

ATTACHMENT 2 – POST EXHIBITION OUTCOMES REPORT

Summary of individual submissions received

The 15 submissions that support the proposal raised the following issues:

Submission Issue	Officer's comment
<p>The site is in a poor condition and is in need for redevelopment.</p> <p>Proposal provides additional housing in a suitable location and positively contributes to the local economy.</p>	<p>The buildings on the site are predominantly mid to late 20th Century two storey industrial properties in relatively good condition. This type of property provides good, affordable adaptable floorspace for light industrial uses and urban services. The site is not required to meet Inner West Council Local Housing Strategy targets.</p>

10 submissions that support the proposal subject to certain changes as shown below:

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Proposal is supported if the height is reduced.</p>	<p>Noted. On 21 November 2017, Council resolved that the maximum building height should be no greater than 5-6 storeys.</p>
<p>Proposal is supported if it ensures adequate parking for existing and future residents.</p>	<p>The proposed number of car parking spaces meets the requirements of Marrickville Development Control Plan (DCP) 2011. The site is in the vicinity of a light rail station and close to Dulwich Hill village centre so residents are less likely to need private vehicles.</p>
<p>Existing ponding issue in the school. Proposal is supported if proposal provides adequate drainage to not exacerbate the existing ponding issue.</p>	<p>Should the Planning Proposal proceed, this matter will be given detailed consideration at the Development Application stage to ensure the ponding issue is not exacerbated by the redevelopment of the site.</p>

65 submissions objected to the proposal on the following grounds:

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Excessive height and scale</p> <p>Proposal is incompatible with the local character. The proposed building height and density is excessive.</p>	<p>Council officers agree the height and scale of the proposed development is incompatible with the local area, particularly the proposed 8 storey building adjacent to the light rail corridor.</p> <p>The height of the closest existing tall building is 4 storeys at 529-539 New Canterbury Road. The GPO development at</p>

Issues	Officer's comment
	<p>429-449 New Canterbury Road is 6 storeys. The proposed maximum height on the subject site of 8 storeys is much taller than existing nearby high density development and is not supported.</p> <p>On 21 November 2017 Council resolved that the maximum building height should be no greater than 5-6 storeys.</p>
<p>Urban design</p> <p>There should be a street level setback from New Canterbury Road and the existing warehouse buildings and shop façades on that frontage should be retained.</p>	<p>In its assessment of the original planning proposal the former Marrickville Council's Architectural Excellence Panel (AEP) recommended that the new development should be built to the boundary with the footpath to match the existing shop front building line along New Canterbury Road. The proposal was amended in response to this recommendation.</p> <p>Detailed design matters such as retention of the shop façades will be considered as part of a site specific Development Control Plan (DCP). It should be noted, however, that the existing warehouse building has no heritage significance and its retention would be the subject of a merit assessment.</p>
<p>Impacts to Dulwich Hill Public School</p> <p>The recurring key concerns are overshadowing, overlooking, construction impacts and traffic safety for students.</p>	<p>The overshadowing and privacy impacts can be addressed by height reduction.</p> <p>Additional design measures can be introduced as part of a site-specific DCP to address overlooking.</p> <p>Detailed consideration of construction traffic impacts occurs at the development application stage.</p>
<p>Overshadowing impacts on surrounding area</p> <p>Concerns regarding overshadowing impacts on nearby homes, the church, the proposed communal open space and to Grove Street.</p>	<p>The proposal generally complies with Part 2.7.3 of Marrickville DCP (MDCP) 2011 provisions for two hours solar access to the windows or principal living areas and principal open spaces of nearby homes between 9am and 3pm during the winter solstice.</p> <p>Due to its poor location and design, the proposed communal open space would not receive sufficient sunlight and does not comply with Part 2.7.5.2 of MDCP 2011.</p> <p>Grove Street properties would not be overshadowed they are 300m from the site.</p>

