

APPENDIX 7A

Engagement Summary Tables



Table 1 Community Responses (Total 41)

Topic	Queries/Details	Response
Parking, traffic and safety 22 responses	Some residents raised concerns about the traffic, parking and safety implications of the proposed development on Darley Street. Specifically, residents raised issues with the proposed development's impact on existing traffic conditions at Darley Street, the insufficient provision of off-street parking proposed, and the safety impacts of additional traffic on residents and pedestrians.	The proposal provides 124 carparking spaces which significantly exceeds the minimum requirements of the Housing SEPP and is not expected to The Traffic Impact Assessment by SGC confirms that a total of 28 additional trips will occur in the AM and 17 trips in the PM, and will have minimal impact on the traffic capacity of Darley Street East and the surrounding street network. Refer Section 6.15 and Appendix 31 of the EIS.
Structural adequacy of basement 1 response	A resident questioned the structural integrity of the basement with concerns about cracking subsidence and structural movement of the basement carparking in the sandy foundation.	The Geotechnical Investigation report by <i>EI Australia</i> (Appendix 17 of EIS) confirms the site conditions are suitable to accommodate the proposed basement parking. Structural engineering drawings and dilapidation reports will be provided at the construction certificate stage and monitoring during the construction through to completion is anticipated. Refer also Section 6.21 of EIS.
Construction disruption 3 responses	Residents are concerned about potential impacts to Darley Street during construction such as limited car parking on street and increased traffic as a result of an influx in construction workers. Residents also raised concerns regarding the cumulative construction impacts of this proposal with the residential flat building being constructed at No.20 Darley Street East.	The Construction Traffic Management Plan by SGC (Appendix 32 of EIS) indicates how construction-related traffic and parking will be managed. The proposed residential flat building development at No.20 Darley Street East is subject to an Appeal with the Land and Environmental Court and therefore the construction timeframe for this development is unknown. Conditions of consent are anticipated to address the cumulative impact if required.
Compatibility with the character of the street/area 18 responses	Several respondents expressed their beliefs that the scale of the proposed development was out of character from the existing predominately two-storey medium density streetscape and locality. Specifically, residents highlighted the need for the proposed street elevation wall height to be reduced to 7.2m to be compatible with the medium density character.	The proposed development aligns with the desired future character of the area, established by Chapter 6 – Low and Mid Rise Housing and Chapter 2 – Infill Affordable Housing of the Housing SEPP. The area is expected to transition to a higher density and built form than what currently exists in the immediate vicinity. A massing diagram depicting the future character of the area is provided in the Design Report (Appendix 13 of EIS and Section 6.7)
Affordable housing 7 responses	Some residents questioned the inclusion of the proposed affordable housing highlighting that it does not align with the established affluent character of the Mona Vale locality. They also expressed that the proposed small portion of temporary affordable units should not meet the criteria of 'affordable housing'. Some residents also questioned the removal of 18 existing affordable homes to be replaced with 7 temporary affordable units.	The proposal is aligned with the incentives for the inclusion of infill affordable housing as set out in the Housing SEPP. The site is very well suited to deliver infill affordable housing managed by a community housing provider for 15 years. The existing apartments on the site do not meet the criteria of affordable housing. Refer Section 6.2 of EIS
Landscaping 8 responses	Several residents raised concerns about the proposed landscaping at the site, highlighting that the proposal does not comply with the Pittwater DCP minimum landscape area control. Residents also highlighted a lack of deep soil areas proposed along the site boundaries	The proposed development is a state significant development application and is not required to strictly comply with the Pittwater DCP controls. Refer Section 6.5 and 6.14 of EIS.

Table 1 Community Responses (Total 41)

