

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Traffic, Access and Parking | 49 (77%) (Total 49 submissions) | <p>77% of submissions related to traffic congestion access and parking;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likelihood of increased AM and PM traffic congestion at Whaling Road, Little Alfred St. and Alfred St. intersections; congestion at these intersections already occurs. • Whaling Road HCA being one way in and out could cause emergency service access issues. • Proposal provides for a piecemeal redevelopment of the Precinct, rather than an integrated development outcome, leading to traffic, parking and access impacts. • Parking overburdened during the week and on weekends, proposed redevelopment works, and roadworks would further exacerbate this situation for residents and visitors. • Only one access road for parking within the site, via Little Alfred Street; it is narrow, and visibility is limited, doubts over its ability to handle the increased traffic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would significantly improve pedestrian amenity and safety with the removal of 2x driveways and unappealing back of house facilities (with access to Little Alfred Street). • The site slopes from east to west by a min. of 3m, whilst Little Alfred Street has a steep hill to the middle of the street and site through links have been designed with stairs to suit the sloping typography and create a level throughout the site link; proponent however open to the possibility of considering alternate through links during Site Specific DCP consideration following the adoption of the planning proposal. • Setbacks along Little Alfred Street are consistent with the existing built form whilst allowing for elevated landscaping podiums which would create a landscaping buffer with the Heritage Conservation Area. • On street car parking and construction would be addressed as part of a future Development Application, noting the North Sydney DCP2013 has maximum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located within 600m of the Victoria Cross Metro Station and the existing North Sydney Railway Station and associated bus service. Such a level of transport infrastructure encourages its use. • North Sydney has one of the highest percentages of public transport uses, 71% of residents and workers that either walk, cycle use public transport or ride share to travel to and from work. • The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (prepared by TTPP) demonstrates that development can be undertaken on site which is compliant with the maximum car parking (inclusive of motorcycle and bicycle) provisions set out in the North Sydney Development Control Plan 2013 (DCP2013) and the minimum requirements of SEPP 65, Apartment Design Guidelines. • Traffic modelling was undertaken for the proposed development to the intersections of Alfred Street/Whaling Road and Neutral Street/Whaling Road as part of the TIA, abovementioned, providing an assessment for the |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over additional residential units overburdening the already at capacity carpark. • Safety in Little Alfred Street due to increased traffic; non-compliant gradient, width and form. • Whaling Road is a dead end street that leads to a closed network of 12 streets and is home to over 1,500 residents, all vehicles ingress and egress through just one point. • Proposal needs to give more consideration to Little Alfred Street with appropriate setbacks at ground floor and level 1. | <p>car parking rates, however given the site is well serviced by public transport, there may be an opportunity to reduce car parking.</p> | <p>proposed parking, internal layout and traffic generation. The proposal is projected to reduce the trips generated from the Precinct by 31 trips at the AM peak and 23 trips at the PM peak given the residential trip generation rates are lower than commercial ones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planning proposal would split the site into four separate sites with indicative yields and separate vehicle access to each site provided from Little Alfred Street. • The development would result in an increase in the average delays and queues to Little Alfred Street-Whaling Road and Neutral Street-Whaling Road intersections, however given the detailed modelling in the TIA these intersections would continue to function well throughout peak periods. • The proposal is not anticipated to have any adverse impacts when compared to the existing scenario. With consideration of the TIA and proposed parking provision it is envisioned that the proposed development would have a minorly beneficial impact on the road network. • TfNSW has requested retail floorspace be limited to 1,200m². It has also raised |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>that the proposal needs to be co-ordinated with the Western Harbour Tunnel project. Although this would be a requirement during DA is it worth noting that the upgrades to the Warringah Freeway as part of the Western Harbour Tunnel EIS will make changes to roads and access within the immediate vicinity of the site. This includes a new south bound off ramp along Alfred Street that is proposed to cut across part of the Alfred Street North Park, effectively reducing the size of the park; as well as changes to allow a new access from the High Street Bridge into Whaling Road. A signalised pedestrian crossing at the intersection of High and Alfred St North is also proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further assessment may be needed with regard to the proposed vehicular entry from Whaling Road, and any further updates to traffic movements as a result of the intersection changes. • The indicated driveway access points may not be able to be achieved if there is no site amalgamation as they rely on access over the adjoining site. The individual properties may need to have separate vehicle access. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| Building Height, Bulk and Scale | 43 (68%) | <p>68% of submissions related to building height, bulk and scale;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floor Space Ratio (FSR) that has been applied does not match the min. FSR as indicated on the proponent's feasibility study. • Sheer size and mass of the proposed development would dwarf the residences surrounding it. • Limited benefit to sites A, C & D compared to B, which receives increased FSR advantage compared with neighbouring properties under the planning proposal. • FSR calculated on entire Alfred Street Precinct area rather than site B. • Dissatisfaction expressed over Bayer building already exceeding allowable height limits; gross overdevelopment of the site. • Design excellence provision rewards 'good design' which often results in higher and more bulky building forms. • Extreme overdevelopment of North Sydney centre. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grimshaw undertook a massing study and determined that all sites could generally achieve an FSR of 3.5:1 using the proposed Site Specific DCP controls. • Additional height and FSR proposed would achieve significant improvement in the appearance of the Bayer Building which is currently intrusive and requires urban renewal. • The design competition process ensures that a high level of architecture and urban and landscape design is achieved, which would benefit the community ensuring optimal outcomes for a ground floor plane, through site links, interface with residential properties and façade treatments. • Built form is considered reasonable, provides a suitable transition between North Sydney CBD and the adjoining Whaling Rd HCA; generally on building envelopes established in Council's draft Precinct Planning Study. • Regarding Site C, Council's preferred option in their draft Precinct Planning Study only allowed for an FSR of 1.62:1 for Site C; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering the site's location within 600m of the future Victoria Cross Metro Station and the existing North Sydney Railway Station and associated bus service it is appropriate to apply proposed density. It is consistent with the strategic direction of the <i>Sydney Region Plan</i> to maximise residential floorspace close to major transport infrastructure. • Apart from the tower on Site B, the existing Bayer building, the bulk of the development is within an 8 storey built form, which complies with Council's recommendation in the Precinct Planning Study. • It is recommended that the built form outlined in the DCP be updated to ensure it provides a suitable transition from the CBD to the Whaling Road HCA with regard to setbacks along Little Alfred Street in the concept scheme. The appearance of the existing intrusive Bayer building is proposed to be significantly improved and beyond Site B the proposed heights are generally |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site A - 1.39:1 ○ Site B - 10.58:1 ○ Site C - 1.62:1 ○ Site D – 3.42:1 ● The draft Alfred Street Precinct Planning Study (prepared as a result of the former JRPP decision) whilst not formally adopted was prepared to create a framework for future land owner planning proposals and this planning proposal is consistent with the Council’s preferred option, which proposes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site B – 24 storeys ○ Sites A & C – 3 storeys ○ Site D – 9 storeys ● This planning proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site B – 24 storeys ○ Sites A, C & D – 8 storeys ○ Little Alfred Street boundary – 3 storeys ● The FSR controls are a maximum provision and there is no assurance that the maximum can be achieved on the site. Furthermore, the mix of commercial and residential floor space could also be reformed to ensure that the site can achieve the target FSRs of 3.5:1. | <p>consistent with Council’s draft Alfred Street Precinct Planning Study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Any additional height to Site D may result in additional overshadowing to the park and the properties to the south in the Whaling Road HCA. ● Any additional height to Site C may result in additional overshadowing to properties to the east in Neutral Street, however some shadow will fall within the existing shadow of Site B. ● Should any increase in height be considered appropriate to site C and D, this would constitute a post exhibition change that would require further consultation/exhibition. ● It is unlikely any further FSR increases could be supported, given the setbacks to Little Alfred St need to be provided as outlined in the Urban design report. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| Heritage | 43 (68%) | <p>68% of submissions related to heritage;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would result in gross overshadowing of the existing R2 zoned 8.5m high Whaling Road Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) houses; likely to occur by the two proposed 24 storey towers. • Proposal does not respond appropriately to site context and surrounding HCA. • The proposed development would in no way sustain or enhance the significance of the HCA, but instead detract from it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site falls outside the North Sydney CBD and the proposed built form provides an appropriate transition from the CBD and Warringah Freeway to the adjoining Whaling Rd HCA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ stepping down to a 3 storey podium along the northern and eastern boundaries, consistent with Council's draft Precinct Study ○ 15.5m setback to the upper levels