

Newcastle Office

Ground Floor, 241 Denison Street, Broadmeadow, NSW Australia 2292

PO Box 428, Hamilton, NSW Australia 2303

T +61 2 4961 6500 F +61 2 4961 6794 E newcastle@rpsgroup.com.au W rpsgroup.com.au

Our Ref: 25856

Date: 8 March 2010

Attn: Leonard Allen
Port Stephens Council
PO Box 42
Raymond Terrace NSW 2324

Via: Email

Dear Sir,

**RE: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR DA 16-2009-811-1
PROPOSED ONE (1) INTO EIGHT (8) LOT SUBDIVISION
LOT 284 DP 806310, NO. 155 SALAMANDER WAY, SALAMANDER BAY**

RPS Harper Somers O'Sullivan (RPS HSO) acts on behalf of the landowner, Port Stephens Council, in providing this additional information in response to Council's letter dated 11 December 2009. The following information is submitted to Council to enable the assessment and processing of the DA to proceed.

1 Development Control Plan

Given that potential end users for allotments such as Aldi (Proposed Lot 1), Big W (Proposed Lot 6) and a Medical Centre (Proposed Lot 4) have been identified, Council has requested that a concept plan be prepared to help determine the appropriateness of the proposed subdivision layout. The Concept Plan will help to assess compliance with the Development Control Plan 2007 (DCP 2007) for the proposed subdivision and that any future proposed are able to comply with DCP 2007. Demonstrated and documented compliance with Section B1 of DCP 2007 is required. Of particular significance to the subdivision are performance criteria B1.P4, B1.P5, B1.P25 and controls B1.C4 and B1.C44.

Response:

A Concept Plan has been prepared and is attached with this response. The Concept Plan addresses the relevant principles and controls of Section B1 of DCP 2007. The sections of particular significance to the subdivision are addressed below:

- Performance criteria B1.P4 – The street network through the site is governed by the existing intersections with the street network both within and around Salamander Shopping Centre. The minor roads connect into the existing Town Circuit and Minor Road 1 terminates at the intersection of the proposed circuit road with a view of the vegetation to the west.
- Performance criteria B1.P5 – Street trees are proposed for the circuit road and will enable the trees to frame the vista.
- Performance criteria B1.P25 – The proposed subdivision creates a variety of lot sizes and meets the specific needs of already identified end users for some of the allotments. The three allotments that have no known end use at this stage are of a range of sizes to comply with the principle of diversity of building forms and active street frontage.

- Development Control B1.C4 – As the proposed development is consistent with the type and location of commercial development associated with Salamander Shopping Centre, no additional photomontages have been provided. It is anticipated that each development application for each Lot will provide elevations illustrating the built form for each site. At this stage, preparing a photomontage that is only an estimate of the final built form is considered an unwarranted academic exercise.
- Development Control B1.C44 – The Concept Plan attached with this response illustrates the proposed infrastructure within the road network and public land. The infrastructure proposed for the development includes, kerb and gutter, stormwater drainage, pedestrian footpaths and cycleways, street lighting, street trees and bus shelters.

2 Concept Plan

Any concept plan prepared for the site would need to consider:

1. *The proposed end users for allotments, their footprints, location of loading docks and built form,*
2. *Traffic Volumes and traffic Calming measures. A new traffic analysis incorporating the proposed Aldi, Big W and Medical Centre should be considered,*
3. *Pedestrian access and linkages,*
4. *The interaction of the site with the adjacent wetland,*
5. *The interaction of the site with the adjacent residential area,*
6. *An integrated traffic/pedestrian movement plan.*

In preparing the concept plan for the site, consideration should also be given to demonstrating that each lot configuration is capable of future development complying with Section B4 – Commercial Development of DCP 2007. It is considered that demonstrated compliance for the subdivision and future DA's on the proposed allotments with the requirements of Section B4 is best achieved through the preparation of a concept plan that addresses these controls.

Response:

A Concept Plan has been prepared for the proposal that includes the matters listed above. The Concept Plan shows the proposed and existing development known for the site, with only Lot 2, 5 and 7 vacant for future use. The future development of these sites will be governed through individual development applications where each intended use will need to demonstrate compliance with DCP 2007.

3 Strategic Issues

Council's Senior Strategic Planner requested that the following matters be addressed, as described in Table 2 below.

