

## Attachment H

PUBLIC AUTHORITY	ISSUES	HOW ADDRESSED
Roads & Maritime Services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The cumulative traffic and transport impacts of development on the surrounding local and regional road network (including the assessment of current and future public transport services) need to be addressed with associated mitigation measures.</li> <li>2. The proponent's assessment should have included the Sydenham Road/ Farr Street, Addison Road/Enmore Road, and Victoria Road/Edinburgh Road intersections.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proponent does not consider it appropriate to request additional modelling of intersections because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This can occur at the DA stage;</li> <li>- The proposal is a long-term precinct wide proposal that will be implemented over a 10 – 15 year timeframe;</li> <li>- The intersections listed have recently been modelled by Inner West Council when adopting its Local Area Traffic Management Plans (LATMs). These LATMs indicated that majority of intersections operate with spare capacity during most time of the day.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notwithstanding, the proponent provided a desk top analysis of the traffic impacts of development on the Sydenham Road/ Farr Street intersection. This analysis concludes that the proposal will result in a reduction in the number of Peak Vehicle Trips generated by uses fronting Farr Street and therefore the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on the Sydenham Road/ Farr Street intersection.</li> </ul>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The proponent's original concept plan for the upgrade of the Victoria Road/ Sydenham Road intersection identifies the need for future acquisition of land in private ownership and outside the boundaries of the proposal. Given Council does not support land acquisition along Wicks Park or from properties outside the proposal area, this intersection upgrade is not achievable.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proponent notes that the original concept plan for the upgrade of the Victoria Road/ Sydenham Road intersection was prepared at a scale requested by the RMS. Even at 100% development take up the scale of the upgrade is considered excessive and over-engineered.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding, the proponent provided a revised concept plan and associated traffic modelling for the upgrade of the Victoria Road/ Sydenham Road intersection that does not rely on land acquisition along Wicks Park or from properties outside the proposal area by incorporating 3 metre land widths.</li> </ul>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The proponent's revised concept plan for the Sydenham Road/ Victoria Road intersection considers reducing road lane and footpath widths to accommodate the increase in uplift, potentially impacting road network efficiency and pedestrian safety.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intersection design responds to the constraints of the intersection and Council's wishes not to use part of Wick Park for a turning lane to ensure safe operation of the intersection.</li> <li>• To ensure the final intersection design is suitable, the LEP amendment includes a satisfactory arrangements provision to deliver required State infrastructure. This includes a staging plan regarding upgrade timing.</li> </ul>

PUBLIC AUTHORITY	ISSUES	HOW ADDRESSED
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proponent is willing to collaborate with the RMS and Council on a final design of the intersection that will provide network efficiency and pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>
	<p>5. Appropriate funding mechanisms (either Section 94 Contributions Plan, Voluntary Planning Agreement and/or Special Infrastructure Contribution) and an Infrastructure Staging Plan, which identifies the timing, cost and trigger points for the delivery of transport infrastructure upgrades, are required prior to the gazettal of the proposal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The satisfactory arrangements clause will ensure that funding mechanisms are in place for the upgrade of the Sydenham Road/ Victoria Road intersection.</li> <li>The proponent notes that VPA's associated with the redevelopment of individual sites are likely to be the preferred method for land within the boundaries of the planning proposal. Contributions plans can be resolved at the next stage of the planning process.</li> </ul>
Sydney Airport Corporation (SACL)	<p>1. The potential for new buildings or other structures in the precinct to intrude into Sydney Airport's obstacle limitation surface (OLS) or other prescribed airspace surfaces.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Gateway Determination (14 March 2016) required the proponent to revise the planning proposal to address this issue. In response, the proposal has changed the height controls from metres for the most height sensitive land to Reduced Level (RL) height controls which consider land gradient. This amendment was supported by SACL.</li> <li>Assurance given by the proponent that temporary intrusions into Sydney Airport's obstacle limitation surface (OLS) or other prescribed airspace surfaces, such as by a crane during construction, would need to be assessed under the <i>Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996</i> and referred to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority, Airservices Australia and airlines for advice.</li> </ul>
	<p>2. The loss of industrially zoned employment lands in the vicinity of Sydney Airport – SACL notes that the Victoria Road Precinct does not currently contain airport or aviation related land uses but it may do so in the future particularly as Sydney Airport continues to grow in accordance with <i>Master Plan 2033</i>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Gateway Determination required the proponent to revise the planning proposal to address this issue. In response, the proposal argued that around 90% of the precinct will be retained within either an industrial or business zone. This argument was acknowledged by SACL.</li> </ul>

PUBLIC AUTHORITY	ISSUES	HOW ADDRESSED
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. New housing in parts of the precinct where the relevant Australian Standard considers it unacceptable – SACL requires the draft DCP and accompanying Victoria Road Aircraft Noise Policy to be strengthened to better disclose and manage likely aircraft noise and related impacts on future residents.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proponent substantially agreed with changes to the draft DCP and proposed noise disclosure notification clause under section 149(5) of the EP&amp;A Act.</li> </ul>
Sydney Water	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A water reticulation scheme and a wastewater catchment plan and reticulation scheme are needed for this development</li> <li>2. A number of buildings are proposed over Sydney Water stormwater assets. These structures need to be reconfigured to be 1m away from Sydney Water's easements and stormwater assets.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These issues can be addressed at the Development Applications Stage.</li> </ul>