Internal Referral – Senior Traffic Engineer

memorandum

TO: KLAUS KERZINGER - SENIOR STRATEGIC PLANNER

FROM: SENIOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER (TRAFFIC)

SUBJECT: 49-61 SMART STREET, FAIRFIELD - PROPOSED FAIRFIELD CHASE REDEVELOPMENT

FILE: DA: 306.1/2011

DATE: 20 APRIL 2011

The development application is for the redevelopment of Fairfield Chase located at 49-61 Smart Street. The site is currently occupied by 6-storey commercial building fronting Smart Street, incorporating retail floor space at the ground floor level. The remainder of the site is occupied by off-street car parking located above the retail/commercial floor space at the ground floor level.

The existing development on the site includes approximately 4,660m^2 of commercial floor space, 2,088m^2 of retail floor space and a medical centre with a floor area of approximately 1,343m^2. Off-street car parking is currently provided for approximately 164 vehicles, accessed via separate entry and exit driveways located along the Council Lane and Smart Street frontages of the site.

The proposed development generally comprises the retention (and refurbishment) of the existing commercial building, and the substantial retention of the ground floor level slab with some minor penetrations for the loading dock, lifts/stairs and pads for new columns.

The proposed development results in the site accommodating approximately 4,660m^2 of commercial floor space, 2,000m^2 of retail floor space, a medical centre with a floor space of approximately 1, 255m^2, a child care centre with a floor area of approximately 90m^2 (20 children), and 119 residential apartments.

Off-street car parking is proposed for a total of 257 vehicles in a 3-storey above ground car parking structure, accessed via a new entry-exit driveway located along the Council Lane frontage of the site.

I have reviewed the plans and information submitted for the proposed development and have following comments:

- The proposed development will not have any unacceptable traffic implications in terms of road network capacity.
- **The off-street parking requirement for the proposed development is four hundred and twenty (420) spaces. The proposed development makes provision for 257 off-street parking spaces, resulting in a shortfall of 163 spaces.**

- **Longitudinal section of the driveways along the ramps indicating levels and grades shall be submitted.**
- Loading/servicing for the proposed redevelopment is expected to be undertaken by a variety of vehicles up to and including 12.5m long heavy rigid vehicles. I have checked the turning manoeuvre by heavy rigid vehicles into/out of the loading dock. No issue is raised in regard to manoeuvring by heavy rigid vehicles.
- The layout of the proposed car parking areas, loading docks and access driveway associated with the subject development (including grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths, loading bay dimensions and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1-2004 and AS 2890.2-2002 for large vehicles – **Can be conditioned.**
- A Loading Dock Management Plan (LDMP) shall be undertaken to Council's satisfaction and shall implement appropriate measures to prevent trucks entering the site when loading dock is full. In addition, the LDMP shall outline measures to ensure trucks can always enter and exit in a forward direction – **Can be conditioned.**
- A Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control shall be submitted to Council for approval, prior to the issue of a construction certificate – **Can be conditioned.**
- The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustments/relocation works, necessitated by the works and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents – **Can be conditioned.**

Conclusion

The following issue shall be satisfactorily addressed, prior to determination:

- The off-street parking requirement for the proposed development is four hundred and twenty (420) spaces. The proposed development makes provision for 257 off-street parking spaces, resulting in a shortfall of 163 spaces. The shortfall in number of parking spaces needs to be addressed.
- Longitudinal section of the driveways along the ramps indicating levels and grades shall be submitted.

PHILIP SAVERIMUTTU
SENIOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER (TRAFFIC)

Internal Referral – Environmental Health Branch

memorandum

TO: PROJECT OFFICER - JULIO ASSUNCAO

FROM: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER – NINA CHAN

SUBJECT: LOT 1 DP 730010 NO. 49-61 SPENCER STREET FAIRFILED

FILE: DA 306.1/2011

DATE: 20 JUNE 2011

Reference is made to your request for the EMS to provide comment on the additional information which has been submitted in support of DA 306.1/2011for the proposed redevelopment of the Fairfield Chase shopping and commercial centre which will consist of demolishing and constructing new retail and medical tenancies and to include two (2) new residential towers and undercover car parking areas.