1. *Council is currently considering a rezoning proposal to amend Port Stephens LEP 2000 with respect to Lot 21 DP 1044009, 100 Salamander Way, Salamander Bay. This proposal is seeking to rezone a portion of the site for residential purposes, offsetting that portion with the remainder of the site as environmental conservation.*
2. *Please clarify the proposal to "offset" development at 155 Salamander Way with dedication of 100 Salamander Way.*
3. *Council consider any development fronting Salamander Way and Bagnalls Beach Road as "Gateway" development, particularly at major intersections. A concept plan is required to demonstrate an integrated approach to achieving an overall integrated townscape that contributes positively to the locality. In this regard, lot size, orientation and access are critical to ensuring a positive integrated outcome as opposed to internalised "mini-major" stand alone development. This is particularly relevant in ensuring that future development encourages integration with the existing shopping mall.*
4. *Please note Council previously developed draft Salamander Bay Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines that may provide assistance in preparing an overall concept plan (contact Council's Integrated Planning section to discuss). It should be further noted that*

an outstanding resolution from Council to prepare a Development Control Plan over the subject site remains unsatisfied as does a resolution of Council to identify a community precinct in the subject locality. These outstanding resolutions need to be considered in light of the proposed application.

Response:

Council's Commercial Services Group has confirmed that the area identified for offsets for the proposed subdivision does not form part of any other offset for the rezoning of Lot 21 DP 1044009, 100 Salamander Way, Salamander Bay and relates solely to the subdivision proposal. As requested a Concept Plan has been prepared for the site and a copy is attached.

The proponent has undertaken a review of the draft Salamander Bay Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines (June 2001) prepared by Deicke Richards. The draft document illustrates a preferred development scenario of multistorey mixed use development with home businesses on the ground floor and also commercial space with office development above. The development of commercial land for residential mixed use is not considered the best use of the site and it is considered that the Deicke Richards strategic planning concept does not meet the requirements of the Tomaree community with regards to commercial development. The layout of the proposed subdivision follows a similar road network design as the draft Salamander Bay Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines but accounts for the intended commercial uses of the site. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed layout provides a more contemporary design solution for the site compared to the draft Salamander Bay Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines prepared nearly a decade ago.

4 Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water Referral

The DA was referred to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW) as Integrated Development. DECCW has issued General Terms of approval subject to several issues being resolved.

Response:

Please find attached a response letter to the DECCW correspondence from the proponent's archaeologist.

5 Drainage and Water Quality

Council's Development Engineer provided that the following points should be addressed to allow continued assessment of the proposal:

- 1. The site is in a compulsory 1-in-100 year onsite infiltration area for stormwater control. The proposal includes dimensions for a detention basin and infiltration trenches as part of the stormwater layout however does not show how these sizes were determined. Please provide a copy of the calculations used to determine the size of these components of the stormwater system. This should include estimates of infiltration rates, design storm events used, impervious area estimates and a plan of the sub-catchments for the site.*
- 2. Mambo wetland is an estuarine wetland covering an area of 175ha. It is part of the Port Stephens Estuary, which has been listed on the Register of the National Estate. As Mambo Wetland is an integral part of the Port Stephens Estuary, it is important that the Mambo Wetland is protected from pollutants that may be transported into the wetlands from the stormwater system.*
- 3. The existing site is very sandy in nature and it produces little or no runoff during storm events. Post development in this site will increase the impervious area to more than 90% and will increase the discharge and the volume of freshwater entering the wetland.*
- 4. The development site has been divided into three sub-catchment areas, but the drainage system proposed for these sub-catchment areas is not supported with any drainage calculations, infiltration calculations or hydrological and hydraulic calculations. The drainage report and the drawings must include the followings;*
 - Sub-catchment areas*

