Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011. In relation to the Concept Plan Area, that future development application address the urban heat controls contained in the Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011. In relation to the Concept Plan Area, that future development demonstrates that all cooktops are induction type. <p>The following conditions are recommended for Stage 1A and Concept Plan Area for EV ready development:</p> <p>Prior to the issue of the relevant construction certificate, the following must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the certifying authority:</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>a) All multi-unit residential car parking must provide an EV Ready Connection to each and every space allocated to residents. An EV Ready Connection is the provision of a cable tray and a dedicated spare 30A circuit provided in an EV Distribution Board to enable easy future installation of cabling from an EV charger to the EV Distribution Board and a circuit breaker to feed the circuit.</p> <p>b) Provide EV Distribution Board(s) in of sufficient size to allow connection of all EV Ready Connections.</p> <p>c) Locate EV Distribution board(s) so that no future EV Ready Connection will require a cable of more than 50m from the parking bay to connect.</p> <p>d) Each EV Ready Connection is served from a cable tray and a dedicated spare 30A circuit provided in an EV Distribution Board to enable easy future installation of cabling from an EV charger to the EV Distribution Board and a circuit breaker to feed the circuit.</p> <p>e) EV Distribution Boards are to be dedicated to EV charging that is capable of supplying not less than 50% of EV connections at full power at any one time during off-peak periods, to ensure impacts of maximum demand are minimised. To deliver this, the distribution board will be complete with an EV Load Management System and an active suitably sized connection to the main switchboard.</p> <p>f) EV Load Management System is to be capable of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading real time current and energy from the electric vehicle chargers under management; • Determining, based on known installation parameters and real time data, the appropriate behaviour of each EV charger to minimise building peak power demand whilst ensuring electric vehicles connected are full recharged; • Scale to include additional chargers as they are added to the site over time. |
| 11. Biodiversity | | |
| Further justification is required as to why a Biodiversity Offsets Scheme is not triggered and a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report is not required | Further details are incorporated into the BDAR waiver prepared by ACS Environmental and Urbis | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>The application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report waiver request (Appendix Y). Council notes this request needs to be approved by the Planning Agency Head and the Environment Agency Head. Given that the current DA proposes to remove a significant amount of vegetation that is native to NSW, a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report appears to be warranted as per Council's original submission.</p> |
| A Biodiversity Management Plan be prepared and accompany future | This is not agreed to. A Biodiversity Development | |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| development applications for the Concept Area. | Assessment Report (BDAR) waiver has been prepared and accompanies this report as Appendix Y which expands on the outcomes of the Biodiversity Assessment provided as Appendix U of the EIS. | <p>Recommended Condition - Tree removal</p> <p>A number of trees proposed for removal have also been identified to contain hollows or are otherwise occupied by native fauna e.g. nests and is a key threatening process. The following is recommended to be included as a condition of development consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The removal of trees containing hollows must be offset through the installation of nestboxes with pre-clearance surveys required to minimise the potential for injury to wildlife. These mitigation measures should be guided by a Biodiversity Management Plan (or similar) e.g. number / type / location of nestboxes. |

