

15 June 2017

File No: 2018/320395
Our Ref: R/2016/40/B
Your Ref: MP 06_0101 MOD 2, SSD 8135

Matthew Rosel
Senior Planner – Key Sites Assessments
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2000
matthew.rosel@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Matthew,

Pemulwuy, MP 06-0101 MOD2, SSD 8135

Thank you for your correspondence dated 10 May 2017 which invites the City of Sydney ("the City") to review the Response to Submissions ("RTS") provided by the applicant and to provide final comments on the proposal.

It is noted that minor amendments have been made to the design of the proposal as detailed in item 5.2.1 of the "RTS Planning Report" prepared by Ludvik & Associates on behalf the applicant. The gross floor area and building heights of the project have not been amended.

The City has reviewed the RTS and continues to maintain the key comments and concerns raised in the letter dated 27 October 2017 and identifies the following matters to be of key significance in the assessment of the proposal:

Comparison to Approved Scheme

The applicant's assessment of the urban design context of the development remains primarily focused on development on the eastern side of the railway line and does not appropriately address the immediate locality, particularly in terms of visual bulk and its impact on the locality. The proposed increases to the height and floor space ratio represent significant increases in terms of a comparison to the approved scheme.

Applicant's explanation for the SSD

The applicant maintains that the proposed modifications are required to enable the precinct wide redevelopment to be self-funding. The City maintains that the funding of the proposal is not a consideration in terms of the planning assessment of the proposal, and should not be considered as a justification for increasing the height and FSR limits for the site.

The commitments to be made regarding beds for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ("ATSI") students should be clarified in terms of the quantity (different figures quoted), and that they are to be 'affordable student accommodation' at a reduced rental rate. It is noted that this is to be included as part of the statement of commitments.

Gallery Space

The applicant has noted that a modification application "CPA-MOD1" is to be made to relocate the gallery space (currently approved within Precinct 3) from Precinct ("P") 3 to P1. It appears that there is still no concurrent application to facilitate this relocation. In the absence of a concurrent application, obligation or planning approval to ensure the relocation and details of the of the gallery space is to be relocated, the determination of this application should be held in abeyance, the current proposal should be amended to include the gallery space, or a Planning Agreement between the AHA and the City of Sydney facilitated by DPE positively requiring the inclusion and construction of the space in P3 be required. It is not

clear how a statement of commitments as suggested by the applicant would ensure the provision of the gallery space.

Public domain

The area of 'forecourt' space to be dedicated has been clarified by the applicant. It should be clear that any public domain dedication relates only to the P3 areas as part of this application. The reconfiguration of public domain in other precinct block areas as notionally indicated would require separate approval(s). The adequacy of open space should be assessed in terms of what is proposed in this application and currently approved in the other precinct blocks.

The extent of public domain works proposed within this application should be clarified. Any approval should require public domain plans to be approved by the City.

The final design of areas to be dedicated to Council should also require a handover approval from the City. A Planning Agreement should be entered into with the City to finalise the details of dedications.

Landscaping

As previously noted, the submitted Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design assessment report does not provide specific recommendations for the 'forecourt' space which will be an important public interface for the development. This should be addressed.

The recommendations included in the updated wind report should be cross referenced to the design of the 'forecourt' space and the suitability of tree species (including undergrowth) confirmed from wind, safety and design perspectives. Design alternatives that ameliorate wind conditions should also be investigated.

Internal amenity

Amendments made to the design in the RTS have improved some internal amenity for residents including increased indoor communal space and increased bicycle parking provision. The provision of private balconies remains low and the number of units with acoustic treatments that are not suitable for natural ventilation remains.

Should you wish to speak with a Council officer about the above, please contact Shannon Rickersey, Senior Planner, on 9265 9333 or at srickersey@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,



Graham Jahn AM
Director
City Planning | Development | Transport