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Impacts on Greek Orthodox Church</p> <p>General concerns regarding the impacts to the church which including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive bulk and scale next to the church; • Uncertainty of the retention of the church; • Parking competition for church goers. 	<p>In relation to the retention of the church. The Planning Proposal's retains the church and it's not included as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed bulk and scale next to the Church is excessive. This and parking would be addressed in a site specific DCP.</p>
<p>Proposed RE2 Private Recreation Zoning</p> <p>The benefits of a private pocket park would be insignificant.</p> <p>The RE2 'pocket park' element at 26 Hercules Street cannot be guaranteed as it is not owned by the proponent.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p>Traffic and Parking</p> <p>Unacceptable impacts on local traffic and loss of on-street parking.</p> <p>Safety concerns about potential increases in traffic during the school drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>Intersection of Beach Road and New Canterbury Road is busy and the increase in traffic would reduce road safety.</p> <p>Additional public parking should be provided within development to address parking issues in the local area.</p>	<p>There is no on-street parking along most of the site's boundaries including on New Canterbury Road and Hercules Street. The proposed redevelopment of the site would reduce the number of vehicle crossings and may create further opportunities for additional on-street parking.</p> <p>The proximity of the light rail station and Dulwich Hill village centre mean that residents of the proposed development would be more likely to use active transport and less likely to use private vehicles.</p> <p>Road safety risk during school drop off and pick up times will be addressed at development application stage.</p> <p>Additional public parking would have to be negotiated as part of a Voluntary Planning Agreement.</p>
<p>Housing mix</p> <p>Lack of a diverse mix of bedroom apartments. There is a significant number of 1 bedroom units and a lack of 3 bedroom units for families.</p>	<p>The proposed housing mix is broadly consistent with Part 4.2.3 of Marrickville DCP 2011. The proposed 3 bedroom units or bigger dwelling type falls 1% short of the minimum rate. This issue can be addressed in a site-specific DCP.</p>
<p>Reference to approval of Sydney Tools in GPO development as poor outcome that should not be allowed to happen again.</p>	<p>Council's deemed refusal of Sydney Tools on the ground floor of the GPO apartment development (DA201400477.04) to the north-east of the site was repealed at the Land and Environment Court, allowing the</p>

Issues	Officer's comment
A concern that this type of poor quality outcome might arise in this proposed development.	<p>applicant to proceed with this poor development.</p> <p>This type of issue would be addressed at the development application stage.</p>
<p>Proposed sunset clause</p> <p>Submission opposes the proposed LEP control to reverse the propose amendments unless a DA for a residential and/or mixed use development is submitted within three years. By limiting the requirement to the submission of a DA the site could be sold with an approved DA which opens the possibility for further delays and changes.</p>	The proposed sunset clause was required as part of the Gateway Conditions. Council officers will raise this concern with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.
<p>Industrial lands</p> <p>Not supportive of further loss of industrial land and local employment in the area as this proposal could mean longer journeys to access urban and industrial services. Industrial uses should be close to public transport.</p>	<p>The proposal is inconsistent with the 'Greater Sydney Region Plan' and 'Eastern City District Plan' retain and manage industrial land principle. The proposal has not justified the loss of industrial land as required by Section 9.1 Local Planning Direction – <i>Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones</i>.</p> <p>The proposed loss of industrial floor space is inconsistent with Council's policies including: <i>Our Inner West 2036 – Community Strategic Plan, Local Strategic Planning Statement, Draft Employment and Retail Lands Strategy and Integrated Transport Strategy – 'Going Places'</i></p> <p>In general these policies aim to protect all remaining industrial and urban services land.</p>
<p>Insignificant public benefits</p> <p>The proposed public benefits are insignificant relative to the proposed development potential of the site. It needs to be more than retention of the church, creation of a through-site link and the pocket park.</p> <p>Lack of affordable housing and community amenities in the development.</p>	If the Minister decides to proceed with the planning proposal Council will endeavour to negotiate a substantial package of community benefits including affordable housing through a Planning Agreement (Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA)).
<p>Access from New Canterbury Road</p> <p>Vehicle access should not be from New Canterbury Road.</p>	No vehicular access from New Canterbury Road is proposed.