- *Pre and post development flow calculations*
 - *Hydrological and hydraulic calculations for minor drainage system (10 year ARI storm events) and major drainage system (100 Year ARI storm events).*
 - *Overflow paths and overflows along the road, private properties etc.*
 - *External catchment drainage must be incorporated into the drainage calculations.*
 - *Easement details for public water to drain through private properties*
 - *Details of detention basin (stage – storage – discharge relationship, side slopes, low flow and high flow outlets details, inlet details, erosion control measures etc)*
 - *Infiltration trench details (x-sections, surface area for infiltration, lengths, invert levels, obvert levels, infiltration rates used for calculations, maintenance access and method of maintenance etc).*
 - *Infiltration system and detention basin must be modelled with the proposed pipe drainage system*
 - *All the drainage pits within road reserve must have the dimension minimum of 900SQ.*
5. *As indicated in the drawings, stormwater from the proposed development site will be directed into the wetland through three separate sub-catchments drainage outlets.*
- *The sub-catchment 1 (eastern side of the development - from Lot7)—There is no water quality control proposed in the development.*
 - *The sub-catchment 2 (southern side of the development - from Lot2) -- There is no water quality control proposed in the development. Development must include appropriate stormwater treatment devices to control the quality of stormwater.*
 - *The sub-catchment 3 (western side of the development - from Lot5) – a detention pond and trash screen across the flow path has been proposed in the development. This is totally inadequate to control the water quality. Trash screen to control the gross pollutant would not be effective and the pollutant collected by the trash screen won't be retained.*
6. *Therefore, development must include appropriate stormwater treatment devices for the above mentioned sub-catchments to control the quality of stormwater prior to entering into the wetland.*
7. *Stormwater Quantity - Sub-catchment 1*
- *Minor (10 year ARI) and major (100 year ARI) flows are not included in the report or drawings.*
 - *Capacity of the proposed drainage system is not given in the drawings.*
 - *Hydraulic gradelines for the pipe system is not given in the drawings.*
 - *Section of the infiltration system is not provided in the drawings.*
 - *Maintenance access and how to maintain the infiltration system is not provided in the drawings*
8. *Infil 1:*
9. *Not supported by the calculations—it seems, the capacity of the infiltration system provided in the drawing is inadequate to control the predevelopment flows which is almost nil for majority of the storm events.*
10. *Located next to the building on adjacent property. Impact on the building need to be assessed.*
11. *No easement over the infiltration system*
12. *System may overflow on to the road or private property – need flow calculations to show this.*
13. *It is not clear, the drainage system from P19 – P26 is located within Lot 7 or within road reserve. If it is located within lot 7, an easement is required over the drainage system.*
14. *Sub Catchment 2*
- *Minor (10 year ARI) and major (100 year ARI) flows are not included in the report or drawings.*
 - *Capacity of the proposed drainage system is not given in the drawings.*
 - *Hydraulic gradelines for the pipe system is not given in the drawings.*
 - *Section of the infiltration system is not provided in the drawings.*
 - *Maintenance access for the infiltration system is not provided in the drawings*
15. *Infil 2:*

16. *Not supported by the calculations— it seems, the capacity of the infiltration system provided in the drawing is inadequate to control the predevelopment flows which is almost nil for majority of the storm events.*
17. *Located next to the building on adjacent property. Impact on the building need to be assessed.*
18. *No easement over the infiltration system.*
19. *System may overflow on to the road or private property – need flow calculations to show this.*
 - *At present, this sub-catchment does not drain to Bagnell Beach road. The existing drainage system at Bagnell Beach road has insufficient capacity. Connecting a new additional drainage system will exacerbate the flooding on Bagnell Beach road and increase the flooding frequency.*
 - *P30 – P33 must design to carry 100 year ARI flows.*
 - *P30-P31 must have minimum of 3m easement over the drainage line.*
 - *The proposed new roundabout makes P32 as a sag pit. Require additional inlet pits around P32.*
 - *P29 must have a weir to control the stormwater for infiltration*
 - *Part of the drainage from community centre and childcare centre drain westerly direction (through lot 3). An inter-allotment drainage system must be created along the boundary to collect runoff from community centre and childcare centre and connect to P27.*
 - *Infil 3 does not have any downstream control to function as an infiltration system.*
20. *Sub-catchment 3*
 - *Minor (10 year ARI) and major (100 year ARI) flows are not included in the report or drawings.*
 - *Capacity of the proposed drainage system is not given in the drawings.*
 - *Hydraulic gradelines for the pipe system is not given in the drawings.*
 - *Section of the detention/infiltration system is not provided in the drawings.*
 - *Side slope of the detention/infiltration system must have slope 1: 6*
 - *Obvert level of the basin is RL5.0 AHD and the invert level of the basin RL 3.65AHD. There is no low flow outlet for this basin. That means, this pond will have permanent water level at RL 5.0 AHD.*
 - *Majority of the road drainage system from P1 – P 6 will be submerged before the storm event and may surcharge during storm events*
 - *I believe that the groundwater level at this location may be higher than RL 3.65 AHD. So very little infiltration will happen at this location.*
 - *Size of the detention/infiltration basin is too small to control the post development flows and volumes. Require proper modelling and calculations to support the size of the basin.*
 - *Require longitudinal section to check the road surface levels and the pit surface levels. It seems, there are number of artificial sag points created on the road. This may cause water to pond at the sag points instead of flow along the road.*
 - *Inter-allotment easement is required between Lot 6 and the existing shopping centre to collect stormwater from Lot 6*
 - *Infiltration basins: Stormwater discharge through an infiltration system is a very slow process and determining the critical storm duration for infiltration basin is not same as determining the time of concentration for pipe flows. Designing an infiltration basin must consider all duration storm events, in particular higher duration storm events. It must be recognised that higher duration storm events produce larger volume of stormwater and as a result the basins may fill up quickly and surcharge.*
 - *Factor of safety for infiltration rate: The infiltration rate is a parameter that may change with time due to clogging or lack of maintenance. As the bio-retention swale receives water from carparks and other areas, the surface infiltration may reduce significantly. Therefore, a higher factor of safety must be applied for designing the bio-retention swale.*
21. *In General*
 - *Consultation must be extended to Mambo Wanda Wetland Committee*