A development assessment was carried out by the EMS, dated 31 May 2011 which requested for the following information to be submitted for EMS assessment:

1. The noise assessment is to be amended to include:
    a. Noise criteria and considerations for the proposed residential towers located at 49-61 Spencer Street Fairfield.
    b. Construction noise criteria and considerations so as to ensure compliance with DECCW (2009) 'Interim construction noise guideline'.

2. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure that the natural environment is not unacceptably impacted upon by the proposal. The CEMP shall include but not be necessarily limited to the following measures:
    a. Measures to suppress odours and dust emissions
    b. Soil and water control measures
    c. Measures to identify hazardous and industrial wastes and the procedure for removal and disposal
    d. Noise and vibration

<u>Noise Assessment</u>
The Noise Assessment prepared by Renzo Tonn & Associates, was amended (dated 2 June 2011) to include an additional Receiver (R5) to consider noise impacts on the proposed residential towers forming part of the mixed use redevelopment site. Intrusiveness and Amenity criteria were considered for R5 in which Intrusiveness limits for the day period (55dbA) and Amenity limits for the evening period (50dbA) were set based on the most stringent limits. The EMS is satisfied that these limits are appropriate for the subject site.

In review of the Construction Noise Assessment prepared by Renzo Tonn & Associates, dated 14 June 2011, a quantitative assessment was carried out to measure, predict and assess noise levels against the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (ICNG, Office of Environment and Heritage, formerly known as Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2009).

The ICNG states that a noise level of RBL + 10 dB(A) is an acceptable level at a residential receiving boundary whereas a level of 70db(A) is considered to be appropriate for commercial premises. Therefore, a level of 60db(A) for the residential receiver (R1) and 70db(A) for commercial receivers (R2, R3, R4, R5) is considered appropriate during all phases of construction.

It is noted that the predicted construction noise levels within the Noise Assessment exceed ICNG noise limits for all locations. Renzo Tonn & Associates have recommended noise mitigation measures (section 7) to be implemented in order to comply with ICNG noise limits. Furthermore, continuing noise monitoring during construction and the development of a complaints handling procedure have also been recommended in order to control noise emissions.

Construction Environmental Management Plan
As per discussions with Councils Senior Strategic Planner, Klaus Kerzinger; a Construction Environmental Management Plan will be conditioned within the Development Consent.

Recommendations

After consideration of the above factors, the EMS raises no further objection to the subject proposal pursuant to the following conditions being placed on the development consent.

Construction Environmental Management Plan
Prior to the commencement of any works on site, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) prepared by a suitably qualified environmental consultant shall be submitted to Fairfield City Council for review and subsequent approval to ensure that the natural environment is not unacceptably impacted upon by the proposal. The CEMP shall include but not be necessarily limited to the following measures:

e. Measures to suppress odours and dust emissions
f. Soil and water control measures
g. Measures to identify hazardous and industrial wastes and the procedure for removal and disposal
h. Noise and vibration

Environment
Any air emissions produced at the premises shall not give rise to air pollution as defined under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997.*

Any works carried out at the premises shall not give rise to water pollution as defined under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997.*

Environmental Reports Certification - 4.36 (d)

1. Environmental Noise Assessment, dated 2 June 2011, prepared by Renzo Tonn & Associates
2. Construction Noise Assessment, dated 14 June 2011, prepared by Renzo Tonn & Associates

Application of the following general conditions

~~Unreasonable Noise and Vibration - 7.33~~

Compliance with approved waste management plan - 6.4

Demolition requirements - 6.5

During construction or demolition - 6.11

NINA CHAN
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER

S. Rodham

Stewart Rodham
COORDINATOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS DEPT.
FAIRFIELD CITY COUNCIL
(20/6/2011)

Internal Referral – Coordinator Building Certification

memorandum

TO: PLANNING – KLAUS KERZINGER

FROM: CO-ORDINATOR BUILDING CERTIFICATION

SUBJECT: 49-61 SPENCER STREET, FAIRFIELD

FILE: DA 306.1/2011

DATE: 19TH APRIL 2011

The BCB has reviewed the proposed development and raise no objections subject to the following conditions.

