



## General Public Submissions

Issue	Number of Times Raised	Response
Removal of Endangered Ecological Community / Proposed offset measures insufficient	6	As part of the suite of amendments made under the previous RTS 2 package, the development footprint was modified to reduce impacts to both threatened ecological communities and adjacent native vegetation. Details of the revised Masterplan were provided in the covering Response to Submissions report and revised Biodiversity Assessment Report (Appendix J) of the previous RTS 2 package. Offsets are proposed in accordance with the NSW Biodiversity Offsets Policy for Major Projects and the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation ACT 1999</i> .
Insufficient open space in the area	2	The Masterplan, as amended under RTS 2, includes additional areas of open space from that of the original Masterplan. Drawing DA02.MP.202(B) in the previously submitted Architectural Plans details the active and passive open spaces of the indicative reference scheme and details the overall area of open space across the site.
Traffic and parking	2	A Traffic response was provided by Ason at Appendix Q as part of the previous RTS 2 response, which found that the increase in traffic as a result of the Masterplan is offset by the provision of new infrastructure and upgrades to existing infrastructure, and is able to be accommodated by the surrounding road network. Traffic generation and impacts on the surrounding road network was discussed in further detail in the covering Response to Submissions report of RTS 2.
Impact on Shrimptons Creek	4	The proposed development incorporates a riparian setback to Shrimptons Creek in accordance with the NSW Office of Water <i>Guidelines for riparian corridors on waterfront land</i> . In addition to this, rehabilitation works and riparian planting will be undertaken as part of subsequent stages of development to improve the overall quality of the Shrimptons Creek corridor.

Issue	Number of Times Raised	Response
Excessive height	3	<p>Whilst the Masterplan, as amended under the previous RTS 2 submission, proposes building envelopes which seek to vary the maximum height in order to respond to submissions relating to the provision of open space, the building envelopes have been deliberately designed and located to minimise impacts on the adjoining area. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overshadowing impacts are limited to Epping Road, the front yard of residential properties on the opposite side of Epping Road and some portions of the Shrimptons Creek riparian corridor. The revisions to the scheme, which include increased setbacks to Epping Road further reduce the shadow impacts on these properties resulting in an improved outcome. It is noted that the affected properties will receive at least 2 hours solar access to at least 50% of the private open space area between 9am and 3pm on 21 June as required by the Ryde DCP.</li> <li>• The revised building envelopes do not result in any significant visual impacts, as demonstrated by the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix K and the Response to Submissions Report of the previous RTS 2 package.</li> <li>• The additional height is located away from the existing residential areas, such as Peach Tree Road.</li> <li>• The variation to the maximum building height allows approximately 2,900m<sup>2</sup> of additional open space provided within the Village Green, increased setbacks along Shrimptons Creek and Epping Road, and retention of 179 additional existing trees, improving the overall amenity of the area.</li> </ul>
Overdevelopment of the area	8	<p>The built form of the Masterplan is generally in accordance with the zoning and planning controls for the site, which was implemented following the finalisation of the Herring Road Precinct Plan undertaken by the Department of Planning and Environment. State government strategic planning for the area has sought to increase height and density controls around train stations and major road intersections to deliver integrated land use and transport outcomes. The originally exhibited EIS included an assessment against the relevant strategic plans for the area and was updated as relevant in the subsequent Response to Submissions report to demonstrate that the built form outcome is consistent with the desired future character of the area.</p>
Insufficient infrastructure	1	<p>A number of reports have been prepared, both as part of the original EIS package and previous RTS 2 package, to assess the capacity of existing infrastructure to cater to future development on the site. It was found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity, gas, water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure is capable of accommodating future development on the site.</li> <li>• The surrounding local road network and public transport is capable of accommodating the future population (refer to Appendix Q of RTS 2).</li> </ul> <p>In addition to this utilities infrastructure, social infrastructure, including a school, two childcare facilities and open space, will be provided on the site. This infrastructure will benefit the residents of the Ivanhoe community and the surrounding area, adding to the wide range of community infrastructure already available.</p>