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Infrastructure capacity</p> <p>Increased burden on utilities and surrounding public infrastructure, particularly schools and public transport. Submissions note that the existing light rail is at full capacity during peak hours.</p>	<p>Agreed. These are additional reasons not to support this planning proposal. It should be noted however, that the Department of Education did not raise concerns about impacts on school infrastructure.</p>
<p>Lack of open space</p> <p>Existing parks in the area are at capacity on weekends and that there is a general lack of open space.</p>	<p>Council is preparing a Plan of Management and Master Plan for Dulwich Hill Parklands (including Laxton Reserve, Arlington Reserve, Johnson Park and Hoskins Park) which provide guidance on the strategic management and physical upgrade of these parks over the next 10 years. Council is waiting for approval from the NSW Government before Council's adoption.</p> <p>This takes account of potential population growth in the area.</p>
<p>Lack of urban canopy</p> <p>Lack of trees and greenery in the streetscape.</p>	<p>A site-specific Development Control Plan will include provisions for planting, landscaping and the tree canopy.</p>
<p>Insufficient consideration of Greenway and Bandicoot Protection Area</p> <p>Lacks consideration of the Greenway and the Bandicoot Protection Area.</p>	<p>The proposal would provide a 6m through-site link adjacent to the light rail corridor to complement the Greenway. In broad terms however, it is inconsistent with Council's adopted Greenway Masterplan (August 2018) as it does not provide the Hercules Street streetscape improvements that redevelopment of the site was expected to deliver.</p> <p>A development application for this site would be required to assess impacts on the Bandicoot Protection Area.</p>
<p>Heritage matters</p> <p>A lack of heritage protection for the Church at 28 Hercules Street. Additionally, the proposed development detracts from surrounding heritage conservation areas.</p>	<p>The church is not a heritage item. Heritage protection of the building would require a separate planning proposal for heritage listing.</p> <p>There are no existing heritage conservation areas near the site, but the bulk and scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with local character.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p>Lack of consideration for environmental sustainability such as energy and water efficiency.</p>	<p>On 10 December 2019, Council adopted the Climate and Renewables Strategy, which aims to increase the environmental performance of buildings in the Inner West.</p>

Issues	Officer's comment
	<p>This will help Council to achieve stronger sustainability planning controls in the future.</p> <p>Building sustainability measures would be addressed in a site-specific DCP and reflect this strategy.</p>
<p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>Concerns about construction impacts, such as dust, noise, truck traffic, asbestos and safety of school children</p>	<p>These matters would be addressed as part of a Construction Management Plan at the development application stage.</p>
<p>Strategic justification is no longer relevant</p> <p>Sydenham to Bankstown (S2B) Strategy is no longer relevant and no longer applies to the site.</p>	<p>In 2018, the State Government announced that the revised draft Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor Strategy will not be adopted and returned the future planning of the corridor to councils. Council is preparing studies to inform this process.</p>
<p>Consolidated Inner West LEP</p> <p>Recommendation to incorporate the planning for this site as part of the Consolidated Inner West LEP program.</p>	<p>The future of this site will be considered in current planning studies. If the Minister does not proceed with the planning proposal the nature of redevelopment will be informed by these studies and reflected in an LEP Amendment for the area.</p>
<p>Deregistered status of proponent</p> <p>Australian Securities and Investments Commission website shows that Angus Development Pty Ltd is a deregistered company.</p>	<p>The planning proposal assessment simply deals with the strategic merits of the proposal. The status of the proponent's company is irrelevant to whether the proposal is a good proposal.</p>
<p>Community Consultation</p> <p>Community consultation period is short.</p> <p>Community consultation should occur as soon as a private-led planning proposal is submitted.</p>	<p>Council has exhibited the proposal for a minimum period of 28 days as set by the Gateway Conditions and is consistent with Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</p> <p>Overall, Council is reviewing its Inner West engagement framework to harmonise and establish a consistent process for community engagement in the planning proposal process. Such a framework will require community consultation and Council is expected to adopt a revised approach in the near future.</p>

4.3 Group Submissions

A total of three group submissions were separately received by Council. The issues in each of the group's submission are summarised below.