	in the landscape design, restricting the ability for canopy tree planting in these areas and consequently reducing necessary screening, privacy and amenity for neighbouring sites.	The proposed development complies with the applicable requirements of the <i>Tree Canopy Guide for Low and Mid Rise Housing</i> (for both deep soil zones and tree canopy coverage) and with the landscape requirements of Chapter 2 of the Housing SEPP. Refer Section 6.2 of the EIS The Landscape Plans by <i>Wyer & Co</i> show the proposed landscaping design incorporates small and medium canopy trees within deep soil areas around the perimeter of the building providing screening for neighbour amenity and privacy.
Solar access 15 responses	Multiple respondents expressed concerns about surrounding developments experiencing a loss of solar access as a result of the proposed development. Particular concerns were raised about the solar access of neighbouring properties during winter and the lack of compliance with the ADG overshadowing controls and impacts to No.33 Darley Street East.	The Housing SEPP controls allow a building form of 6-8 storeys at the site. It is reasonable to anticipated that overshadowing of nearby properties will occur. Refer Section 6.10 of EIS
Privacy 9 responses	Several respondents questioned the impacts of the bulk and scale of the development on neighbouring residential amenity and privacy. They particularly raised concerns about overlooking from the development into neighbouring living spaces and outdoor private areas.	The proposed development is consistent with the building separation requirements to achieve visual privacy with additional design detail included for specific parts of the building. Refer Section 6.12 and 6.13 of the EIS and Design Report (Appendix 13 of EIS)
Setback / separation 6 responses	Multiple residents commented on the proposed non-compliance with the ADG building separation requirements and Pittwater DCP clause D9.7 minimum setback requirements. In particular, they raised concerns with the proposed 9.3m building separations to habitable spaces at No.33 Darley Street. Residents also commented on the lack of proposed landscaping buffers at the property boundaries, expressing amenity concerns for neighbouring properties.	As above, the Pittwater DCP controls do not apply to State Significant Development. The proposed Landscaped Area, and 9.3m building separation to No.33 Darley Street complies with the minimum requirements of the Apartment Design Guide which is the applicable control. Additional privacy treatments such as screening, window and balcony offsets and angled windows are expected to achieve privacy.
Overall Scale and Mass 26 responses	Several residents responded with concerns about the overall scale and mass of the development. Issues regarding the proposed height with the inclusion of the infill affordable housing bonus, the substantial building envelope and the lack of correspondence with the streetscape were raised. Specifically, the proposed development failing to comply with control D9.9 in the Pittwater DCP requiring all development to be sited within the building envelope was another concern that was raised. Additional questions regarding the proposed developments impact on the adjacent heritage item were also raised.	As above, Pittwater DCP does not apply to State Significant Development. The building height is compliant with the Housing SEPP provisions. The mass and scale of the development is addressed in Section 6.7 of the EIS and Appendix 13 Design Report The scale of the building is considered compatible with the future character of the locality as envisioned by the Housing SEPP and as shown in the context of the 3D massing diagrams included in the Design Report. The proposal will have no impact on the heritage significance of the local heritage listed items at No.22 Darley Street East as confirmed in the Heritage Impact Assessment at Appendix 22 of the EIS.

Table 1 Community Responses (Total 41)

Waste 1 response	One respondent questioned the arrangement of the garbage storage within the basement and servicing arrangements in the street. The resident recommended the provision of a ground-level loading bay for waste storage.	As outlined in the Waste Management Report by <i>Senica Consultancy Group</i> , (Appendix 33 and Section 6.24 of EIS) a temporary bin holding area is to be located adjacent to the street for storing bins on the day of servicing. At all other times the bins are stored in the basement. Council will service the general waste and recycling weekly via a wheel out wheel back service to a truck parked in the street. This arrangement is deemed the most suitable waste management system for the development.
Environmental considerations 1 response	One response raised concerns about the environmental impacts on the Acacia tree in the northeastern corner of the site and the proposed excavation noting that part of the site is shown in the Northern Beaches Flood Hazard map.	The proposal will retain the Acacia Tree in the northeast corner of the site and establish a tree protection zone during construction as outlined in the Arborist Report by <i>Dr Treegood</i> . The flood hazards have been assessed in the Flood Statement (Section 6.23 and Appendix 28 of the EIS) which confirms the site is not within the flood planning area.
Lack of infrastructure (Water services, public transport and sewage) 9 responses	Some residents questioned the potential impact on the existing water, public transport and sewage services noting existing capacity problems, low water pressure, and bus availability.	Early engagement with Ausgrid and Sydney Water has been conducted. It has been established that adequate connections and infrastructure capacity exist for the proposed development. Refer Section 5.2 of Engagement Report. The capacity and frequency of public transport is considered appropriate as confirmed in the Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix 31 of the EIS).