1.1	4.1	6.2	9.3
2.2	4.4	6.5	
2.4	4.22	6.6	
2.5	4.24	6.7	
2.11	4.28	6.10	
2.26	4.30	6.11	
2.30	4.31	6.12	
3.1	4.40	6.31	
3.2	4.41	6.35	
3.3	4.47	6.36	
3.4		6.39	
3.8			
3.9			
3.12			
3.14			
3.15			

IAN SMITH
CO-ORDINATOR BUILDING CERTIFICATION

Internal Referral – Senior Development Engineer

memorandum

TO: Klaus Kerzinger – Senior Strategic Planner

FROM: Joseph Bazergy - Senior Development Engineer

SUBJECT: Lot 1, DP 730010, NO. 49-61 Spencer Street Fairfield

FILE: DA 306.1/2011 – Fairfield Chase Redevelopment

DATE: 15 August 2011

In reference to the above, and your referral dated 15/04/2011, the following is advised:

The site is located within a partly medium, low and no flood risk precincts affected by overland flooding and within a low flood risk precinct affected by mainstream flooding, as described in the Flood Information Sheet issued by Council on 24 March 2011 to Wallis & Spratt Consulting Engineers. The 100 year overland flow affects a very small area at the north western corner of the site, at the intersection of Spencer Street and Council Lane, (refer plan showing overland flow flood extent attached to a copy of the Flood Information Sheet). The 100 year overland flood level at this corner is RL 11.0 m AHD. In this regard, the floor level of the shop and medical centre proposed at this corner will need to be set a minimum of 500mm above the 100 year ARI flood level.

The development needs to comply with the development controls contained in Chapter 11 in Fairfield City Wide DCP 2006, "Flood Risk Management" and in particular with "Schedule 6" of Chapter 11. Council's "Flood Risk Management" policy has been considered in the assessment of the Fairfield Chase Redevelopment and conditions requiring the applicant to comply with this policy are included in the recommended conditions below. Given that the flooding affectations of the site are predominantly limited to "low flood risk precincts" (with the exception of a very small area affected by "medium flood precinct - overland flow" at the north western corner of the site) and provided that no "Critical Uses & Facilities" are proposed, nor "Sensitive Uses & Facilities" are proposed on the ground floor, the applicant can address the matters required in Chapter 11 of Council's DCP prior to issue of the Construction Certificate, as per the conditions below.

Stormwater drainage is by a gravity system to Council's drainage system in Council Lane via an on site detention system and by gravity to Council's street kerb and gutter.

It is proposed to widen the carriageway in Council Lane to 7.0 metres from the proposed vehicular entry/exit driveway in Council Lane to Smart Street. The existing kerb and gutter at the southern side of Council Lane (opposite side) is to remain and the developer needs to dedicate the land required to effect the road widening in Council Lane. The building is also required to be clear of the 3 metre splay corner required at the intersection of Smart Street and Council Lane.

To avoid repetition of conditions, I have deleted in my conditions reference to ROW as it is covered in your conditions, and reference to compliance with AS 2890 and traffic matters which are covered in the RTAs and Council's Philip Saverimuttu's conditions.

There are no objections to the above DA, subject to the following conditions:

Table	Conditions		Variables/Conditions
1		New Condition	**Compliance with Plans** Stormwater drainage for the development shall take place generally in accordance with the concept stormwater plans prepared by Wallis & Spratt Pty Ltd consulting engineers, project No 16498, drawing H01, H02, H03, H04, H05, H06, H07, H08, H09, revision 1, dated February 2011. Final plans with details and specifications suitable for construction including a spillway to the OSD tank and complying with Council's Urban Area On-Site Detention Handbook, Stormwater Drainage policy and AS 3500 shall be submitted to the Certifying Authority prior to issue of the Construction Certificate.
6		New Condition	**Flooding Affectation** The development the subject of this consent is located in a **low** flood risk precinct affected by mainstream flooding and partly within a **medium** flood risk precinct and partly within a **low** flood risk precinct affected by overland flooding, as described in the Flood Information Sheet issued by Council to Wallis & Spratt Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd dated 24 March 2011. In this regard, prior to the issue of a construction certificate, the applicant shall engage a suitably qualified consultant to ensure that the development complies with the development controls contained in Chapter 11 in Fairfield City Wide DCP 2006, "Flood Risk Management".
2		New Condition	**Finished Ground Floor Levels** Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate the Certifying Authority shall ensure that the finish ground floor levels for the development comply with the 500 mm freeboard requirements above the 100 year ARI flood levels in accordance with Schedule 6, in Chapter 11 of Fairfield City Wide DCP 2006, "Flood Risk Management".
2		New Condition	**Building setback to Council Lane and Splay Corner** The proposed building alignment as shown on submitted plan DA606 "Council Lane South ROW Section F", prepared by Urbis Pty Ltd, shall be a minimum of 0.6m clear of the proposed kerb line in the widened Council Lane. The proposed building shall also be clear of the 3.0 x 3.0 metre splay corner required at the intersection of Smart Street and Council Lane.
2	2.16	(a), (b), (c)	100 years
2	2.17	Delete (a)	b) Method 2 of Council's Urban Area On-Site Detention Handbook-February 1997, to restrict the total discharge from the site for all storms as shown on the submitted concept stormwater plans prepared by Wallis & Spratt Pty Ltd Consulting Engineers and referenced in conditions of this consent. Delete b) ii)
2	2.20		
2	2.21		
2		New Condition	**Engineering Construction Certificate** Prior to the issue of Building Construction Certificate, an Engineering Construction Certificate shall be submitted to the

