

Summary of Submissions – Agencies and Organisations

PP-2022-1137 – 130 Killeaton Street, St Ives



Agency	Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
Biodiversity, Conservation and Science (BCS) (Formerly EHG)	<p><u>27 March 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More measures are needed to avoid clearing Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (STIF) on the subject land. Priority should be given to retaining additional areas of native vegetation. Measures should be taken to avoid or minimise clearing of native vegetation and threatened species in accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) 2020. Justification is required to demonstrate why all trees but one on site are planted, otherwise, the language should be changed to reflect the possibility of regeneration. <p><u>9 May 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCS has reviewed the Proponent's response email and confirms that sufficient information and justification to adequately address the previous questions and concerns raised by BCS have been provided. 	<p><u>Response to 27 March submission:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification on the origination of STIF on the subject site has been provided and has found that other than the individual indicated tree (Turpentine #51), they have all appeared at once in historical aerial photographic record which is not consistent with natural regeneration. Biodiversity Offsets Scheme is not triggered and thus the NSW Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) is not directly relevant. However, the avoidance of impact has been demonstrated in the proposal by the tree retention plan which was in turn informed by the combined ecological assessments. The proponent has considered retaining further trees on the site and found that it would compromise basic and design and viability of the proposal due to the location and size of the trees being within the development footprint. The only tree has been identified to be considered 	<p>The proponent has adequately addressed BCS's submissions, noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCS has confirmed they have no outstanding issues or comments, including tree retention and biodiversity impacts; and the Ku-ring-gai DCP 2024 includes controls which can ensure appropriate consideration of tree retention as part of the development application process, including preparation of a vegetation management plan and a landscape plan.

Summary of Submissions – Agencies and Organisations

PP-2022-1137 – 130 Killeaton Street, St Ives



Agency	Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
		remnant on site, but its location and condition make its retention untenable in the redeveloped landscape.	
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	<p>TfNSW has no objections to the proposed amendments as the proposal is expected to generate low traffic volumes resulting in minimal traffic impacts. Suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• alternative travel modes such as public and active transport; and• connecting cycling links to/from Killeaton Street to other established cycle networks in the area.	<p>TfNSW has raised no concerns with the planning proposal. Council has also raised no concerns about potential traffic impacts from the proposal.</p>	<p>The proponent's response to traffic impacts is adequate, with TfNSW raising no objection with the planning proposal.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Council officer's pre-Gateway assessment of the planning proposal did not identify unacceptable traffic impacts from the proposal.</p>
Ausgrid	<p>The proposed rezoning with the only comment seeking to ensure the compatibility of proposed development with existing Ausgrid infrastructure, particularly in relation to risks of electrocution, fire risks, Electric & Magnetic Fields (EMFs), noise, visual amenity and other matters that may impact on Ausgrid or the development.</p> <p>No further comment to make regarding this planning proposal at this point in time.</p>	<p>The density proposed for the site is consistent with adjoining development, and any future development applications will ensure an appropriate level of amenity is maintained for existing development.</p>	<p>The proponent's response is adequate noting that Ausgrid have raised no objections and delivery of energy services to future development can be adequately addressed during the development application process.</p>

Summary of Submissions – Agencies and Organisations

PP-2022-1137 – 130 Killeaton Street, St Ives



Agency	Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
Ku-ring-gai Council	<p>Council's submission referred to the resolution from their Ordinary Meeting on 16 May 2023, which resolved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>That the planning proposal is not supported by Council.</i><i>That the NSW Department of Planning and Environment be advised of Council's position and the Planning Proposal not be submitted for a Gateway Determination in accordance with section 3.34 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</i><i>That Council updates Greenweb mapping to reflect the occurrence of Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (STIF) and Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF) at 130 Killeaton Street, St Ives.</i>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The rezoning review process was progressed based on Council's previous resolution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A Biodiversity Impact Assessment and Arborist Report were submitted as part of the Planning Proposal. These reports concluded the ongoing amenity and biodiversity value of the subject site will be retained.The rezoning review recommendations of 25 August 2023 required the proponent to prepare an updated arborist report, biodiversity assessment, and updates to council's biodiversity mapping.The Panel was satisfied pre-gateway that these conditions had been adequately met. All relevant biodiversity impacts will be addressed under future development applications to ensure consistency with the recommendations of the assessments and Council's controls as a result of the updated biodiversity mapping.	<p>The Panel considered Council's previous resolution during the rezoning review for this proposal. Any conditions recommended by the Panel during the rezoning review were subsequently incorporated by the proponent and presented to the panel Pre-Gateway. The Panel agreed these conditions were satisfactorily met.</p> <p>BCS have also considered the proposal post-exhibition and have raised no objection to the proposal nor have any outstanding issues.</p>