Table 2 State Agency Responses

Agency	Queries/Details	Response
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure	- Walking distance verification - engage a qualified surveyor to confirm that the walking distances comply with the LMR and affordable housing provisions under the Housing SEPP. - EDC report - Update and prepare the EDC report in accordance with the relevant guidelines. - Design compliance - ensure the proposal satisfies the ADG design criteria, including (but not limited to) CPTED principles. This includes providing a separate pedestrian pathway for the ground floor units along the western side. - Internal corridor ventilation and sunlight - consider relocating the fire stairs and lift core to introduce open ends on the north and south sides of the internal corridor, improving both ventilation and solar access. This may also assist with articulation of the side elevations through the introduction of indents, recesses, and similar design elements. - Basement access - confirm that the driveway ramp accommodates two way traffic movement. - Darley Street east facing units - the perspectives appear to show wintergardens (enclosed balconies). As the proposal already achieves the maximum GFA, these may need to be removed. - Unit layouts and storage - Units 4.04 and 5.04 include internal storage rooms that appear capable of functioning as additional bedrooms. Please review these layouts. - Storage - Additionally, storage provision in the basement appears limited relative to the number of units proposed and should be reassessed.	A Walking Survey Plan has been prepared by Norton Survey Partners at Appendix 9 of the EIS which confirms the site is within 400m walking distance of the mapped area of Mona Vale Town Centre. An updated EDC Report has been prepared by Newton Fisher Group at Appendix 6 of the EIS in accordance with the relevant guidelines. An assessment against the ADG is provided in the Statutory Compliance Table at Appendix 3 of the EIS. Any contraventions to the ADG controls are justified in Section 6.2 of the EIS. Alignment with the CPTED principles is considered in Section 6 of the EIS. A pedestrian path directly connects the street and the common ground floor lobby and is located between the vehicle crossing and the communal open space. Ground floor apartments on the western side share a pathway connecting private courtyards with the street. The corridors and lobby will be ventilated through the louvre window between the lifts. The area of the opening meets the requirement for natural ventilation requirements under the NCC. Introducing an additional window for the corridor would impact the views afforded to the ocean facing apartments. Swept paths are indicated on the basement floor plan Drawing Number PLA-DA-10B1 and demonstrate two way movement of vehicles can be achieved. No wintergardens are proposed as part of this development. These storage rooms will be fitted out for storage. The windows within these storage rooms provide an option for better natural ventilation to the specific rooms and the broader apartments. Storage has been provided in the basement in line with the requirements of ADG.
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	No response received.	N/A

Table 2 State Agency Responses

Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	- The proposed SSD site does not include any State Heritage Register (SHR) listed items and there are no SHR listed items in the vicinity of the site. As such, we have no advice regarding built heritage. However as local heritage items are in the vicinity, advice should be sought from the local council. - We recommend that the statement of heritage impact for the SSD include consideration of the historical archaeological potential of the study area. Any proposed impact to identified 'relics' of local or state significance should be supported by an historical archaeological assessment prepared by a suitably qualified archaeologist in accordance with the relevant guidelines.	The proposal will have no impact on the heritage significance of the local heritage listed items at No.22 Darley Street East as confirmed in the Heritage Impact Assessment at Appendix 22 of the EIS. Refer to Appendices 21 and 22 of the EIS.
Fire and Rescue NSW	No specific comments regarding the preliminary proposal have been provided.	N/A
Ausgrid	Letter of offer by Ausgrid advising that the installation of a L-type kiosk substation is likely to be required. The relevant ASP Level 3 (ASP/3) will be required to undertake the design and then the relevant ASP Level 1 (ASP/1) will be required undertake the design and construction.	As per the Architectural Plans (Appendix 12), a substation is located in the north-east corner of the site matching the design requirements
Sydney Water	A feasibility letter providing advice for the proposed development was issued by Sydney Water with respect to water, sewer, infrastructure requirements generally.	Refer to Section 5.2.6 of the Engagement Report and the Integrated Water Management Plan and Civil Engineering plans (Appendices 27 and 27 of the EIS) which account for the design requirements. Other matters are expected to be addressed by conditions of consent.
National Parks and Wildlife Service	NPWS confirmed that they have no comment or feedback to provide on the proposal	N/A
Water NSW	Water NSW stated that the site is not located near any Water NSW lands or assets. No further comment was received.	N/A

Table 3 Northern Beaches Council (Pre-Lodgement Meeting)