- Development advisory Panel minutes dated 7 August 2009, dot points under drainage/ detention/infiltration have not been addressed properly.
- Infiltration pipe system 1.5 to 2m behind the proposed kerb and guttering could be easily implemented to reduce the flow rates and volumes. This has not been considered in this subdivision.
- Road LS indicates that it has been graded toward Salamander Way. That means major flows from the road and surcharged flows from the pits will flow along the road and flood Salamander Way and new roundabout. This is not acceptable. All the major flows must be directed to the proposed infiltration/detention basin.

Response:

The proponent and their consultant engineer Chris Smith from Barker Harle met with Council's drainage engineer to discuss the comments outlined above and worked with Council to prepare a design solution for the site. Accordingly, a revised Drainage and Stormwater Assessment has been prepared and is attached with this correspondence. The revised assessment should now satisfy Council's drainage and water quality issues.

6 Flora and Fauna Issues

Council's Environmental Projects Officer has provided the following comments to be addressed:

1. *Offset proposals include landscaping to include koala feed trees and retention of existing ones as well as dedication of Lot 21 DP 1044009 – 100 Salamander Way.*
2. *A detailed landscaping plan showing koala trees to be retained and planted should be submitted to allow continued assessment of the impacts to the Koala population. Specific species list must also be provided and MUST be endemic to the locality. In addition to this more detail is needed in regard to the proposed offset. Detailed information in regard to offset size, specific locations need to be provided. Also methodology on appropriate offset size for the removal of 4.2 Ha of EEC needs to be carried out to justify any offset proposal. The applicant will also need to enter into a planning agreement on the land to protect it in perpetuity for conservation purposes as proposed.*
3. *Appropriate assessment of the EEC impact is dependant on the above points (landscaping details and offset details)*
4. *Appropriate assessment of the CKPoM is dependant on the above points (landscaping details and offset details)*
5. *There has been no survey effort during the flowering period of cryptic orchid species or juncea known to occur in the locality. The habitat assessment for these species has also stated that suitable habitat is present on site. As the proposed development will result in all vegetation to be removed it can be said that there has been little to no consideration for preservation of these species habitats. It is unclear as to if additional suitable habitat for these species occurs outside the development site but within the immediate locality (eg Mambo wetlands / 100 salamander Way etc). This needs to be clarified. It is recommend that a survey be carried out during the flowering period of the identified orchids and juncea that potentially occur on site (winter/spring). More information is required as to the amount of suitable habitat for these species being removed from the immediate locality.*
6. *Stormwater should not enter the adjacent SEPP 14 wetlands untreated. Treatment must not only include Gross pollutant but also urban runoffs such as oils and greases etc. The development is also within a 50m buffer zone to the SEPP 14 wetland.*
7. *Many of these issues could be rectified by retaining the western area of the site that is vegetated and appropriate environmentally considerate landscaping in the east and south.*

Response:

The proponent's ecologist, Gary Worth has prepared a response to the matters outlined above. Please find a copy of the response attached. Additionally, a Landscape Master Plan for the proposal illustrating koala feed trees has been submitted on the 9th November 2009. Additionally, Council has engaged Gary Worth to prepare a Plan of Management for the offset land proposed

for this development. The Plan of Management works are currently underway and a copy will be forwarded to Council once the works are complete.