Issue	Number of Times Raised	Response
Exceedance in FSR is inappropriate	3	<p>A Clause 4.6 Justification of the exceedance in FSR was prepared by Ethos Urban as part of the previous RTS 2 package, where it was attached at Appendix F.</p> <p>This document noted that, in the case of the proposed development, compliance with the FSR development standard is considered to be unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of the case and there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify a contravention of the standard. It is noted that the exceedance to the development standard has been significantly reduced given the reduction to overall site gross floor area. The RTS 1 response proposed 278,000m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area which was reduced to 268,000m<sup>2</sup> under RTS 2, representing a 2.5% variation to the development standard. Specifically, the 4.6 variation notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exceedance results in a better planning outcome by strategically redistributing bulk and scale;</li> <li>• The exceedance achieves the objectives of Clause 4.4 notwithstanding the noncompliance;</li> <li>• The exceedance will not result in adverse environmental impacts as a result of the variation and is considered to be in the public interest; and</li> <li>• The exceedance will allow for the provision of additional space for community facilities, and therefore provides public benefit.</li> </ul> <p>Due to the inclusion of affordable housing, the development is also eligible for additional floorspace in accordance with the bonus prescribed by the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP. In addition to this, the Seniors Housing SEPP would also permit a floorspace bonus of approximately 4,800m<sup>2</sup> if the seniors housing component would be delivered as a stand-alone development. Accordingly, the FSR variation is only 0.12:1.</p>
Loss of privacy and/or buffer trees to properties on Herring Road	4	Trees on the Herring Road boundary will be retained, with the proposed building envelopes set back to maximise tree retention and ensure there is a buffer to Herring Road.
Reducing floorspace for community/amenity facilities and social housing is inappropriate	2	In order to effectively respond to concerns raised in the Response To Submissions (RTS) process, GFA reductions across the project have had to be made to ensure greater provision of public open space and reducing the overall bulk and scale of the buildings. This has necessarily required a reduction of, amongst others, the community and affordable housing GFA. A high standard of community facilities and affordable housing will continue to be provided on-site in excess of DCP and project-specific requirements, and continues to represent a significant improvement over the current built form and layout at the site. In particular, the amount of social housing to be provided (approximately 950 dwellings) far exceeds the 259 social housing dwellings that were previously on the site.

Issue	Number of Times Raised	Response
Visitor parking rates variation inappropriate	1	<p>This issue was addressed in the Technical Note prepared by Ason Group and appended to the previous RTS 2 package at Appendix Q. The document noted that the significance and location of the site requires an innovative and sustainable parking strategy that responds to the site's excellent level of public transport accessibility and the need for reduced vehicle trips. Therefore, the proposed development adopts a range of strategies aimed at promoting sustainable travel options and reducing the need for visitor parking. The independent TMAP Addendum Peer Review found that:</p> <p><i>The proponent has increased the amount of visitor parking provided on the site since the exhibited EIS, given that all residential visitor parking will now be provided in the basement of each building. This will allow for additional visitor parking to be provided on streets within the site. The adopted visitor parking rate is therefore considered to provide an appropriate balance between meeting the parking demands of visitors to the site as well as mitigating traffic impacts on the surrounding road network.</i></p> <p>Therefore, the proposed level of on-site parking is considered to be appropriate.</p>
Wind impacts from tall buildings	2	<p>A Wind Statement was prepared by Cermak Peterka Petersen and included in the previous RTS 2 package at Appendix L. The statement found that the amendments made to the original Masterplan are expected to improve wind conditions at the site, including the modified shape of Building A3's west façade encouraging wind flow around the northern perimeter of the site rather than into the precinct, and the increased setbacks and deletion of the slip road being expected to provide additional shielding from channelling winds.</p> <p>A comprehensive Wind Assessment was also undertaken by Cermak Peterka Petersen as part of the original EIS package, at Appendix V. Within the document, it was found that the environmental wind conditions at ground level around the proposed development are expected to meet the comfort criteria for pedestrian standing and walking and pass the relevant safety criterion.</p>
Envelope of Building A1 excessive	3	<p>The depiction of Building A1 under the Masterplan represents the maximum permissible envelope for the building. The detailed design of Building A1 and its further environmental impacts will be assessed in detail as part of the Stage 1 detailed design DA proposal.</p>
Permanent U-turn facility should be provided	1	<p>This issue was addressed in the Technical Note prepared by Ason Group and appended to the previous RTS 2 package at Appendix Q. The document notes that multiple meetings with regards to the removal of the existing roundabout and the provision of a U-turn facility were held, and it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact to the residents on the western side of Herring Road between Epping Road and Saunders place will only impact inbound trips; and</li> <li>• Surveys have shown peak U-turn movements at the intersection to be at only 41 vehicles/hour. This represents the amount of vehicles that will be redistributed through the network should the roundabout be removed.</li> </ul> <p>Until the Ivanhoe Estate internal road network is completed at the end of Stage 1C, turning heads will be provided at the end of the proposed north and south roads (i.e. Main Street and Neighbourhood Street) to enable U-turn manoeuvres to take place. Following the completion of Stage 1C, access to developments on the western side of Herring Road will be facilitated through the internal Ivanhoe Estate road network.</p>

Issue	Number of Times Raised	Response
Stage 1 is inappropriate / should not be assessed until Masterplan is approved	3	It is intended for the Masterplan and the Stage 1 DA to be assessed concurrently, recognising that the Stage 1 DA cannot be determined until consent is granted to the Masterplan in accordance with Section 4.22 of the EP&A Act.