

## Matthew Rosel

---

**From:** Michael Rowe <MRowe@jbaurban.com.au>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 19 April 2016 2:06 PM  
**To:** Matthew Rosel  
**Cc:** Amy Watson; Tim De Young; Stuart Harman (Stuart.Harman@au.brookfield.com); Simon Lincoln (SimonLincoln@makearchitects.com); Christopher Curtis  
**Subject:** RE: SSD 5824 MOD1 - Further information request, including TfNSW submission on RtS  
**Attachments:** GTA Letter on AS Compliance.pdf; Public Carpark Fire Egress Diagram.pdf; One Carrington s96 Further Response to TfNSW Submission 19Apr16.pdf  
**Categories:** Amendment

Hi Matt

Please see attached response to the TfNSW letter. In summary we're happy with the TfNSW suggested conditions.

In relation to Condition B11, GTA has provided additional information for your consideration which explains the specific variation to the AS and the reasons why it's acceptable. Instead of seeking for it to be 'generally' in accordance as I'd originally proposed, as the non-compliance explained in the letter only relates to the ramps and aisles at certain intersections not accommodating passing perhaps the following amendment would provide greater certainty:

*The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including driveways, ramps, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths, and parking bay dimensions) shall be in accordance with AS 2890.1-2004, AS 2890.6 for accessible spaces and AS2890.2-2002 for heavy vehicles where applicable.*

*Notwithstanding the above, intersections between ramps and aisles are not required to provide for passing vehicles in accordance with AS2890.1. The final design shall be certified by a suitably qualified traffic engineer.*

We note that the Council, RMS and TfNSW have reviewed the non-complying design of the basement on the architectural drawings and did not raise any objection to it as part of their review. Therefore the proposed change to the condition to reflect the design shown on the drawings in the context of the letter provided by GTA, in our view shouldn't trigger the need to have a further review by the RMS. However if the Department is of the view this would be required then we would withdraw the requested amendment to the condition as part of this application so as to not slow it down any further.

Mike Russell is away at the moment but I understand has been working with the City on getting its land owners consent, I'll have an update on this for you next week when he's back.

Regards

**Michael Rowe** Associate

Office +61 2 9956 6962 Direct +61 2 9409 4921 Mobile +61 403 043 345 [Connect on LinkedIn](#)  
[jbaurban.com.au](#) - Level 7, 77 Berry Street, North Sydney (PO Box 375, North Sydney NSW 2059)



urban development services   

This email is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain information that is confidential and privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us by return email or phone, and delete the original message.

---

**From:** Matthew.Rosel@planning.nsw.gov.au [mailto:Matthew.Rosel@planning.nsw.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 29 March 2016 2:16 PM