

13 March 2026

Kevin Pillay
Senior Development Manager IRT

Dear Kevin

RE: SSSA architectural response for 2-4 Popes Road Woonona NSW 2517

Calderflower have prepared the following commentary in response to the issues raised during the SSSA assessment and together with IRT's comments and feedback on the recently tabled potential amendments to the masterplan.

Calderflower expect that advice will be received from consultants regarding the heritage, stormwater, and town planning as well as QS costing. We expect that with this information IRT will be able to instruct the project team to proceed accordingly with the preferred response to the Department.

In summary, and following commentary received from IRT, Calderflower have prepared the following table of comments.

Category	Comment/ Objection	Architectural response (Calderflower Architects) and agreed actions
DPHI-2-Architectural Plans	Appendix B to the RIS does not include all architectural drawings listed on the cover sheet. This includes (but may not be limited to) A330.3 Building C Elevations, A801 Materials, A900 Photomontage. The Department requests that a complete drawing set is submitted.	A complete set of drawings has been provided- refer IRT WOONONA SSSA Transmittal 260305 attached.
DPHI-3-Architectural Plans	Drawing A702 does not appear to identify the number of units that receive no direct sunlight (less than 2 minutes) mid-winter, as per Objective 4A-1(3) of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). The Department requests the drawing be revised to include this analysis.	Refer updated drawing A702 Rev G
DPHI-4-Parking	As per Schedule 4(4) of the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i> (Housing SEPP), drawing A100 should also clearly state the number of ILU, RCF and visitor parking spaces that are either accessible (AS2890.6) or 3.2m wide.	Drawing has been updated to reflect the information requested-Refer updated drawing A100 Rev G
DPHI-5-Parking	As per Schedule 4(4) of the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i> (Housing SEPP), drawing A100 should also clearly state the number of ILU, RCF and visitor parking spaces that are either accessible (AS2890.6) or 3.2m wide.	Drawing has been updated to reflect the information requested-Refer updated drawing A100 Rev G

Traffic and Transport	Staff bicycle spaces and end of trip facilities are a requirement in the Wollongong City Council DCP Chapter E3 and a recommendation in the TIA, which will assist in reaching GTP targets and objectives. However, these facilities have not been shown on the plans.	Action: Staff bicycle spaces and end of trip facilities will be added to the drawings per Council DCP. Refer A100 Rev G, A300.2 Rev G
Traffic and Transport	Bicycle parking spaces for staff need to be provided within secure cages with a self-closing door and combination keypad as required by AS2890.3.	Action: Secure cages with self-closing doors and combination keypads will be provide per AS2890.3 Refer A100 Rev G, A300.2 Rev G
Traffic and Transport	End of trip facilities need to be provided as per the requirements of Table 1 of Chapter E3 of the DCP.	Action: End of trip facilities to be provided on the revised drawings. Refer A100 Rev G, A300.2 Rev G
Traffic and Transport	Table 3 of the recently adopted Chapter E3 of the DCP requires additional van loading bays for parcel deliveries, uber eats, menu log etc. Based on the proposed GFA, and additional 2 x van loading bays need to be provided within the site.	Action: Van loading bays to be provided under the Porte Cochere and dedicated loading bays will be provide adjacent to the Porte Cochere as part of the on-grade parking Refer A101 Rev G
Design - Amenity, Safety & Sustainability	In relation to the waste management Plan, Wollongong City Council's Waste Team require the recycling generation rates to be increase to 80 litres of recycling per unit, 40 litres per unit FOGO. Accordingly, bin rooms will need to be increased in size.	Action: The waste management plan and floor plans will be updated to reflect the rates stated. Refer A407 Rev E
Design - Amenity, Safety & Sustainability	The Waste Team require recycling bins and FOGO bins to be provided on each floor above ground (in addition to the waste chutes proposed) to ensure that the waste streams are dealt with properly and not mixed. The current arrangements may result in residents putting recycling down the waste chutes.	This item is not supported for a development of this type. Additional waste rooms at each floor will potentially lead to safety, amenity and accessibility issues. The generation of odours, general hygiene and pest control issues would result in an inappropriate outcome. We propose maintaining the current strategy, which is aligned with operational best practices.
Basement Car Parking	A fully tanked basement design should be expected at this site due to proximity to a watercourse.	A fully tanked basement design will be implemented
Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character	The importance of the signalised pedestrian crossing across the Princes Hwy has not been highlighted in most of the site analysis documentation. This should be clearly illustrated and emphasised on all relevant documentation to ensure alignment of site entries and view corridors are appropriate.	Action: A note will be added to the site analysis documentation and other relevant drawings to highlight the signalised pedestrian crossing across the Princes Hwy. Refer A006 Rev G, A009 REV G, Refer A101 Rev G
Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character WCC-13-1	View Corridors and Built Form The applicant has responded that the existing building to be demolished obscured key views as a justification to Buildings D and E. The	Low level building such as the church, cafe and Port Cochere do not have significant impact the view to the escarpment. They do however obscure view to the neighbouring houses which is a positive outcome. The covered link between

