

5 June 2023

Michael Maloof, Senior Development Assessment Planner
Development Services
Bayside Council
444-446 Princes Highway,
Rockdale NSW 2216

Via the planning portal and by email Michael.Maloof@bayside.nsw.gov.au

Dear Michael,

DA-2022/409 - 28-40 Lord Street Botany -Further Request for Information

Thank you for your email of 12 May in which you provided the further comments of Council's development engineer for our consideration.

The attached schedule sets out our response to the issues raised.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with either Jenny or me.

Regards



Alan Cadogan, Director

Urbanac Pty Ltd, m: +61 400 906 383, e: alan@urbanac.com.au

URBANAC

Schedule 1 – Further Response to Council's Request for Further Information

Council's Comment	UTS Response
<p><i>The Traffic report that your submission relies upon cannot be publicly released due to it being commercial in confidence. As such, Council cannot rely on it to justify the parking demand as it is not in the public interest. Council has a duty of care to demonstrate any scheme complies or is acceptable in respect to the traffic and parking requirements in the public realm. Therefore could you please revise the Traffic Report so that it can be released or use an alternative method to calculate the parking demand so that it justifies the amount and can be released or be available to the public.</i></p>	<p>UTS has agreed to provide a copy of the Measurement Report. We trust this provides sufficient detail to satisfy Council for the purposes of supporting the expected occupancy. A copy is attached.</p> <p>A copy of Planning Circular PS 21-03 Regulating expansion of schools is also attached.</p>
<p><i>In regard to the cap of people on the site if you desire 1,600 people on-site then the traffic report must justify this amount of people on site. Note the previous approvals have a cap number based on the staff numbers. A plan shall be provided that demonstrates sufficient floor space (2m² per person) is provided on-site above the PMF flood level for the maximum amount you desire. The location of the flood refuge, and storage area for items required during the shelter-in-place shall be indicated on a plan.</i></p>	<p>UTS does not believe a revision to the traffic report is necessary.</p> <p>Section 6.2 of the Traffic and Parking Assessment Report identified parking demand ranging from 334 to 497 spaces at the final stage based on scenarios that included a maximised staff occupancy as a worst case scenario using expected UTS attendance figures. It states:</p> <div data-bbox="786 992 1465 1379" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p><i>"6.2 Scenario Test No. 1 - Forecast Parking Demands of All Travel Behaviour as Staff</i></p> <p><i>Having regard to the scenario presented above in Section 5.3 where all persons travel behavior mirrored that of a 'staff' member, the peak staff demands of the site would equate to 1,343 persons. In turn, this would potentially equate to a parking demand of 497 spaces.</i></p> <p><i>Thus, the available overall parking provision of 573 spaces would be sufficient to accommodate the peak period demands of this conservative scenario."</i></p> </div> <p>Based on the findings already in the Traffic Report at Section 6.2, the demand generated by 1,343 occupants is 497 spaces – i.e. a rate of 1 space per 2.7 persons. Thus 571 spaces at 1 space per 2.7 persons would provide for demand from 1,541 occupants.</p> <p>Please be advised that, regrettably, our earlier response noted a parking demand occupancy of 1,600 contained an error for which we apologise – it was based on 479 spaces not 497, a typo we have only just now identified. UTS would accordingly like to update the 1,600 figure to be 1,541 persons.</p> <p>We also note that this number of occupants is not expected to be reached for several years. This is due to the staged timing of the uptake of the consent. We note that a performance based condition linking occupancy and parking provision would not be expected to be triggered until the later stages of the uptake. At that time, UTS would have site-specific data for occupancy at the Tech Lab site on which to base a re-examination of the parking provision including whether the shuttle bus service should be augmented.</p>

<p>A plan shall be provided that demonstrates sufficient floor space (2m² per person) is provided on-site above the PMF flood level for the maximum amount you desire. The location of the flood refuge, and storage area for items required during the shelter-in-place shall be indicated on a plan.</p>	<p>Drawing A1.07 details the areas of the proposed development including the upper levels of the buildings.</p> <p>The total GFA of levels 1 and 2 of the development is:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Block A-A1 level 1:</td><td>1,200m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block A-A1 level 2:</td><td>1,150m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block B/C level 1:</td><td>3,500m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block B/C level 2:</td><td>2,240m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block D level 1:</td><td>1,700m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block D level 2:</td><td>1,465m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block E level 1:</td><td>880m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Block E level 2:</td><td>880m²</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td><td>13,015m²</td></tr> </table> <p>At a rate of 2m² per person the upper floors of the development would provide capacity for 6,507 persons to shelter in place, well over the likely capacity.</p>	Block A-A1 level 1:	1,200m ²	Block A-A1 level 2:	1,150m ²	Block B/C level 1:	3,500m ²	Block B/C level 2:	2,240m ²	Block D level 1:	1,700m ²	Block D level 2:	1,465m ²	Block E level 1:	880m ²	Block E level 2:	880m ²	Total:	13,015m²
Block A-A1 level 1:	1,200m ²																		
Block A-A1 level 2:	1,150m ²																		
Block B/C level 1:	3,500m ²																		
Block B/C level 2:	2,240m ²																		
Block D level 1:	1,700m ²																		
Block D level 2:	1,465m ²																		
Block E level 1:	880m ²																		
Block E level 2:	880m ²																		
Total:	13,015m²																		
<p>The location of the flood refuge, and storage area for items required during the shelter-in-place shall be indicated on a plan.</p>	<p>Regarding the flood refuge storage areas and items, UTS considers that this can be dealt with via a condition of consent, and suggests the following wording or similar would be appropriate:</p> <p><i>Prior to the occupation of each stage, the Plan of Management is to be updated to include a plan showing the location of the flood refuge storage areas for the buildings of that stage for sheltering in place in the event of a flood.</i></p>																		