of Sites A, C and D along eastern boundary ○ Ground floor podium indented 6m along northern boundary, to allowing for a landscaping buffer, whilst upper levels setback 6m from the boundary. • The proposal introduces elevated landscaping podiums to soften the build form and transition to the adjoining HCA. • Setbacks along Little Alfred Street are consistent with the existing built form whilst allowing for elevated landscaping podiums which would create a landscaping buffer with the Heritage Conservation Area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is supported by a Heritage Impact Statement (prepared by Urbis) that concludes that the proposed is favourable to Council's reference scheme in regard to overshadowing, setbacks and on heritage grounds. • None of the dwellings on site are heritage listed or have heritage value. The proposed development would result in significant alterations to, or removal of existing buildings which are of no architectural value, inclusive of the Bayer Building at 275 Alfred Street and which currently detracts from the setting and significance of the nearby Whaling Road HCA. • The Whaling Road HCA character and significance and adjoining heritage items remains protected in the context of its adjacency of the North Sydney CBD under the proposed development, as assessed in the HIA. • It is considered that the draft DCP could be updated to provide further provisions to allow an improved interface with the Whaling Road HCA, as provided in the urban design report. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed height and built form is generally consistent with Council’s preferred draft scheme for the precinct, incorporating a provision for the Bayer building to adopt a slimmer profile at its topmost levels; as recommended by the North Sydney planning panel. | |
| Overshadowing /loss of solar access | 33 (52%) | <p>52% of submissions related to overshadowing and loss of solar access;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional height of the proposal would deliver reduced solar access for the residential amenity of the precinct; currently residents need to use household lighting during daylight hours and are limited in accessibility to solar powered storage. Bayer Building already casts a large shadow over many dwellings, the proposed would exacerbate this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Denton, an independent overshadowing specialist was appointed to prepare overshadowing analysis, to analyse the full extent pf overshadowing impacts on Alfred Street North Park and surrounding residents. The analysis concluded the park would retain sufficient solar access between 10am-2pm at mid-winter and the planning proposal would generally result in the same or less overshadowing to the Alfred Street North Park than Council’s draft Precinct Planning Study. The Urban Design Package provided by Grimshaw’s notes 92% of the Precinctis compliment with solar access requirements and individually; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site A: 100%; Site B: 85%; Site C 100%; and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Urban Design package (Grimshaw) demonstrates that development can be undertaken at the site which is compliant with the requirements of the SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guidelines. The building envelopes have considered; solar and daylight access, building separation, street setbacks, visual privacy, pedestrian access and entries, all types of parking, apartment mix, mixed use building, ventilation, acoustics and waste management. The analysis (prepared by John Denton) undertaken to assess impacts of the proposed development on the existing conditions as at 21st June between 9:00am-3:00pm note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> properties along Whaling Road would receive 3.0 hours of AM |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site D: 90%. • The elevational shadow diagrams demonstrate that the proposal would have ‘minimal overshadowing impacts to properties along Whaling Road and would be less than proposed in Council’s draft Precinct Planning Study’. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ sunshine and maintain a portion of solar access in the afternoon; dwelling adjacent, between Little Alfred and Neutral Streets would receive similar conditions in the afternoon from 2:00pm onwards; • The Department also notes that there is significant existing overshadowing caused by the North Sydney CBD Skyline in the afternoon to the Alfred Street Park North and surrounds particularly after 3pm. • Given the proposed location of a new southbound off ramp that will transverse the Public Open Space RE1 known as Alfred Street North Park, as part of the upgrade works occurring for the Western Harbour Tunnel, the overshadowing to this land from 12pm to 1.00pm is not likely to affect the extent of the park that will remain and most of the shadow may affect the proposed roadway. • The draft DCP should be updated to further address the built form setbacks that could potentially reduce overshadowing impacts to the surrounding Whaling Road HCA and the park between 1pm and 3pm. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| Proposal Inconsistencies – Site Specific DCP and Reference Scheme | 9 (14%) | <p>14% of submissions related to proposal inconsistencies;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal relies on inconsistent and conflicting documentation to support it, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ i.e. ‘reference scheme’ (prepared by Grimshaw 03/2019) is not consistent with more recent amendments made to the planning proposal. • Proposal seeks rezoning of land and property within the precinct not owned by the proponent. Proponent notes attempted communication with owners of this land. • The planning proposal is misleading in that it claims to represent appropriate and sensitive transition to the Whaling Road Heritage Conservation Area, but in fact provides little or no aesthetic or functional integration between the Proposal sites and the Whaling Road precinct. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where there are inconsistencies between the Site Specific DCP and Reference Scheme in the Urban Design Report, the Site Specific DCP should be relied upon. • The Reference scheme illustrates how a mixed use development could be achieved using this site on the site using the LEP and DCP density controls; illustrating the layout of each floor. • The site specific DCP is not required to be finalised during the planning proposal stage. Once the planning proposal is finalised site specific DCP is to be negotiated with council given it is currently a ‘draft’ document and would therefore be further refined during this process and undergo a separate exhibition in due course. • The proponent notes the issues raised in relation to the true site links depth of build form along little Alfred street and signage would be able to be addressed when the Site Specific DCP is considered by Council. <p>Section 3 of the Planning Proposal details amendments made to scheme throughout</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although a site specific DCP is not required to be finalised at this stage of the planning proposal, the execution of a site-specific DCP is considered to be integral in ensuring a refined development outcome can be produced. The Department is of the view that a site-specific DCP should be required to be prepared prior to finalisation, and a clause in the LEP should require the draft DCP be adopted to address site-specific issues prior to any lodgement of a Development application for the site. • The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (the Act) and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations (Regulations) do not require land owners consent to lodge or determine a planning proposal, however compliance with notification purposes is required. • The Department notes the proponents attempt to obtain consent from all landowners in line with North Sydney Council’s requirements, however not all responded; Benmill Pty Ltd and JB No.3, |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>the process; consolidated package, including all the latest revisions sent to DPIE October 2020.</p> | <p>owners of 275 Alfred Street provided their consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed building height transition to low scale development, in the urban design report shows increased building envelope setbacks and landscape buffer and are considered by the Department to minimise amenity impacts to the surrounding HCA, if these are consistently reflected in the draft DCP. • The Department considers that the reference scheme referred to in the proposal and supporting the planning proposal should form the basis of the draft DCP rather than the draft DCP being relied on where there are inconsistencies between the documents. • The vehicular access point for Sites C may require further consideration as if there is no amalgamation of these sites, Site D will rely on Site C for access to its property. The move of the access point to Whaling Road from Little Alfred Street should be reconsidered with regard to changes proposed as part of the Western Harbour Tunnel. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Amenity | 15 (24%) | <p>24% of submissions related to amenity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over lack of green space, trees and public amenity. • Proposal out of context with surrounding residential area. • Further intense development in this area would destroy the residential amenity of the area. • Alfred Street North Park (southern side of Bayer building) is 'noted' as green space however this is often utilised by the TfNSW (RMS) as storage/future real estate for the Northern Beaches link. • Increased pressure on already overstretched local recreational resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public domain appearance would be increased by providing mature tree plantings along street frontages. • The site is located in proximity to several open space opportunities and through links. • The proposed development provides an appropriate transition to the low scale development in the HCA with a residential fine grain typology along Alfred Street, increased building envelopes setbacks and a landscaping buffer. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed building height transition to low scale development, increased building envelope setbacks and landscape buffer are considered by the Department to minimise amenity impacts to the surrounding HCA, and should be reflected in the draft DCP. • Changes to the Alfred Street North Park are proposed in relation to the Western Harbour Tunnel and upgrade to Warringah Freeway project that seek to improve active transport connections. |
| Overlooking/Loss of Privacy | 15 (23%) | <p>23% of submissions related to overlooking and loss of privacy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would create a 24 hour opportunity, lack of privacy to homes in the Whaling Road HCA. • Rezoning would enable overlooking from an increased height by residents in contrast to current commercial (Bayer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privacy concerns along Little Alfred Street can be addressed at the Development Application stage, however the proposal generally complies with SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guidelines (ADG) separation distances. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in the HIA given the proposal seeks to retain the site of the existing Bayer Building as the highest built form within the precinct, flanked by modest building increases either side the views |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>building) overlooking not being a privacy issue.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper level development proposed on Sites A, C and D would be approximately 23m from the Little Alfred Street boundary, compliant with ADG. | <p>are generally maintained throughout and would not be unduly impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A slimmer profile, as noted in the Site Specific DCP is required at the site of the Bayer building's topmost levels as recommended by the North Sydney Planning Panel and supported by the Department. |