	<p>significant view corridors are also considered relevant.</p> <p>The applicant is encouraged to consider improving view lines to the heritage building from the south of Princes Highway by potentially further setting back the north-eastern corner of Building D and increasing the front setback. Viewpoint 11 in the VIA shows the height and scale of Building D impeding all views to the Heritage item including roof forms that were previously visible despite the (now demolished) existing building.</p>	<p>Building C and the existing RAC is required for safe, accessible pedestrian movement between the buildings. Building D has been amended with the top floor set back on the northern side (opposite the Heritage item) Refer A340.2 Rev G</p>
<p>Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character WCC-13-2</p>	<p>View Corridors and Built Form</p> <p>The view corridor to the heritage building from the north of Princes Hwy is successful, however the applicant is encouraged to also improve view lines to the heritage building from the south of Princes Hwy by potentially cutting back the north-eastern corner of Building D and increasing the amount of open space to the south-eastern side of the heritage building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale to the ridgeline of the Church Building and retaining views both to the site from the Princes Highway and through the site west to the Illawarra Escarpment. • Buildings C and D are in close proximity to the Heritage item and will be highly visible from the public domain and impacts on the church building. The argument put forward in the Variation Statement that a reduction in building footprint has retained views to the Escarpment is not supported by the applicant's Visual Impact Analysis. • The Visual Impact Assessment: Urbain Group June 2025 shows short range views to the Escarpment and Church Building are significantly impacted by the proposed built form arrangement. • The height of Buildings D and E shall be more sympathetically designed to step down to the south and north respectively to three stories to better relate to the Heritage item. 	<p>The view from the southeastern side of the heritage building is an improvement to the existing location of buildings adjacent to the heritage building on the site. These buildings obscure the church when approaching from the southeast. Building D has been amended with the top floor set back on the northern side (opposite the Heritage item) - Refer view analysis Refer A340.2 Rev G</p>
<p>Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character</p>	<p>There is an existing substation located in the middle of the site. It is not clear where this will be relocated given the extent of the basement area proposed. The extent of basement carparking area remains a</p>	<p>The existing substation is to be decommissioned, and a new substation is being proposed.</p>