Save Dully

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Strategic justification is no longer relevant</p> <p>Submission states the development is consistent with the direction of the revised Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor Strategy that is no longer applicable.</p> <p>The proposal also includes references to the former strategy which should be removed.</p> <p>The local community, along with Council, have opposed the Sydenham to Bankstown Strategy in which the State Government no longer pursues and has returned planning powers back to Council.</p>	<p>On 27 July 2018, the State Government announced that the revised draft Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy will not be adopted and that the Government will work with councils to plan the future growth of the corridor. Council is preparing studies that will contribute to this process.</p> <p>Council acknowledges that the draft Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor Strategy should not be used to make planning decisions. Rather, the proposal should demonstrate consistency with current strategic planning frameworks, such as the <i>Greater Sydney Region Plan</i> and <i>Eastern City District Plan</i>, and Council's own LSPS, draft ERLS and the Integrated Transport Strategy.</p>
<p>Impacts on school</p> <p>The highest point of the development (9 storeys) is directly opposite to Dulwich Hill Public School. The development should be aligned away from the school not towards.</p> <p>This will cause overshadowing and privacy impacts to the school, particularly to the top oval.</p>	<p>The impacts on the school could be addressed through the reduction of the proposed height and scale of the proposed development. On 21 November 2017, Council resolved that the maximum building height should be no greater than 5-6 storeys to take account of the potential impacts on the school.</p> <p>Council officers will raise overshadowing and privacy impacts to the school with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.</p> <p>Should the planning proposal proceed any potential impacts on the school can also be addressed as part of a site-specific DCP.</p>
<p>Excessive height and scale</p> <p>The development is out of character with the surrounding low density housing.</p> <p>The proposed development is intensive for the site. Proposed height should be no more than 5 storeys along New Canterbury</p>	<p>Council officers acknowledge the height and scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with the local area, particularly the proposed 8 storey building adjacent to the light rail corridor.</p> <p>The original planning proposal was submitted at the time of the draft Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor Strategy, which recommended 8 storeys</p>

<p>Road and 3 storeys along Hercules Street, to reflect its sensitive location to the school.</p>	<p>on the site. The former Marrickville Council was generally supportive of the proposed height and scale of the proposed in expectation of the S2B strategy being adopted.</p> <p>In 2018, the NSW Government announced that the draft Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor Strategy would not proceed and it returned the planning of the Corridor to councils. This decision removed that potential justification for the proposed bulk and scale.</p> <p>On 21 November 2017 Council resolved that the maximum building height should be no greater than 5-6 storeys for this proposal.</p>
<p>Proposed private recreation zoning</p> <p>Lack of clarity and explanation behind the decision to propose the rezoning of 26 Hercules Street to RE2 zone (Private Recreation).</p> <p>No guarantee that 26 Hercules Street can be provided as a pocket park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private Recreation zoning would not trigger compulsory acquisition by Council. • Proponent no longer owns the site to dedicate the land as a pocket park. <p>A RE2 zoning would prohibit the existing residential accommodation use on the site if left unoccupied for more than a year.</p> <p>A RE2 zoning could permit other intensive uses on the site.</p>	<p>Condition (F) of the Gateway Determination requires the Planning Proposal to “<i>confirm the proposed RE1 and RE2 zoning of the site</i>”.</p> <p>The original Planning Proposal included a RE1 Public Recreation zone for 26 Hercules Street to facilitate a pocket park.</p> <p>Internal referral comments from Council’s recreation and public domain planners advised that the pocket park would not offer significant recreation benefits and it would be impractical for Council to adopt.</p> <p>The proposed link adjacent to the light rail corridor is beneficial as a Council asset as it contains biodiversity and complements the Greenway.</p> <p>Council officers advised the proponent to proceed with the RE2 zoning to satisfy a Gateway condition. Given the site was owned by the proponent at that time, there was no barrier to providing a pocket park.</p> <p>The site is no longer owned by the proponent and this raises uncertainty about the delivery of the pocket park.</p> <p>Other permissible uses would be considered on their merits at the development application stage.</p>
<p>Lack of transparency</p>	<p>The original Planning Proposal was submitted to Marrickville Council and its community engagement framework was applied to the initial assessment.</p>