Topic	Queries/Details	Response
Waste Refer Section 6.24 and Appendix 33 of EIS	- Reconfiguration of bins to 240L. - GF Temporary bin holding area to be repositioned within 6.5m from the property boundary. - GF waste collection access path should be reconsidered given the waste vehicle will obstruct the neighbouring site. - The carpark exhaust in the centre of the B1 waste room should be removed.	Architectural Plans have been updated to show 240L bins within bin storage areas. The Ground level temporary bin holding area is not changed because it is suitably accessible for truck servicing as well as concealed from the street and does not detract from the street interface. The kerbside frontage is sufficient to park waste trucks without obstructing neighbouring driveways. The exhaust has been relocated to abut the wall of the waste room and will no longer obstruct the movement of bins.
Urban Design/ Planning Refer to Design Report at Appendix 13 of EIS and Sections 6.7, 6.8, 6.14 of EIS.	- Significant impact on existing streetscape and character- 8 storeys proposed in generally 2 storey setting. - Shadow impacts are significant. - Too many hardscaped areas within the front setback. More landscaping should be prioritised in this area. - The pool and amenities in the front setback are not supported. - Substation should be meaningfully integrated into the development - Encourage more sunlight to the entry path and lobby. - Pedestrian entry point to the proposed building should be more direct to the street.	The scale and dimensions of the proposed building is compliant with the provisions of the Housing SEPP. Whilst it will be larger than many other buildings currently in the streetscape, it will be compatible with the anticipated future character to evolve in response to the Housing SEPP incentives. See the 3D massing diagrams included in the Design Report. The shadow impacts as a result of the proposed development are addressed in detail in the EIS. The shadow is reasonable and is generated from a compliant building envelope. The communal open space has been provided in the front setback to maximise solar access and utilise space which has the best microclimatic conditions for year-round communal recreation. High usage of this space requires durable paved surfaces. The proposal is compliant with canopy tree planting rates and deep soil landscaping areas. The amenities proposed in the communal open space are well set out for active and passive uses and are expected to optimise the attractiveness and use of the facilities year-round. The features are typical of high quality residential apartment developments and are suited to the microclimate conditions within the ground level front setback. The location will minimise noise and overlooking to neighbouring properties and screen hedging and fencing will maintain privacy and security from the footpath. Substation complies with Ausgrid requirements and is discretely integrated with the street presentation. Colonnades and recesses allow sunlight to the entry path and lobby. The entry path follows a direct route in line with the building façade and is clear and prominent for wayfinding.

Table 3 Northern Beaches Council (Pre-Lodgement Meeting)

	• A 6.5m front setback should be provided. • Inadequate deep soil within the eastern and western boundary resulting in unsuitable privacy issues. • GF and L4 POS areas do not respond to ADG. • Splayed windows to not cause additional overshadowing issues. • Greater articulation is required to the tower component of the development. • The upper two storeys permitted under the 30% bonus should not create additional overshadowing impacts. • Must demonstrate that a minimum of 15% GFA contributes to affordable housing to benefit from the 30% bonus. • Cl. 4.5A of PLEP 2014 must be addressed and a Cl. 4.6 provided. • Must provide survey that indicates the site is within 400m of Mona Vale Town Centre. • Driveway and parking area gradients shall be in accordance with AS/NZS 2890.1:2004. In particular, the first 6m from the front boundary into the property shall be at maximum 5% gradient if the driveway is going down from the front boundary.	Levels 1 to 3 have a minimum 6.5m front setback to the edge of balconies and the external wall setbacks exceed 6.5m and are variable. The gym is setback approximately 12.4m and the main built form approximately 18m at ground level. Whilst it is acknowledged that features such as amenities building and pool are located within the front setback, these do not contribute to the bulk and scale of the built form when viewed from the streetscape. The basement is designed to consolidate deep soil areas particularly within the rear setback consistent with the Tree Canopy Guideline. The proposal provides compliant deep soil and tree canopy in line with the LMR guide. Privacy to the eastern and western neighbours is addressed with additional fixed screens to the outer edge of private courtyards and dense planting adjacent to the common boundary. Private open spaces at Ground level and Level 4 exceed ADG requirements for dimensions and areas. The generous size of private open spaces allows the future users to have more choice as to which parts of the space are used for different purposes with the intention of achieving privacy and separation most suited to the context of each space. The splayed windows do not cast shadows that add to the overall mid-winter shadow outline between 9am and 3pm. Articulation to all facades of Levels 5 to 8 is achieved by recessed balconies and variety in materials, colours and windows. The upper two storeys will cast additional shadow. However, this is reasonably anticipated given the additional two (2) storeys permitted. The Architectural Plans demonstrate 15.5% of GFA is dedicated for the purpose of affordable housing. Cl. 4.5A is addressed adequately in the EIS and Clause 4.6 Variation Statement at Appendix 35 of the EIS. A survey of this nature is provided in Appendix 11 of EIS. The driveway gradient is 8:1 at the front building line and is not in accordance with AS/NZS 2890.1:2004. This is in direct response to the topography of the site.
--	---	---

Table 3 Northern Beaches Council (Pre-Lodgement Meeting)

Traffic	- Generally, parking numbers, design and arrangement are supported. - Must demonstrate suitable clearance is provided to the loading bay on B1.	Noted. This has been confirmed in the Transport Impact Assessment at Appendix 31 of EIS
Landscaping Refer section 6.14 and Appendix 34 of EIS	- Lack of tree retention and planting in front and side setbacks should be expanded upon. - Arborist Report should consider impacts to neighbouring Tree 31 and 34.	The extent of tree removal is supported by an Arborist Report with significant compensatory planting proposed. Trees 31 and 34 are proposed for retention. TPZ and SPZs as well as other onsite management measures are proposed in the Arborist Report to ensure these trees are protected during construction and operation.