	<p>concern as this represents an unnecessarily large volume of soil to be removed. Combined with the known substantial flooding impacts at this location, this is a poor environmental outcome.</p>	<p>Action: The location of this new substation & main switch room will be shown on updated architectural drawings. Refer A101 Rev G, A201 REV G, A212 REV G Basement size: The size of the basement is appropriate for this type of development.</p>
Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character	<p>On architectural drawings A700-A700.1 it is difficult to identify the extent of shadows produced by the proposed buildings and differentiate them from the existing shadows produced by other surrounding dwellings. It is recommended that the graphic representation of the shadow diagrams be revised to clearly outline what shadows have occurred due to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Drawing A700 clearly shows existing shadows & proposed shadows on separate drawings. A700.1 shows the proposed shadows overlaid over the existing shadows and clearly indicates additional shadows, reduced shadows and no change to the shadows. Additional sun-eye drawings have been provided on A701 for each hour between 9am and 3pm in mid-winter. Action: Show outline of existing buildings (to be demolished) for further clarity Refer A700.1 Rev D</p>
Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character	<p>Interfaces and building separation with the western neighbouring properties have improved by relocating the internal roadway along the western boundary, however, the visual privacy sections provided on architectural drawings A213-A216 have been located in such a way that does not display how visual privacy or overlooking is to be mitigated. For example, in the section on drawing A213, the landscape buffer should be dimensioned and highlight what impact this would have on the overlooking concerns.</p>	<p>The location of Buildings A and B greatly improve the amenity of the neighbours to the west of the site as the existing building is located on the boundary with no set-back. The proposed setback exceeds they ADG guidelines of 6m by approx. 800mm. Action: Refer additional view analysis from Buildings A & B showing additional privacy screens & solid balustrade walls. The vegetation set back is dimensioned and additional landscape screening is proposed by the Landscape architect. Refer A213 Rev D, A214 Rev D</p>
Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character	<p>Furthermore, the sections have only been taken through bedroom windows, however the more contentious interface is that through the living room windows and POS balconies. Providing a note which states "narrow window opening" does not convincingly demonstrate that visual privacy has been mitigated. This is particularly evident in the section provided on A216 which clearly shows that overlooking into the southern neighbouring dwelling from</p>	<p>The separation of building D to the southern boundary is significantly greater than the ADG setback for a building of this height (7.3m proposed compared to 6m ADG). The neighbouring buildings have fully enclosed outdoors areas opposite the nearest proposed windows negating any privacy overlooking issues. No balconies or living spaces have been located on this façade of building D- only bedrooms.</p>

	<p>Building D is possible. All interface sections are to be reviewed.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the building setback has been increased with the removal of an apartment on each floor extending the distance to boundary to 12.4m in this area. Refer A215Rev D, A216 Rev D</p> <p>Action: Updated detail on the shadowing impact to neighbouring private open space. Refer A703 – A710 Rev E</p>
<p>Design - Context & Neighbourhood Character</p>	<p>As indicated in the comment above, visual privacy impacts to neighbouring properties along the west remain a concern. The existing building, whilst sitting closer to the boundary, includes angled windows focusing views away from the boundary and neighbouring dwellings. The current proposal, whilst providing increased setbacks, provides views directly towards neighbouring properties, and the ability to provide meaningful landscaping along the western boundary to assist in combatting visual privacy is questioned given the proposed width of the landscape strip. Further articulation of the western façade should be considered to direct views away from the neighbouring dwellings.</p>	<p>There have been no submissions from these neighbours and improvements were discussed and agreed with the neighbours through community consultation.</p> <p>Action: Refer additional view analysis from Buildings A & B showing additional privacy screens & solid balustrade walls. The vegetation set back is dimensioned and additional landscape screening is proposed by the Landscape architect.</p> <p>Refer A213 Rev D, A214 Rev D</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>The shifting of Building B further north is an improvement; however further adjustments are recommended for Building B to align with the existing Residential Aged Care Facility (RACF) as a minimum to assist in maintaining and/or improving view corridors through the site and towards the escarpment from the Princes Highway. Refer also to comments under Context and Neighbourhood Character.</p>	<p>Action: Impact of moving Building B to the north is negligible as Building B does not obscure views to the escarpment. CFA can provide a view analysis of existing and proposed view lines if required</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>The additional buildings and pavilions proposed to connect to both the north and south side of the existing heritage church is questioned, particularly the cafe provided to the south. This disrupts view lines to the escarpment which is not supported. Refer also to comments under Context and Neighbourhood Character.</p>	<p>Low level building such as the church, cafe do not have significant impact the view to the escarpment. The adaptive re-use of the heritage building ensures the viability of this building.</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>The various built forms are generally well articulated with some nice contemporary details proposed. Whilst the bold contemporary forms are visually appealing, they do not appear to be devised from site</p>	<p>The scale and form of the proposed building with a flat roof is intended to provide a suitable backdrop to the pitched roof form of the heritage item. The brick character of the heritage item is</p>