<p>Concerns regarding the lack of transparency of the planning proposal since 2015 and the lack of community engagement in the design scheme.</p> <p>Council needs to revisit its engagement processes for private-led planning proposals which allow community feedback</p>	<p>The planning proposal received a favourable Gateway Determination after a rezoning review and Council is only the Planning Proposal Authority, without delegation to make the LEP amendment.</p> <p>Council has exhibited the proposal for a minimum period of 28 days as required by the Gateway conditions and in line with Schedule 1 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.</p> <p>Council is reviewing its engagement framework for the Inner West LGA to harmonise and establish a consistent process for community engagement in the planning proposal process. Such a framework will require community consultation and Council is expected to adopt the new approach in the near future.</p>
<p>Status of the proponent</p> <p>Concerns about the deregistered status of the proponent, in particular in regards to the Voluntary Planning Agreement process.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges the deregistered status of the proponent's company. The planning proposal assessment simply deals with the strategic merits of the proposal. The status of the proponent is irrelevant to whether the proposal contains good merits.</p> <p>Council's Property Team would be responsible for addressing the legal status of a proponent and land owners in relation to the validity of a proposed VPA. This is separate to the assessment of the planning proposal.</p> <p>Council does not make the final decision in this case, but the de-registration of the proponent's company will be drawn to the attention of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.</p>
<p>Church as a local heritage item</p> <p>Support for the church to be retained as a local heritage item.</p> <p>Concerns about the proponent hiring consultants to make recommendations of the heritage significance of the church which it does not own.</p>	<p>The church is not listed as a local heritage item under Schedule 5 of the Marrickville LEP 2011. There is no current or future intention by Council to heritage list the church.</p> <p>Any request for a heritage listing would require assessment and consideration by an independent heritage consultant and a lodgement of a formal Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The merits of listing the church will be considered in Council's forthcoming</p>

	heritage study that is intended to inform the next stage of the LEP.
<p>Access, traffic and parking</p> <p>Additional analysis of access, traffic and parking impacts is required.</p> <p>Proposed additional traffic along Hercules Street may cause potential conflict with school traffic.</p> <p>Impacts on surrounding on-street parking along residential streets.</p> <p>Reduction of the overall development may result in decrease in on-street parking impacts.</p>	<p>The proponent's traffic and parking assessment report has demonstrated that the traffic and parking impacts associated with the proposed development do not present any unacceptable implications.</p> <p>The proposed development would encourage residents to use active and public transport because of its proximity to the light rail station and Dulwich Hill village centre.</p> <p>A site specific DCP would also include controls for access, traffic and parking.</p>
<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Lack of details of the level of affordable housing to be offered.</p>	<p>If the Minister decides to proceed with the planning proposal Council will endeavour to negotiate a substantial package of community benefits including affordable housing through a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA).</p>
<p>Greenway</p> <p>The design of the development should align with the vision of the Greenway Strategy.</p>	<p>The Proposal includes land contribution for a pedestrian and cycleway link along the light rail corridor which is considered beneficial to the Greenway. The overall design of the proposal and in particular its excessive height and scale could adversely affect the amenity of the Greenway.</p> <p>These issues would be considered in a site-specific DCP.</p>