			Certifying Authority for the following works: • Construction of carriageway widening along the northern side in Council Lane to 7.0 metres between face of kerbs, from the proposed vehicular entry/exit driveway in Council Lane to Smart Street, together with reconstruction of the kerb returns, in accordance with approved plans and specifications at no cost to Council. The kerb and gutter alignment at the southern side of Council Lane shall remain as existing. • Stormwater connection to Council's system. • Full width foot pavement reconstruction along the site's frontage to Smart Street, in accordance with Council's requirements. • Reconstruction of the speed reduction devices and pedestrian crossing in Council Lane. For the issue of Engineering Construction Certificate, five (5) copies of plans and specifications giving full details of the design and construction shall be submitted with the application. Documentary evidence of approval from the relevant utility authorities affected by the proposed works shall also be submitted with the application. Prior to release of the Building Construction Certificate, the applicant shall lodge with Council, a bank guarantee or a cash bond to the cost of all works required under this consent to be carried out within the road reserve or on land under the control of Council. The value of the bank guarantee or the cash bond will be determined by Council upon approval of the detailed engineering drawings.
2	2.25		(*) via heavy duty industrial type crossings
2		**New Condition**	**<u>Road Dilapidation Survey Required</u>** The route for transportation of materials during construction to and from the development site shall generally be by the shortest possible route to the nearest "regional road", with every effort to avoid school zones on public roads. The applicant shall nominate the route for transportation of materials for approval by Council prior to issue of any construction certificate. Prior to issue of any Construction Certificate, the applicant shall submit to Council a road dilapidation survey of the local roads along the agreed transportation route. The survey shall be provided by a suitable pavement consultant and shall cover the full width of the pavement kerb to kerb inclusive and give details of areas of cracking, profile defects and the like. At the completion of work, the dilapidation survey shall be repeated and any deterioration made good under Council supervision or paid for by the applicant. A damage deposit or bank guarantee may be required to be lodged with Council as a security against compliance with this condition prior to issue of any construction certificate.
4	4.9		(a), (*) Council Lane Delete (b)
4	4.10		(*) 3 metre x 3 metre splay on the corner of Smart Street and

			Council Lane as public road .....
4	4.11		
4	4.12		
4	4.13	(b), (c)	(*) along the site's frontage to Spencer Street and Council Lane
4	4.15		…. Full width paving block footpath shall be reconstructed to Council's requirements for the full road frontage of the property in Smart Street.
4	4.17	a), b), c), e), f), g), h) Amend d)	Amend d) to .. finished floor levels on the ground floor.
4	4.18		
4	4.19		
4	4.23		.. The finished *ground* floor levels Delete "*and ridge height*"
4	4.31		
4	4.42		
6		**New Condition**	**<u>Method of Stormwater Drainage</u>** The stormwater generated from the development shall be directed to the On site detention system and then to Council's stormwater drainage system in Council Lane as shown on the submitted concept stormwater drainage plans. Drainage pipes across the footpath shall be 75mm x 200mm galvanised R.H.S laid at a fall not exceeding 1:40, and designed for the stormwater flows concerned.
7	7.12	a), b), d), e) Delete c)	