	location or existing context. The proposed materials, colours, façade modulation and roof forms do not establish a strong relationship with the existing heritage building on site and would benefit from drawing greater inspiration from the surrounding context to achieve a more sympathetic and cohesive outcome.	observed with the use of extensive brick in the new facade. The contemporary nature of the new development is intended to respect the heritage item and not mimic it.
Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality	Prefinished and durable materials/finishes are strongly encouraged by Council, and applied finishes should be minimised. This includes any painted or rendered surfaces, noting the accelerated effects of weathering are likely. All proposed finishes are to be clearly specified and noted on drawings (not currently provided). This includes brick specification, cladding types, colour/profile/finish of plant screening etc. Large scale details should also be provided for key features such as balustrading, window boxes, roof and awning details etc. to ensure that the architects vision is fully realised.	Action: Large scale details will be included in the updated documents Refer A800 Rev G
Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality	The proposed finishes to the existing Flametree RACF are noted as bagged and/or painted which is not accepted. The applicant is encouraged to explore a revised colour pallet that incorporates the existing face brickwork to avoid unnecessary paint, render or bagging of brickwork to maintain a low cost and durable finish that requires less ongoing maintenance. The photomontages provided on architectural drawings A900-A902 should also be updated to show the proposed material and colour pallet of the RACF to better understand how it integrates with the overall development.	Action: The proposed bagging of existing brickwork has been removed from the application Refer A800 Rev G, A300.7 Rev G & A300.8 Rev G
Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality	The blank wall presentation along the western side of building B is a result of the placement and orientation of the basement carpark driveway ramp entry. This along with the general abundance of blank walls to the ground floor plane of all Building B frontages, provides a poor interface, lack of activation, and insufficient passive surveillance to the main internal roadway and other associated outdoor spaces, bringing into question the suitability of the basement ramp location and orientation.	The location of the basement ramp has been considered to avoid flood issues to the north of the site while also avoiding clashes with the primary pedestrian drop-off (Porte cochere) to the south. An activated interface is addressed along the pedestrian spine running east west from the Porte cochere, past the heritage building to Princes Hwy. An activated interface to the basement vehicular access is not appropriate. Passive surveillance is achieved from numerous windows and balconies from Buildings B and C.
Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality	Building E equally presents a very defensive and blank ground floor façade, particularly	Action:

	<p>along the eastern frontage facing Princes Hwy, which lacks activation and visibility and does not integrate well with the surrounding landscape. The proposed gym use on the ground level is dominated by solid sandstone walls and timber battens, providing an internalised building program that does not engage well with the streetscape or associated outdoor spaces.</p>	<p>Remove battens from façade and open to terrace facing the Princes Hwy. A terraced landscaping zone falls from the Ground floor of the proposed Gym to a river gravel lined channel between Building E and the Princes Hwy.</p> <p>This forms a buffer to the street from the upper terrace.</p> <p>Refer A350.2 Rev G</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality WCC-21-4</p>	<p>The increase of proposed bulk and building width/depth of Building C and D is a concern. In particular, the consolidation of Building C, into one built form has resulted in a bulky building appearance with dark internalised corridors and convoluted circulation areas that have no access to natural light or ventilation. By merging the buildings into a large triangular wedge shape, the perception of bulk and scale has increased. This appears to be a result of filling in the open areas rather than redistributing the mass. Consideration should be given to whether an L-shaped configuration, or other alternative, may provide a more appropriate built form outcome than the current triangular wedge arrangement.</p> <p>The SDRP did not endorse consolidation of the built form as an outcome in itself, but rather requested exploration of whether such an approach could deliver improved amenity outcomes and more usable open space for Building C. The current proposal does not demonstrate that these improved outcomes have been achieved. While a wedge-shaped built form may be acceptable in principle, the resulting building width, depth and internal configuration have produced poor-quality communal areas and common circulation spaces with limited access to natural light and ventilation. These outcomes do not satisfy the relevant amenity objectives of the ADG and do not represent an improvement of the previous scheme. Accordingly, Council maintains its position that the built form of Building C requires further refinement. Alternative massing and layout strategies should be explored to improve building scale, circulation efficiency and internal amenity consistent with SDRP comments.</p>	<p>Building C was consolidated into a single more cohesive built form in response to comments from SDRP #2</p> <p><i>The separation of Building C into two forms with a narrow breezeway at ground level is currently unconvincing. Explore whether consolidating the built form will create more usable open space elsewhere and improved outcomes for building C.</i></p> <p>It is clear from the statement above that the SDRP endorsed the consolidation of the built form.</p> <p>All apartments have generous glazing proportions with the southern and western apartment having views to the escarpment and vegetation riparian zone.</p> <p>Increased amenity due to generous setbacks and distance to other structures: The generous distance from the southern facing units to the nearest built form allows for ample natural ambient light to penetrate the habitable spaces (the living and bedrooms spaces). The increased distances also assist in reducing wind turbulence caused by tightly spaced building and provide increase visual amenity and comfort. These large setbacks allow for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase landscape areas • Deep soil planting • Communal open space • Wider footpaths • Large vegetation riparian zone <p>No Action:</p>

<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality WCC-21-5</p>	<p>The proposed rooftop service and plant areas across all buildings are not well integrated into roof designs or overall built forms. They are visually dominant and contribute to the perceived bulk and scale when viewed from surrounding areas, presenting as an additional storey in some instances, breaching the height limit.</p> <p>This is not supported, and the height departure must be carefully considered by the Department.</p>	<p>Generally, the roof plant has been set back from the building edge to reduce the visual impact when viewed from ground level. The plant is enclosed by acoustic screening enhancing amenity for residents and neighbours.</p> <p>Action: Separate diagrams to support the clause 4.6 showing the height exceedance will be provided. Refer A401.1 Rev B</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality WCC-22</p>	<p>Access to natural light in the southern portion of the circulation corridors across all levels of Building D is not provided. There are similar concerns with the lack of natural light and ventilation to circulation corridors and foyer spaces of Building C also.</p>	<p>Building C & D: Natural light from large north facing windows bring light into the communal corridors and lobby space. There is no requirement for natural light for all internal corridors in buildings: The National Construction Code (NCC), which governs building in Australia classifies apartment corridors as common areas. The code does not require natural light for these corridors. They must instead have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate artificial lighting • Emergency light for evacuation • Mechanical ventilation or acceptable airflow <p>These requirements are all capable of being achieved with the current designs</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>Council has declared a Climate Emergency and expects new developments to exceed minimum mandatory sustainable buildings criteria. This includes (but is not limited to) solar panels, rainwater harvesting and reuse, use of electric-only appliances and systems, EV chargers, bicycle parking for residents, staff and visitors, prefinished durable materials with low embodied energy, and low water use planting. These are to be considered and incorporated into all buildings.</p>	<p>The following sustainable initiatives have already been considered in the design solar panels, rainwater harvesting and reuse, use of electric-only appliances and systems, EV chargers, bicycle parking for residents, staff and visitors, prefinished durable materials with low embodied energy, and low water use planting.</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>The Department requests further detail provided in the clause 4.6 variation request (height). Please revise Table 1 - Description of variation to include height exceedance by building. Please also summarise the area of each building above and below the maximum height plane, and the component(s) of the building that is exceeding the height control.</p>	<p>Action: Clause 4.6 to be amended with 3d diagrams including a summary of the area of each building above and below the maximum height plane, and the component(s) of the building that is exceeding the height control Refer A401.1 Rev B</p>