Dulwich Hill P&C

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Excessive height and scale</p> <p>Proposed development is out of scale with the surrounding area, and may set a precedent for large scale development in the vicinity.</p> <p>Particular concerns about the proposed height of 32m at 38 Hercules Street, as it is significantly higher than any other building in the immediate surroundings.</p> <p>Lack of setback from Hercules Street.</p> <p>A 4 storey height is more suitable for this site that is opposite to a primary school.</p>	<p>The height and scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with the local area, particularly the proposed 8 storey building adjacent to the light rail corridor.</p> <p>On 21 November 2017 Council resolved the maximum building height should be no greater than 5-6 storeys, taking account of the potential impacts to the school.</p> <p>Should the planning proposal proceed detailed design consideration and mitigation of potential impacts to the school can be addressed as part of a site-specific DCP.</p>
<p>Impacts to school</p> <p>Concerns about the proposed overshadowing to the school, particularly to the playground and during winter.</p> <p>Reduction of height may address the overshadowing issue.</p> <p>Concerns about privacy impacts to the school. Recommends measures to be adopted for units facing the primary school to minimise privacy issues.</p>	
<p>Traffic and parking impacts</p> <p>The school community is to be consulted and involved in the development of traffic plans to manage traffic and parking issues If the Planning Proposal is to be approved.</p> <p>Summary of traffic and parking issues as raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient parking for drop-off; • Hercules Street has no pedestrian crossing to entrance of the school; • Proposed underground parking would allow cars to exit with limited line of sight to pedestrians; • Commercial trucks entering the building to service the proposed supermarket may cause safety issues; • No additional street parking to be proposed. 	<p>There is no on-street parking along most of the site's boundaries including on New Canterbury Road and Hercules Street. The proposed redevelopment of the site would reduce the number of vehicle crossings and may create further opportunities for additional on-street parking.</p> <p>The proximity of the light rail station and Dulwich Hill village centre mean that residents of the proposed development would be more likely to use active transport and less likely to use private vehicles.</p> <p>Road safety risk during school drop off and pick up times would be addressed at the development application stage.</p> <p>Additional public parking would have to be negotiated as part of a Voluntary Planning Agreement.</p>

<p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>Concerns about construction impacts, such as dust, noise, truck traffic and safety of school students. Hercules Street is the major pedestrian entrance to the school and raises potential safety concerns of potential construction traffic.</p>	<p>Construction impacts would be addressed as part of a Construction Management Plan at the development application stage.</p>
---	--

Greek Orthodox Church (28 Hercules Street)

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Proposed amendments</p> <p>Opposes any lot boundary changes or rezoning to the church site without direct consultation.</p>	<p>The proposed amendments, in particular in relation to the secondary sites, present significant site-specific issues which are discussed in detail in Attachment 1.</p> <p>The planning proposal would amend the Marrickville LEP 2011 by changing the zoning and development controls of the proposed sites. The amendments would not affect the legal lot boundaries.</p> <p>The concept design needs the rear portion of 26 and 28 Hercules Street to facilitate the proposed development. The proponent does not own the church site or the lots to the rear of the church so the possibility of implementing the development on the secondary site is uncertain.</p> <p>This situation could lead to an unacceptably fragmented redevelopment of parts of the site.</p>
<p>Impacts on church site</p> <p>Direct overshadowing of the church during winter.</p> <p>Concerns about the potential impacts, during and post-construction, to the daily operation of the church. In particular, impacts to the operation of the bell tower. The submission highlights the church should retain all rights to operate the bell in the future without compromise.</p>	<p>Construction impacts would be addressed as part of a Construction Management Plan at the development application stage.</p> <p>Potential impacts on the operation of the Church would be considered as part of a site-specific DCP and at the development application stage.</p>
<p>Incompatible with local area</p> <p>Proposal is inconsistent with the local character of the area, in</p>	<p>Council officers acknowledge the height and scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with the local area, particularly</p>

<p>Impacts on school</p> <p>Concerns regarding privacy impacts to the school.</p>	<p>the proposed 8 storey building adjacent to the light rail corridor.</p> <p>On 21 November 2017 Council resolved that the maximum building height should be no greater than 5-6 storeys.</p> <p>Should the planning proposal proceed, detailed design consideration and mitigation of potential impacts to the school can be addressed as part of a site-specific DCP.</p>
<p>Traffic and parking impacts</p> <p>The proposed development would cause parking and traffic issues on the surrounding residential streets.</p>	<p>There is no on-street parking along most of the site's boundaries including on New Canterbury Road and Hercules Street. The proposed redevelopment of the site would reduce the number of vehicle crossings and may create further opportunities for additional on-street parking.</p> <p>The proximity of the light rail station and Dulwich Hill village centre mean that residents of the proposed development would be more likely to use active transport and less likely to use private vehicles.</p> <p>Road safety risk during school drop off and pick up times will be addressed at development application stage.</p> <p>Additional public parking would have to be negotiated as part of a Voluntary Planning Agreement.</p>
<p>Pocket Park and Open Space</p> <p>Proponent no longer owns the site to dedicate the land as a pocket park.</p> <p>Inadequate supply of open space to accommodate the additional demand of units on the site.</p>	<p>Lack of certainty about delivery of the pocket park will be raised with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.</p> <p>Council is preparing a Plan of Management and Master Plan for Dulwich Hill Parklands (including Laxton Reserve, Arlington Reserve, Johnson Park and Hoskins Park) which provides guidance on the strategic management and physical upgrade of these parks over the next 10 years. Council is waiting for approval from the NSW Government before Council's adoption.</p> <p>This takes account of potential population growth in the area.</p>