Joseph Bazergy
<u>Senior Development Engineer</u>

Internal Referral – Senior Development Planner

memorandum

TO: KLAUS KERZINGER – SENIOR STRATEGIC PLANNER

FROM: SENIOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNER

SUBJECT: 49-61 SPENCER ST, FAIRFIELD

FILE: DA:306.1/2011

DATE: 9 MAY 2011

Klaus,

The built form and organisation of the residential towers are considered to have merit, providing relatively good residential amenity in terms of cross-flow ventilation and solar access. The spatial separation between the 2 towers is more than adequate and the setbacks of the buildings from the laneway are not considered to be unreasonably, though it would better if greater setbacks could be provided, given the height of the buildings.

The relocation of the vehicular entry point from Smart Street to the laneway is a good outcome, though have some concerns about potential conflicts between vehicles entering/exiting the building and pedestrian walking through the arcade from The Crescent. It would be better if this vehicular entry/exit point is relocated further along the laneway. I suspect that the applicant wanted to ensure minimal impact upon the medical and dental centre, hence, the decision for the location of the vehicle entry/exit position.

Having reviewed the documentation and architectural drawings submitted with the application, the following comments are provided on the proposed development:

1. The proposed development will result in the isolation/landlocking of the properties on the corner of Spencer and Smart Sts between a 6-storey commercial building (the Fairfield Chase building) and the proposed 20-storey residential tower. The submitted documentation indicates that the isolated sites could be re-developed into a 4-storey commercial building built boundary to boundary. It is also proposed that a breakthrough wall be provided on Level 1 car park for future easement for carpark access. However, no documentation has been submitted showing that the proposed development would not prejudice the isolated sites from being similarly re-developed to the same density and intensity as the proposed development. That is, a 20-storey high mixed-use development that complies with SEPP 65 requirements particularly with respect to the provision of the required spatial separation between buildings to address visual/acoustic privacy and overshadowing.

2. Given that the proposed development proposes a building that significantly exceeds the high limit outlined in the Fairfield Town Centre DCP 2006 of 14

storeys, it is considered critical that the documentation should also show the proposed development against the desired future character for the Fairfield Town Centre as envisaged by the DCP.

3. Whilst the merit of 2 taller and slender towers in comparison to lower and squat towers that conform to the DCP has been noted, the height of the buildings remains a concern. In this regard, the proposed development is likely to set a precedent for any future high rise development in the Fairfield Town Centre and significantly, would compromise on the integrity of the Fairfield Town Centre DCP. The height of the building should be carefully considered in the context of what Council aims to achieve for the Town Centre. The additional shadows project by the development must be carefully considered against the shadows cast by a compliant development.

4. The shadow diagrams show the shadows cast by the proposed buildings for the critical hours of 9am to 3pm in mid-winter. As the proposed buildings are considerably higher than the allowable height limit of 14 storeys, it is essential that the applicant also submit shadow diagrams showing the shadows cast by a compliant development, in order to enable a proper and informed decision to be made. In addition, the shadows cast by the proposed buildings should also be shown in conjunction with the shadow projected by the desired building envelopes shown in the Fairfield Town Centre DCP.

5. Documentation should be submitted demonstrating that the proposed communal open space provided between the 2 towers will receive the required 3 hours of direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm in mid-winter, with the shadow casts by the Fairfield Chase building shown as well.

6. In its present form, the northern part of the podium is proposed to be allocated as part of the private open space of the residential apartments on the podium. Whilst this will enhance the amenity of those residential apartments, it is considered that a better outcome would be to convert this area as part of the communal open space area for the development for the benefit of all residents.

7. The proposed landscape treatment of the podium with raised garden that will house grasses, instead of suitable and appropriate landscaping is considered a poor outcome. Details of the proposed planter boxes should be provided, particularly the growing medium and water reticulation system.

8. Details of the proposed metal mesh to be provided.

9. The location of the proposed child care centre on the southern part of the site is considered a poor outcome in terms of solar access. The child care centre is unlikely to be provided with the sort of amenity expected for the mental and physical development of children. In addition, poor access is provided for the child care centre that is not accessible to parents with prams or wheelchairs.

10. The location of the common room on the southern side of the side would not provide a meaningful communal room for the residents.