| No Public Benefit | 10 (16%) | <p>16% of submissions related to public benefit;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionable and unsubstantiated 'public benefits' arising from the Proposal. No public benefit. By replacing floor space with residential as proposed new employment opportunities are diminished. North Sydney Council's submission noted that a Voluntary Planning Agreement was not exhibited. The Letter of offer provided is limited in detail and only provides a high level indication to enter into a VPA. Council also noted that should the Department support the planning proposal that a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning proposal seeks to reinvigorate the Precinct by creating a lively mixed use precinct which would provide activities for both day and night. Main activities within the precinct would occur internally within the pedestrian arcade whilst limiting activity along Little Alfred Street. The Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) is currently in draft format and gives certainty as to what would be included in the draft VPA, it's the proponent's intention to prepare and mature its contents during the Development Application (DA) stage. A letter of offer has been prepared for the planning proposal to give the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the site's location within 600m of the future Victoria Cross Metro Station and the existing North Sydney Railway Station it is consistent with the strategic direction of the <i>Sydney Region Plan</i> to maximise residential floorspace close to major transport infrastructure. The Department notes the proposed development letter of offer includes potential contributions towards affordable housing, enhancement of surrounding public spaces and through links to surrounding public transport infrastructure. The Department notes the proponent's letter of offer and intention to negotiate a VPA with Council . |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>deferred commencement date be included to allow additional time for Council and the proponent to negotiate the VPA outcome.</p> | <p>Department and Council some certainty as to what would be included in the VPA.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that a deferred commencement clause be included in the LEP to enable finalisation of Council's Development Control Plan (DCP) to further refine the proposed FSR and site-specific design provisions. This additional time would also provide Council with an opportunity to negotiate the VPA outcome and the Department time to exhibit and execute the VPA. |
| Western Harbour Tunnel and Warringah Freeway Upgrade | 7 (11%) | <p>11% of submissions related to the Warringah Freeway upgrade and consideration of Western Harbour Tunnel;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the planning proposal was lodged the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link has been approved inclusive of upgrades to the Warringah Freeway. The site is adjacent to the Freeway and impacts of this work needs to be taken into consideration. Compatibility with the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Western Harbour Tunnel and Warringah Freeway upgrades (WHTWUFU) were not considered in the original assessment given it was not advanced as it is to date. A letter has been prepared by TTPP to address the traffic impacts, during construction and operation, of the Warringah Freeway and Western Harbour Tunnel on the proposal. The letter notes construction generating traffic travelling along Alfred Street North are considered minimal and not expected to result in adverse traffic impacts on Alfred Street North. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department considers the Western Harbour Tunnel and Warringah Freeway upgrades project to enhance the travel connectivity route across Sydney Harbour. TIA assessment provided as part of the exhibition package and the updated letter from TTPP addresses the traffic impacts during construction and operation of both the Warringah Freeway and Western Harbour Tunnel. The Department notes minimal traffic generation during construction and a net reduction in traffic compared to the existing potential traffic generation of the site once operational; a result of the |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>proposed reduction in commercial floor area onsite compared to current conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department notes the EIS provides indicative details of the proposed changes within the vicinity of the Alfred Street Precinct, including: • a new southbound off ramp along Alfred Street North to High Street through the Alfred Street North Park; • the conversion of the existing High Street and Alfred Street intersection to a signalised intersection, • a new access to/from Whaling Road via Alfred Street North from High Street. • TFNSW has commented that the traffic analysis will need to take into account these changes for any future development application. However it is noted that the draft DCP should also consider these changes with regard to the vehicle access entries proposed. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Environmental concerns (noise & air quality) | 4 (6%) | <p>6% of submissions related to environmental concerns;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased air pollution from stationary traffic, concentrated in the small area around residential homes. • Impacts to residents due to noise generated during construction, likely to be several years of redevelopment. • Fall-out from air-borne dust and other particulates from on-going construction and existing Warringah Freeway upgrades. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction concerning issues i.e. air pollution, asbestos, noise etc. would be addressed in a future Development Application (DA) with standard conditions generally imposed to minimise the impact to surrounding residents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction related impacts and all associated reports requirements would be addressed thorough consideration of the Development Application and appropriate consent conditions would be set. |
| Financial inequality | 4 (6%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed new height delivers financial gain to potential new developer to redevelop site, community and resident impact not considered equitably in planning proposal. • Limited financial benefit to sites A, C & D compared to B, which receives increased FSR advantage compared with neighbouring properties under the planning proposal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking a balance between amenity, appropriate building envelopes, public benefit, economic viability and development surety has been reflected in the build form, generally consistent with Council's draft Precinct Planning Study. • The intent of the proposal is to revitalise the existing precinct i.e. the interface with the Whaling Road Heritage HCA whilst incorporating benefits of improved; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public space, widening of footpaths and planting of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department notes the proponent's attempt to obtain consent from all landowners in line with North Sydney Council's requirements. However not all responded; Benmill Pty Ltd and JB No.3, owners of 275 Alfred Street provided their consent. • It is not a requirement of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (EP&A 1979) and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations (Regulations) to obtain owners' consent to lodge or determine a Planning Proposal. However compliance with notification purposes is required. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent’s Response | Department’s View and Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>mature trees along active frontages;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Permeability; ○ Mixed-usage of the site, with both day and night time opportunities for activity. ○ Contributions financially, for upgrades to surrounding public spaces. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 271 and 273 Alfred Street would be required to be amalgamated to create Site C and 263-269 Alfred Street and Little Alfred Street to create Site D; minimising the number of land owners to enable the redevelopment of the Precinct. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Department considers the planning proposal should benefit the Precinct as a whole, not specifically the Bayer building. Density is proposed to increase across the entire precinct whereby all sites should experience financial benefits compared with current conditions. ● Providing a suitable building envelope for the proposal, to ensure amenity is maintained to the surrounding area takes precedence over feasibility which may be resolved in the longer term. ● Measures to ensure the proposal contributes to public domain and open space improvements in line with demand generated are in place through the mechanism for Council to levy developer contributions at the Development Application stage or via a Voluntary Planning Agreement. |

Alfred St. Precinct – Submissions Table

| Key Issue | Number of Submissions | Specific Reasons (Highlight the key issues and specifics raised around the theme) | Proponent's Response | Department's View and Recommendation |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| Public Exhibition | 1 (3%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Sydney Council provided a submission noting their concerns over public exhibition, more specifically regarding notification and exhibition length. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised by the Planning Panel Secretariat that the notifications were carried out in accordance with the Planning Panel's Operational Procedure Guidelines and the Exhibition period was extended from 10 December 2020 until 29 January 2021, to 10 December 2020 until 19 February 2021 (refer to Attachment 4). Whilst the exhibition documentation was not made available on DPIE's website until 22 December, the notification period was extended which allowed for the minimum required 28 days. DPIE confirmed that documentation was made publicly available on their website inclusive of the final and redundant documents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that a deferred commencement clause be included in the LEP to enable finalisation of Council's development control plan (DCP) to further refine the proposed FSR across the four sites and site-specific provisions. This additional time would also provide Council with an opportunity to negotiate and the Department time to exhibit and execute the VPA outcome. The Department was compliant in uploading all publicly available information online for the minimum requirement of 28 days. |