Table 8: Contamination, Drainage and Catchment Management, Waste

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|---|---|
| 12. Contamination | | |
| <p>12.1 It is recommended that City of Parramatta Council (CoPC) Contaminated Land Policy and Procedure is considered and referenced for each stage of development.</p> <p>12.2 The applicant prepare detailed site investigation (DSI) covering soil, groundwater and subsurface gas is prepared prior to the release and approval of each stage of the development to inform potential risks to human health and the environment in the context of overall redevelopment of the site. A copy of all contamination reports, remediation action plans and validation reports be provided to Council for stakeholder review and comment.</p> <p>12.3 The applicant prepare a detailed site investigation for all land proposed for dedication as parks and open space to identify any potential areas of concern with respect to contamination and inform a conceptual site model (CSM). The DSI must inform potential</p> | <p>Various responses</p> | <p>Recommended conditions of consent</p> <p>It is recommended that DPE condition any approval to ensure consistency with Council's technical recommendations made in its submission refer Section 12.</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|---|
| <p>risks to human health and the environment in the context of open space and recreational landuse.</p> <p>12.4 It is recommended that the applicant appoint an NSW EPA accredited site auditor to independently review all detailed site investigation reports, remediation action plans and validation actions prepared for each stage of the Development.</p> <p>12.5 A Site Audit Statement must verify that each stage of the land release is suitable for any specified use or range of uses, what management is required before the land is suitable for any specified use or range of uses and identify the person or authority responsible for current and any ongoing and future management of land contamination and remediation within each stage the project precinct.</p> | | |
| 13. Drainage and Catchment Management | | |
| <p>The application shall demonstrate how the development complies with Council's Local Floodplain Risk Management Policy, Parramatta LEP 2011 and</p> | <p>The Flood Assessment prepared by BG&E as part of the SSDA Package made reference to the controls within the Parramatta LEP, Parramatta City Council</p> | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>For the private domain and for the core and precincts, a water management strategy must be prepared demonstrating application of Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) to achieve the water quality and environmental targets described in DCP 2011. This should be based primarily on integration with the landscape and not rely on proprietary 'end of pipe' treatment devices. Private and public domain water management and WSUD strategy must be combined and must be</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|---|
| DCP 2011 and NSW Floodplain Development Manual dated April 2005. The Flood Assessment Report shall be updated in accordance with Attachment B . | Floodplain Risk Management Policy and Parramatta DCP. The addendum flood report provides additional information in response to Council's submission. | modelled for the precinct as a whole using MUSIC software or equivalent. This should form part of the Masterplan. Water Management for individual lots and sub precincts will then be able to be designed as a subset of this Masterplan. Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 13.1 (a) – (m) . These matters have not been addressed. |
| The Integrated Water Management Plan should be updated in accordance with to Attachment B . | No response | Not addressed Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 13.2 (a) – (e) . These matters have not been addressed. |
| A full DRAINS model will be prepared. | Not provided | Not addressed DRAINS model must be provided for stormwater design along with sub-catchment plan. Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 13.3 (a) – (f) . These matters have not been addressed. |
| The development shall comply with the water quality treatment measurements and targets contained in the Telopea DCP section on Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD). An electronic copy of MUSIC Model is required. | No response | Not addressed Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 13.3 (a) – (f) . These matters have not been addressed. MUSIC Model needs to be provided for stormwater design along with a sub-catchment plan. |
| Matters relating to the assessment and design of Stage 1A shall comply with Council's requirements in Attachment B . | No response | Not addressed Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 13.5 (a) – (d) . These matters have not been addressed. |
| Matters relating to hand over of future Council owned assets shall comply with Council's | No response | Not addressed Please refer to Council's submission, Attachment B, Section 13.7 (d) – (j) . These matters are required at completion of project and prior to handover to Council. |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|--|--|--|
| requirements outline in Attachment B . | | |
| 14. Waste management | | |
| Stage 1A development is required to increase the footprint of the waste holding area to accommodate a 60L/dwelling per week generation rate for recycling. | <p>According to Section 4.0 Residential Flat Buildings of the City of Parramatta Council Waste Management Guidelines for new Development Application 2016 waste generation rates are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80L/dwelling/week generation rate for Garbage • 40L/dwelling/week generation rate for Recycling <p>These waste generation rates have been adopted and are therefore compliant.</p> | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>Council is in the process of amending its waste guidelines to reflect a 60L/dwelling/week generation rate for recycling (this will be operational prior to this development being realised). A 60L waste generation rate is required to ensure consistency with our waste guidelines and will ensure best practise and adequate recycling capacity for the occupants in the future.</p> |
| The application is to provide further details in relation to waste truck access to Stage 1A as detailed in Technical Assessment at Attachment B . | <p>Access for waste vehicles (up to 12.5m HRV) can enter Stage 1A via the basement entrance and can enter and exit in a forward motion via the use of a turntable. Turntables are permitted under relevant Australian Standards and is used within Greater Sydney and elsewhere in CoP.</p> <p>Conversely, to design for a 12.5m HRV truck to enter in a forward direction, manoeuvre</p> | <p>Not addressed</p> <p>Council requires trucks to be able to enter and exit in a forward motion within a 3 point turn. From the provided plans, it is not clear whether the waste holding area is located sub-street level. Further detail is required to understand the access, as access into areas below street level is generally not supported. Council also requires 4.5M clearance height throughout the truck's entire travel path. All paths travelled by a waste truck will need to be rated to support a 25t vehicle.</p> <p>The use of turn tables is not supported in Parramatta for the function of waste collection, irrespective of where turntables are used in other locations, noting councils have different waste requirements and controls.</p> <p>It is incorrectly assumed the waste collection vehicles would only be occasionally visiting the site. The vehicles are required to access the site up to 6 times a week to perform the waste collection function.</p> |

| Council Submission - Recommendation (November 2021) | Response to Submissions Report (April 2022) | Council Comment |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>on-site for loading and then exit in a forward direction would result in a significant impact/poor design outcomes for development for a vehicle that only occasionally requires access to the site.</p> <p>Further information is enclosed in the Traffic and Parking Addendum Report.</p> | <p>The location of the bulky waste room is not acceptable. The proposed location presents an operational challenge where bulky waste will need to be navigated passed bins in the garbage holding area as bulky waste is collected on the same day as the garbage and recycling bins. The bulky waste room requires a separate access and not through the garbage holding room.</p> |