<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>It is difficult to confirm solar access compliance given the scale and quality of the solar access diagrams provided on architectural drawing A701. The diagrams are to be provided at a larger scale to ensure that the windows and balcony areas being assessed can be clearly seen. Some additional larger scale detailed views may also be required for some units.</p>	<p>Action: Larger scale drawings will be provided Refer A701 Rev G</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality WCC-23</p>	<p>Several unit types (including unit type 02, 07, 08, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, and 22) provide open plan layouts which exceed the maximum 8m room depth requirement as set out in Objective 4D-2 of the ADG. "In open plan layouts (where the living, dining and kitchen are combined) the maximum habitable room depth is 8m from a window."</p>	<p>Seniors Housing calls for adaptable housing for all apartments. All apartments in this development are designed to be fully adaptable. The increased spatial requirements needed to achieve a compliance nonetheless provides the desired amenity and meets the objectives within the ADG.</p> <p>This guideline is intended to ensure daylight to habitable living spaces.</p> <p>Under the NCC, a habitable room generally includes spaces such as Living rooms, Dining rooms, Bedrooms & Studies.</p> <p>Kitchens are not usually considered a primary 'habitable room' The daylight requirement is mainly for the living area, which is the primary habitable space.</p> <p>Refer to Seniors Housing Design Guide Page 127, reference to ADG Part 4D.</p>
<p>Design - Built Form, Scale, Aesthetics & Materiality</p>	<p>Whilst Unit Type 23 provides a small window to the living space, the amount of light is questioned given the depth and proportion of the room. On this basis it is recommended that an additional window or sliding glass door is provided to the living area which opens out directly onto the balcony space.</p>	<p>Action: Will be amended in updated drawings. Refer A509 Rev C</p>
<p>Heritage - Built Form</p>	<p>There are very little existing views to the Riparian Area from the public domain. This view is not identified in the HIS as significant and this retention of this view corridor is not discussed. These views would only be internal site views from a very specific location in the proposed entry forecourt. The merits of prioritising this view corridor above setting back Building D to Princes Highway and retaining views to the church when travelling North along Princes highway should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>Heritage consultant advice required.</p>

<p>Community Services & Safety - Diversity</p>	<p>The SIA should list the number of dwellings that will be constructed to cater for people with a disability. as the intention of this proposal is to promote aging in place it is assumed to provide for diverse dwelling products, and a number of accessible dwellings will be constructed. Adaptable dwellings incur costs to be adapted.</p>	<p>All apartments have been designed in accordance with the requirements of SEPP Housing and with ageing in place principles. The units will only require adaptation of kitchen joinery/drawers and bathroom shower glass + installation of grab rails to pre-installed wall reinforcement/backing, to allow for full accessibility.</p>
<p>Community Services & Safety - Diversity</p>	<p>While it is noted the unit floor plans have options there is a significant number of 3-bedroom independent living units proposed noting 51% of the units are 3-bedroom units. How do these options ensure housing affordability to enable a range of income ranges access to these units?</p>	<p>IRT confirms that <i>'the unit mix is based on our customer centric research confirming that the majority of downsizers in the local catchment area expect a 3-bed unit and/or 2-bed + study. Affordability will be enabled through the development of a sales strategy.'</i></p>
<p>Environment</p>	<p>The Department has reviewed solar access impacts to the adjacent property at 460 Princess Highway and is not satisfied that the proposal removes solar access to this property at mid-winter (Figure 3) relying on solar access for part of the day at the equinox. The Department requests that the proposed built form adjacent to this property be reviewed including: a) analysis of overshadowing impacts to this property, including dates of the year when the property is in full shade and dates when the property receives at least 2 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm at mid-winter</p>	<p>Action: Refer sun access analysis showing Building D with alternative footprint. These diagrams show improved solar access to the neighbouring property receives at least 2 hours of direct sunlight in mid-winter. In addition, the proposal demonstrates improved solar access compared to the existing building between the hours of when 1pm and 3pm (mid-winter). Refer A703- A710</p>
<p>Design - Landscape & Outdoor Space</p>	<p>The full extent of the basement carpark is unclear on architectural drawing A100, in particular its relationship with the existing RAC building, which should be updated for clarity. On architectural drawing A300.2 it appears that pedestrians accessing the RAC from the basement carpark are required to transverse through the loading, waste and laundry area to access the lifts which is not acceptable and raises concerns in regard to safety and wayfinding, with possible pedestrian and vehicular conflicts, as well as the poor identification and visibility of the lifts from parking areas.</p>	<p>The basement has been reduced in size and moved further away from the RAC. Drawing A100 shows the outline of a min clearance of 1,5m around the RAC building over. Drawing A101 has been updated to show the outline of the basement below. Pedestrians in the basement will make their way to the lift core for Building C and exit the lift at the communal entrance lobby of the Porte cochere. They will then access the entry doors to the RAC via an accessible covered walkway. Suitable wayfinding signage will be incorporated. Refer A100 Rev G, A101 Rev G</p>

