

21 May 2013

The Director General
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Alan Cadogan

Dear Mr Cadogan,

RE: THOMAS STREET CAR PARK SITE MODIFICATION 7 OF MP09_0066 (Our ref: S090002)

I refer to your emailed advice dated 16 May 2013 on lodgement by the Meriton Group of a further modification of the approved development on the Thomas Street Car Park site in Chatswood. The approved development in this case means, as indicated in the letter lodged with the application by Meriton Group, the development as approved in Modification 3 of MP09_006 dated 18 February 2013.

Council notes that Modification 3 incorporates also Modification 4 that approved the extension of the basement car park under Fleet Lane West in December 2012.

It is noted that this modification has not been notified to surrounding property owners as it relates to parts of the development that are primarily below ground level and are unlikely to have any impact on surrounding land

Clarification of the Content of Modification 7

For the sake of clarity it is noted the proposed changes in Modification 7 to the Modification 3 approved development concern the basement car parking levels. The changes also affect the below ground mezzanine level and the ground level and are understood to be as follows:

1. No change to the allocation of car parking numbers between the residential, serviced apartments, child care, retail and public car parking uses.
2. Reconfiguration of Basement levels and lowering of Basement 5 to facilitate a revised ramp system and removal of the ramping within the circulating aisles.
3. Adjustment of the lift core locations.
4. Pooling of Council/public car spaces but still over 5 basement levels.
5. Relocation of the serviced apartment car parking to Basement 2 and Basement 3 under the residential tower. Adjustment to the residential car parking location and residential visitor car parking location as a result of the relocation of the serviced apartment car parking.

6. Provision of the child care and retail spaces (13 in total) on Basement 2 partly under the residential tower and partly among the public car parking spaces.

Council notes that the plans lodged with the application did not provide the mezzanine and ground floor plans that are impacted by the change to the locations of the serviced apartment and public car park lift cores. The documentation also did not deal with the how the service apartment guest would move from the serviced apartment car parking to the serviced apartment tower lobby as the serviced apartment tower lift does not now access the basement car parking.

To fully understand the intention of proposed Modification 7 affecting Modification 3 Council was provided with two additional plans by Meriton Group being A-0100/D for the ground floor and A-0110/D for the basement mezzanine.

In response to Council's question as to how the serviced apartment guests would access the serviced apartment tower Council was advised that guests would be provided with an access card that allowed use of the residential tower lift from Basement 2 and Basement 3 with access into and through the residential foyer after which the guests would have to cross the open plaza and enter the serviced apartment building. On the basis of the plans and documentation on the Department's website and the additional information provided by the Meriton Group this submission has been prepared.

Comments on Modification 7

The plans provided go part of the way towards consolidating and separating the public car parking from the car parking for the development on the site. However, as Council has previously advised, the public car parking should be completely separated and accommodated over a minimum number of levels of the basement and occupy the full width of the southern part of the site. The plans submitted still have a lack of separation with the resulting operational consequences in confusion between the public and development car parking. This also has consequences in utility services and separation of the Council owned facility from the operational infrastructure and maintenance of the rest of the development. The Council facility will be separately maintained and operated by Council. The public car park has been repeatedly noted to be a separate land use and entity in the development that is not to be tied to any arrangement involving the residential or serviced apartment components.

Furthermore the amended plans, despite the advice that the serviced apartment guests may use the residential lift to the ground floor and then cross the plaza, the layout of the car parking and location of the public lifts indicates that the serviced apartment guest will more likely cross into the public car park and use the Council car park lifts to access the serviced apartment foyer and tower. This is unacceptable as the lifts for the public car park must operate separately and for the exclusive use of the public car park as they will be owned and maintained by Council. Again the issue is that the public car parking facility in its entirety needs to be separate.

These comments are not new to the Department or to the Meriton Group.

The positive feature of the new design is that the slope in the circulating aisles is being removed (except as noted below) and the location of the Council lift is more central to the public car parking and avoids the need for bike riders and drivers to cross the loading dock on Basement 1 to access the public car park lifts as was approved but objected to Modification 3.

A final comment is that the current plans require review as there are inconsistencies in the plans. The residential lift core indicates the provision of three lifts in the tower, three lifts on the ground floor, four lifts on Basement 1 and two lifts servicing Basements 2 to 5. On Basement 1 the slope on the circulating aisle within the public car park has been retained going from RL 96.40 down to RL 94.950. As the floor level of Basement 2 below the location is a constant RL 92.60 this means that the floor to floor level is in part is only 2.35 metres which will not work. The floor to floor level needs to allow for the depth of the concrete floor slab and compliance with Australian Standards for unobstructed clearance in public car parks below the sprinklers, services, directional signage etc.

Condition B15

Council reviewed and considered the detailed design of the public car park based on the originally approved development granting conditional approval of the design. The repeated changes to the design and layout of public car parking on the site requires that Condition B15 is re-activated for each and every variation that is made and Council's separate approval is sought prior to any Construction Certificate for an amended design.

Conclusion

Council requests that the Department take into consideration the points and recommendations made in this submission. Council does not oppose the modification subject to the comments made in this submission. The plans need to be reconciled based on the overall approval, other modifications and associated conditions.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you require clarification of any aspect of the Council's submission.

Yours faithfully,



Greg Woodhams
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DIRECTOR