11. The loading facility appears to be designed specifically for the retail tenants, not for residents. In this regard, there is no direct connection between the loading bays and the access lifts for the residents and the location is considered too far.

12. The loading bays are provided with inadequate height clearance of a minimum of 4.5m.

13. Balcony sizes and storage areas must comply with the minimum required as per Fairfield Town Centre DCP 2006.

NELSON MU
SENIOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNER

Internal Referral – Manager Waste Services

 AT - I

Julio Assuncao - Re: Waste room for Fairfield Chase Proposal DA306.2011

From: Ross Smith
To: Assuncao, Julio
Date: 8/2/2011 12:30 PM
Subject: Re: Waste room for Fairfield Chase Proposal DA306.2011

Hi Julio,

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the matter today.

Essentially the applicant has made a few amendments based on my original comments and is now changing the bin parameters to 1.1 skips in lieu of the 240 litre bin and carousel for garbage removal. The south tower still contains the alcove (undesirable in my view) exit for garbage skips to the street near the garbage and bike room. I felt the garbage room could be extended over the alcove to remove that issue.Furthermore this frees space required for 3 or 4 recycling wheelie bins.

The garbage room for the north tower is still very tight for manoeuvring skips about to change over under the garbage chute. I suggested taking a metre off the end north shop and extending the width of the garbage room. Again some space is required for recycling wheelie bins.

The proposal in the revised diagram is doable at best, but incorporating all original suggestions is a lot more practical.

Regards
Ross

>>> Julio Assuncao 7/28/2011 10:24 am >>>
Hi Ross,

Further to your comments 2 June 2011, we requested that the applicant make some amendments to the waste areas of the proposal.

The applicant has made some modifications to the waste room for the southern tower and from what I can gather the size of the individual bins have also been amended. We are now in the in the process of finalising our assessment of the proposal and are seeking your comments in this regards to the amended plans. For your convenience I have attached the original plans as well as the revised plans.

Please don't hesitate to contact me on x228 if you have any questions.

Thanks again

Julio

Julio Assuncao | Strategic Land Use Planner | Environmental Standards
Fairfield City Council

M: PO Box 21 Fairfield NSW 1860

T: 9725 0228
F: 9757 4708
E: jassuncao@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au

Hi Klaus,

Thank you for forwarding the plans and Waste Management Plan (WMP) regarding the abovementioned matter. Please note the following feedback:

1. The WMP is generally in line with good practice for this type of tower residential development. It has a chute system for putrescible waste and separate ventilated waste rooms on each floor to provide recyclable material storage and access to garbage chute hopper. Residential waste generation rates noted in the WMP are practical.

2. The WMP shows 1.5m3 containers as the collection system for garbage but the plans seem to indicate a 240l wheelie bin carousel compactor system. I do not think this is critical and probably has been placed on the plans for illustration purposes only. Greater detail is required to properly understand this matter.

3. Given 2 above I will make some suggestions. The south tower ground level waste room should remove the dividing wall between the bin chute area and the bin storage to make the room open and more practical. Otherwise there is insufficient width to wheel containers (length ways only at 1200mm) past the structural column in the waste room. Also incorporate the 'dead alcove' entrance to the adjacent bike storage room as part of the garbage room so that extra space is available to store containers and wheelie bins awaiting collection.This waste room should then have a 1800mm wide door opening to the street to allow the efficient wheeling out of containers for emptying. The bike storage could then have a new street door exit.

4. The north tower ground level waste room is too narrow to be practical at 3000mm and needs to be at least 4500mm given the use of containers. This is possible I believe by gaining the additional width from the adjacent length of pump rooms, substation and or Spencer St shop. This waste room also needs a 1800mm wide door street exit.

5. The 126m2 common room at level 2 parking seems to be the clean up material storage room discussed in the WMP. Whilst this is a sensible it must be noted as a condition of approval that all the bulk material stored there needs to be brought up to outside street ground level by the building cleaners for timely removal.

6. The separation of commercial waste from residential is mandatory and therefore supported as part of the DA. At this stage concern is raised as to the adequacy of commercial waste bin storage although waste removal frequency (daily or bi weekly etc ?)
will likely "smooth' this issue out.

7. Sensible construction inclusions and finishes have been noted for the cleaning and practical purposes of the ground level waste rooms.

I trust this feedback is of assistance in determining this important DA application.

Regards
Ross