<p>Social Impacts</p> <p>Recommends a Social Impact Report should be provided.</p>	<p>The original Planning Proposal considered by Marrickville Council did not require a Social Impact Assessment.</p>
---	--

4.3 Public Authority Submissions

Public authority consultation with Transport for NSW (TfNSW), Roads and Maritime Service and Department of Education was required by the Gateway Determination. Council received a submission from TfNSW.

i) Transport for NSW

Issues	Officer's comment
<p>Pedestrian Access</p> <p>The proposed provision of a 6m wide through-site link is supported.</p> <p>Recommendation to further activate the ground floor by locating non-residential uses along the western boundary and ensure passive surveillance.</p> <p>Investigation into future pedestrian demands generated by the proposal and cumulative pedestrian demands in the area through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Investigation of a second pedestrian access to the light rail platform at the southern end of the site;• Appropriate pedestrian treatments along Hercules Street frontage;• Appropriate setbacks to ensure footpath widening along New Canterbury Road frontage and facilitate place making initiatives.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These matters can be addressed through the preparation of a site-specific DCP and at the development application stage.</p>
<p>Vehicular Access</p> <p>Any vehicular access points to New Canterbury Road will not be supported. Existing vehicular crossings on the New Canterbury Road will need to be removed and replaced with kerb and gutter as part of any future Development Applications.</p> <p>All future service vehicle concerns should be accommodated on site. New Canterbury Road should not be relied on for future delivery/ loading demands associated with the proposed use. 'No Stopping' signposting will be required on New Canterbury Road.</p> <p>Road safety concerns with any increase in right turning vehicles from Kintore Street to</p>	<p>No new vehicular access to New Canterbury Road is proposed.</p> <p>These matters can be addressed through the preparation of a site-specific DCP and at the development application stage.</p>

<p>New Canterbury Road. As a result, right turns should be physically prevented at this location. This will require a submission of a Traffic Management Plan in the future.</p>	
<p>Future Development Requirements</p> <p>Sensitive noise receive will need mitigation measures from New Canterbury Road and light rail operations to satisfy Clause 102 (3) of Infrastructure SEPP 2007.</p> <p>Early consultation with TfNSW at the pre-DA stage is encouraged to meet Clauses 85 – 87 of Infrastructure SEPP 2007.</p> <p>Any building located within 25m of the light rail corridor and that includes excavation of 2m requires concurrence from TfNSW.</p> <p>Design and construction of any future building must comply with TfNSW's <i>Technical Note T HR CL 12080 ST External Developments version 1.0</i> and DPIE's <i>Development Near Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Safety Interface Agreement and Commercial Agreements with TfNSW need to be in place following the approval of the development.</p> <p>Future design of any building on the site need to demonstrate no adverse impacts from the light rail corridor, station and operations.</p> <p>Drainage from the development must be adequately disposed of/managed and not discharged into the light rail corridor.</p> <p>Any transport assessment to support future DA(s) for the site must include updated bus service information. Currently Traffic and Parking report contains outdated information.</p> <p>Updated trip generation surveys of smaller retail developments in Sydney can be utilised and can be requested.</p>	<p>These matters are noted and can be addressed through the preparation of a site-specific DCP and at the development application stage.</p> <p>Any future development application will consider the requirements of the Infrastructure SEPP 2007 and these related matters.</p>