Design - Landscape & Outdoor Space	Storage cages within the carpark area should be provided for all units where possible. These can be useful for larger and less frequently used items or large outdoor items which may not be practical to store within a unit. Ensure that the location of any storage cages does not impact visibility and surveillance throughout the carpark.	Storage cages are provided in the basement behind car spaces as well as in storage rooms. Notes have been added to the drawing to highlight storage areas. Storage has also been provided at Ground Level of Building B for additional storage. Refer A100 Rev G, A101 Rev G, A320.1 Rev G
Design - Landscape & Outdoor Space	If waste chutes are being provided, they should discharge into a separate secure waste rooms that are not accessible to residents to avoid potential safety issues.	Waste chutes have been provided for Buildings C, D & E and discharge into waste rooms where residents cannot access chute area. Refer A100 Rev G
Design - Landscape & Outdoor Space	The Department is concerned with the design of the internal road along the western boundary of the site, including its location adjacent to neighbouring residential properties, width, lack of separation to adjacent apartments AG01 and AG02 and its vehicle dominant design (Figure 4 and Figure 5). The Department requests that the design of this internal road, including its width and vehicle dominance, be revised to improve amenity to adjacent residents (with increased landscape separation) and be designed as shared space	Privacy to adjacent bedrooms/ units to be addressed through landscape screening Refer Landscape documentation.
Traffic & Transport	Swept paths of a B99 vehicle passing a B85 vehicle need to be shown within all new car parking areas, ramps, aisles and all two-way manoeuvring areas with additional clearances of 300mm to any solid obstructions as per AS2890.1	Parking layout and spaces complies with AS2890.1 and requirements of the Housing SEPP. Swept paths to be produced by traffic consultant. Refer A100 Rev G, A101 Rev G
Additional Documents Requested	The citing and built form of the proposed new development in particular Building D and E is more carefully considered with input from Wier Phillips and better discussion of the potential built form outcomes in the HIS;	No Action:
	The Setback of Building D be increased to improve views travelling north to the Church Building and Illawarra Escarpment ridgeline.	No Action:
Additional Documents Requested	Building D and E should be LEP height compliant, and more sympathetically designed and step down to three stories as they approach the Church building to better	No Action:

	relate to the scale of the heritage item and improve visual impacts:	
Additional Documents Requested	The basement carpark should be reduced and a greater physical buffer to the heritage item proposed to mitigate potential construction impacts.	Basement parking has been reduced and a greater physical buffer has been provided: Refer A100 Rev G, A101 Rev G
Additional Documents Requested	The EIS does not include an assessment of section 107 of the Housing SEPP, stating that it does not apply. The Department considers this section to apply to the RCF component, and requests that an assessment be included in the submission report.	Action: This item will be addressed with comments relating the proposed new building work

Please call me if you have any questions or require further details and clarification.

Kind regards,



Lara Calder
Director and Nominated Architect
Calderflower Architects Pty Ltd
Registration Number: 6955