Traffic and Pedestrian Access

Council's Traffic Engineer has provided the following comments on the proposal:

Network impact and connectivity:-

1. *The traffic report states that traffic signals will be required at the Bagnall Beach Road/Town Centre Circuit intersection as a result of development of all of the lots. Council considers that the traffic signals are required to be conditioned to be constructed prior to issue of the subdivision certificate in consideration of the totality of this development.*
2. *Road widening and an additional travel lane are required on the northern side of the Town Centre Circuit connection to Bagnall Beach Road. This will be required to allow traffic signals to function efficiently at the intersection and to prevent traffic queuing into the circuit road and impacting the adjoining roundabout. Please provide concept plans and adjusted subdivision plan for consideration.*
3. *The proposed roundabout on Salamander Way will have serious impacts on existing residents at properties No.152 & 154. The roundabout needs to be either relocated or to have an access drive to the properties included that demonstrates reasonable access solutions. Please provide concept plans and any adjusted subdivision plan for consideration.*
4. *The existing roundabouts on Town Centre Circuit do not function well, mainly due to the very small radius of the annulus. There is evidence of pavement failure caused by heavy vehicles turning over the roundabouts and this will be exacerbated by increased traffic volumes associated with further development. An analysis of the level of service is required to be provided for all the existing and proposed internal intersections in order to ascertain what internal infrastructure upgrades are required. The road pavement widths do not comply with the commercial requirements of 11m to 13m wide pavement. The proposed 8m carriageways are too narrow to allow for reasonable access to the proposed lots. There is insufficient road width to cater for turning/passing lanes and the result will be congestion of the travel lanes. This problem is already evident in the existing road network and considerable problems result in peak periods. Provide a revised plan and traffic strategy that addresses how vehicle entry into intersections and lots will be provided without compromise of the circulation function of the road network. Special consideration of heavy vehicle access is required in this commercial environment, and how each individual lot will be provided with vehicle access points. Please provide concept plans, revised report and adjusted subdivision plan for consideration.*
5. *The proposed verge widths do not comply with the 4m wide requirements of council's DCP. Without a DCP, guidelines or master plan in place for this development the impacts of future loading docks, driveways and built-form presentation to the road reserves are unknown and not enforceable. The proposal to create sub-standard verge widths is not supported without controls in place to ensure that desirable outcomes are achieved. The recommendation is that verges, in accordance with Port Stephens Council's DCP 2007, are to be provided for all the roads fronting commercial lots unless controls are linked to the lots. Please amend verge widths and subdivision plans or provide alternate solutions to address the issue.*
6. *There is no practical consideration of pedestrian and cycle movements around the northern loop of Town centre circuit, it is unrealistic to predict that people not entering the site from the Purser Street connection will utilise the high level cycleway on the northern boundary of the site as a means to move from east to west (and visa versa). Please provide cycle/pedestrian connectivity on the southern side of the northern loop section of Town Centre Circuit. Please provide concept plans and adjusted subdivision plan for consideration.*
7. *Purser Street connection – The proposal has not considered vehicle connection to Purser Street to the north of the site to maximise connectivity to the commercial centre in*

accordance with B1.P7, B1C8 of Port Stephens Council's DCP 2007. This connection was also mentioned in the Child Friendly Environment Case Study - GMU Salamander Bay Town Precinct, December 2008. Please provide vehicle connection and amended construction plans for this connection

Response:

The proponent has met with Joe Gleeson – Port Stephens Council Traffic Engineer to discuss the proposal and the comments outlined above. The following outcomes from the meeting were agreed:

1. The traffic report provided calculations based on the existing development and the proposed development of Aldi (Lot 1), Medical Centre (Lot 4) and Big W (Lot 6). The report concludes that there is no requirement for traffic lights at the Bagnall Beach Rd and Town Centre Circuit at this stage of the development. The applicant would have no objection to a condition being imposed that prevented the development of Lot 7 until such time as the traffic lights were installed.
2. Road widening will form part of the traffic lights construction and installation, as above.
3. The proposed roundabout on Salamander Way has been designed by Council's Stuart Roby. The design has taken into account that Salamander Way is on a "B Double" route, the proximity to the adjacent wetlands, and a connection to the new access road on the western boundary of the site. The traffic consultant, Colston Budd believes there is no significant impact on the residents of 152 and 154 as the roundabout is wholly contained within the road reserve and it is not uncommon for driveways to enter a roundabout. There is insufficient land within the road reserve to construct an access drive.
4. It is intended to redesign and upgrade the existing roundabout at Town Centre Circuit at the Bagnall Beach connection as part of the road widening when the traffic lights are installed. The existing roundabout at the western intersection of Town Centre Circuit is constrained because the surrounding properties are privately owned. However, it may be necessary to realign the roundabout when Minor Road 2 is constructed.
5. It is proposed to increase the pavement width of the new access road to the west and east of the site (refer to revised layout plan by Barker Harle), with the exception of the section of road along the northern boundary. All roads in the Town Centre Precinct will be signposted "No Parking" this will allow passing movements. Concept layout plans of the proposed Aldi, Medical Centre and Big W have been provided showing vehicle entry/exit points including loading dock locations. As a result of the new roundabout on Salamander Way and the improved circulation via the new access road, heavy vehicle access will be accomplished via the concept loading dock configuration of both Aldi and Big W. Improved loading dock access for heavy vehicles to the existing shopping centre will also be achieved via the improved road network.
6. The verge widths do comply with the DCP on the western road and the new eastern section. The section on the northern boundary will incorporate the existing footpath and cycleway but will not contain any services other than street lighting.
7. The suggestion that there is no practical consideration of pedestrian and cycle movement around the northern loop of Town Centre Circuit is refuted. The high level existing footpath and cycleway will cater for all residential areas to the north of the site. A duplication of the footpath and cycleway on the southern side of the northern loop is not feasible or practical (please refer to the Pedestrian Connection Plan by Terras Landscapes). There are alternate east/west connections proposed and existing. Additionally, it is considered that any pedestrian movement from east/west through the site would occur through the proposed development on Lot 6 and the existing shopping centre, not via a pedestrian footpath around Lot 6.
8. A connection to Purser Street is neither practical nor desired as this will impact on the current residential amenity of Purser Street. The proposed road at the northern loop has been designed to be benched to accommodate the significant height differential between the RL at Purser Street and the finished RL at Lot 6, being some 4.5 metres below. Reference to Part B1 C8 of Port Stephens Council DCP 2007 provides for interconnected network within the Development Site. Pedestrian and cycle connection via Purser street is provided for.

Public transport:-

1. *Provision for bus stops is required around the proposed circuit roads at four hundred metre intervals, including adjacent to the existing library/community centre and the proposed medical centre; on the northern loop of Town Centre circuit; and just north of the connector road to Bagnalls Beach Road. This is required to accommodate community and private/charter operators as well as potential changes to public bus services. Bus lay-by's shall be provided on both sides of the road immediately opposite each other. Please provide amended plans.*
2. *The concept plan submitted does not show pedestrian linkages to the existing bus stop on Salamander Way. Pedestrian facilities are to be provided to allow pedestrians and cyclists to connect to the proposed shared path on the eastern side of the proposed circuit road. Please provide amended plans.*

Response:

1. The subdivision plan provides for the two new bus bays on Salamander Way adjacent to the boundaries of Lots 1 and 2. It is intended to now redesign the road alignment to the west of Lot 4 to allow for a bus stop in this location to service the proposed Medical Centre and Library. The design of the bus stop at this location will also assist in providing traffic calming along the new access road. Provision of an additional bus stop to the north of the Bagnall Beach Road connection is argued as unnecessary as it would be within 100 metres of the existing bus interchange within the existing shopping centre.
2. Pedestrian linkages on Salamander Way are shown on the Concept Plan and the Pedestrian Connection Plan (Terras Landscapes).

Heavy vehicles:-

1. *The 8m carriageway is too narrow to allow for heavy vehicles to track around the bends in the road without crossing the centreline. Swept paths need to be provided, as well as details regarding the priorities of intersections. Please provide amended plans.*
2. *Details of proposed loading/delivery areas, procedures and proposed delivery times are also required for all proposed lots.*

Response:

1. The carriageway width is being increased with amended plans provided – refer to amended plan by Barker Harle.
2. Proposed loading/delivery areas for Aldi and Big W are shown on the Concept Pan. Delivery times are not relevant to the subdivision and will be provided as part of the respective Development Applications for the individual users.

Pedestrian access:-

1. *Bagnall Beach Rd is a sub-arterial, multilane road with no priority given to pedestrians. Increases in traffic due to development must be provided for by controlled pedestrian access across Bagnall Beach Road. Activity and work opportunities generated by the development will have a significant impact on connectivity with three schools and a TAFE adjacent to the site. The current disconnection for external pedestrians entering the site is not addressed in the subdivision proposal. Provide amended details.*
2. *Pedestrian access to the north of the site (Purser Street) will be very limited with the shared path being at a different level to the proposed road. Consideration should have been given to the provision of steps to at least provide connectivity for able-bodied people. The vehicle connection of Purser Street and subsequent regrading will amend this situation. Provide amended pedestrian/cycle details with the road regrading.*
3. *Child friendly principles also need to be addressed by providing improved internal connectivity and way-finding. Way-finding through large at grade car parks does not enhance safety or connectivity for both young and older road users. Sight lines, lighting*

and vegetation are to be considered at all crossing points within the site. This site is shown as an important link in Council's footpath and cycleway strategy. This should be addressed as part of a DCP for the site.

4. *Pedestrian refuges or raised pedestrian crossings (wombat crossings) are required at footpath crossing points on Town Centre circuit. These will assist pedestrian safety as well as reducing traffic speeds. Provide concept plans for consideration which also demonstrate consideration of bus stops, pedestrian corridors and desire lines for existing and proposed lots/developments within the commercial precinct.*
5. *1.2m footpaths are shown on some of the roads. These are inadequate for a commercial centre of this scale. Provide 2.4m wide shared pathway connecting throughout the site on all roads. 1.2m footpaths shall be constructed on the other side of Road 1 and Road 2.*
6. *Shared pathway is required along the external frontages of the site on Salamander Way and Bagnall Beach Road for all frontages adjoining Bagnalls Beach Road and Salamander Way.*

Response:

1. There are currently 3 pedestrian refuges provided along Bagnall Beach Road that connect to the proposed shared footpath/cycleway in the road reserve along the eastern boundary of Lot 7.
2. As previously stated it would be impractical and dangerous to provide steps from the footpath at Purser Street to the roadway below. A vehicle connection from Purser Street is not achievable between the existing Purser Street levels and the finished levels of the new road.
3. The Concept Plan addresses the connectivity and way finding through the proposed and existing network. The design has taken into consideration the existing facilities and incorporated connections and circulation throughout the entire development. The pedestrian/cycleway network included in this proposal will provide a clear pedestrian pathway for access and will include street lighting to assist with way finding at night. The design is in accord with Port Stephens Council footpath and cycleway strategy.
4. Traffic calming will be incorporated along the new proposed circuit road providing safe pedestrian crossings (refer to Barker Harle plans).
5. Noted.
6. Noted and provided.
7. Noted and provided.

Parking restrictions:-

1. *The 8m carriageways shown are too narrow to allow on-street parking and two way travel lanes. Consideration needs to be given to how this will be controlled with a minimum of ongoing maintenance for Council. Provide a traffic report outlining how traffic flows and parking are to be controlled.*

Response:

1. It is intended to have no on street parking throughout the entire development.

Minor Road 2:-

1. *The road cannot be approved in its current form. There needs to be connectivity provided through to the circuit road or alternatively a turnaround provided that will accommodate the design heavy vehicles. Provide amended details.*

Response:

1. There is no intention for heavy vehicles to access this road and therefore the proponent disputes the need for connection to the circuit road. The Concept Plan illustrates the

proposed layout for the Aldi site and demonstrates that there will be provision for connection through the site to the Town Circuit.

Attachments:

Please find the following information attached with this correspondence:

- Concept Plan for the proposal (RPS);
- Pedestrian Connection Plan (Terras Landscapes);
- Response to Flora and Fauna Issues (Garry Worth);
- Revised Engineering Plans and Drainage Strategy (Barker Harle); and
- Response letter to DECCW correspondence re Cultural Heritage (RPS).

If you have any questions please contact Norman Barnes at Port Stephens Council on 4980 0389 or the writer on 4940 4200.

Yours faithfully

RPS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve McCall'.

Steve McCall

BEnvSc

Principal/Manager – Planning, Energy & Renewables