

Stockland Commercial Property

133 Castlereagh Street
Sydney NSW 2000

T 02 9035 2979
F 02 8898 2979

www.stockland.com.au

10 June 2015

Mr Brian Gibson
Senior Development Planner
Lake Macquarie Council
Box 1906, Hunter Region
Mail Centre NSW 2310

Via email: briangibson@lakemac.nsw.gov.au

Attention: Mr Brian Gibson – Senior Development Planner

Dear Sir;

Re: 387 Lake Road, Glendale - Request for further information in relation to DA 764/2014.

Thank you for your recent correspondence from 2 June 2015 in response to Stockland's further submission on the above development application.

Please find below our response to the issues raised in relation to the submission and, where applicable, details of supplementary information as required.

No	ITEM RAISED BY COUNCIL	STOCKLAND RESPONSE	ANNEXURE (If applicable)
1.0	Traffic - Pedestrians and Cyclists		
1.1	The removal of the pedestrian crossing across four lanes adjacent to the Hungry Jacks restaurant is supported. This matter will have to be approved by the Lake Macquarie Traffic Facilities and Road Safety Committee. Prior to removal being undertaken, it is recommended that Council be contacted and request this matter be investigated. The approval process for removal of the crossing could take three months, and is considered appropriate to occur once the replacement crossing east of the new roundabout is installed.	Noted. Stockland will, as soon as possible, provide a revised submission seeking the removal of the pedestrian crossing as required by the proposed condition of consent.	NA

1.2	It is required that the footpath that leads to the existing pedestrian crossing mentioned above be continued as shown in the image below.	Noted. Please see amended submission plans attached showing extension of footpath.	Annexure 1 – Revised DA Plans Annexure 2 – Revised Floor Plan
1.3	The travel routes of the delivery vehicles were noted, particularly where the vehicles cross over oncoming lanes whilst manoeuvring around the site. Details are required as to the management of delivery vehicles attending the site such that they are not present during peak operational times and thus impacts are minimised.	Noted. Stockland will restrict deliveries during peak operating times in any new delivery zones. Details of the time and duration of restrictions can be found in the attached Car Park and Operational Management Plan. Existing delivery restrictions will apply to current loading zones and docks.	Annexure 4 – Car Park and Operational Management Plan
2.0	<u>Traffic - Car Parking Areas and Structures</u>		
2.1	AS2890.6 requires a 90 degree angle accessible/disabled parking space to have an unmarked shared area of 2.4m x 2.4m either behind or in front of the marked disabled spaces. This required area may cause conflict when located behind the space and on the circulation road, hence disabled parking spaces within the circulation road or on service vehicle routes are not supported unless the shared area is located in front of the disabled parking space or the parking spaces are parallel and compliant with AS2890.6.	Please refer to McKenzie's addendum noting the current DA plan complies with the AS.	Annexure 3 – Supplementary DDA advice.
2.2	The red pavement shall be provided on the Bus Only road however shall not extend anywhere that non-bus vehicles travel. A condition can be applied in this regard.	Noted. Stockland will comply with the proposed condition of consent.	
3.0	<u>Traffic - Senior/Disabled Access</u>		
3.1	Dimensions of the dedicated drop off-zones for mini buses catering to passengers with reduced mobility and wheelchair users to be reviewed to ensure adequate area is provided to safely board and exit the rear of the vehicle.	Stockland's DDA consultant has confirmed the plan lodged with Council complies with all standards.	Annexure 3 – Supplementary DDA advice.
3.2	The Access Audit recommends including a baby change table in the unisex accessible toilet facility. A condition can be applied as such that signage is erected that the change table must be left in the folded position after use to ensure adequate circulation space is provided for wheelchair users to access the toilet.	Noted. Stockland will comply with the proposed condition of consent.	

4.0	CPTED		
4.1	Concerns remain about the requirement of staff and customers needing to utilise the perimeter parking. Details of additional precautions are required that reduce the risk of stealing from motor vehicles, motor vehicle theft and personal crime through the increased presence of capable guardianship such as regular patrols conducted by security staff and ensuring perimeter lighting complies with AS 1158.1 – Pedestrian.	Noted. See attached car park management plan detailing procedures for staff parking, and further information regarding perimeter security, lighting and monitoring.	Annexure 4 – Car Park and Operational Management Plan
5.0	Hours of Operation		
5.1	Details of the proposed hours of operation for the Centre are required. This is in the context of delivery vehicles and management of noise generating activities associated with the perimeter parking.	Noted. See attached Car Park Management and Operational plan detailing procedures for staff parking, and further information regarding perimeter security, lighting and monitoring.	Annexure 4 – Car Park and Operational Management Plan
6.0	Landscape		
6.1	The Preliminary Arborist Report condemned all existing soil cell structure to existing car park shade trees. The arborist states that majority of existing trees central to the carpark ascertain girding roots with many trees having a Useful Life Expectancy (ULE) of less than 5 years. The recent landscape plans nominate these trees for retention rather than replacement and as per Arborist advice an improved soil cell structure to ensure establishment and growth opportunities is required.	Please refer to Sym Studio's addendum.	Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans. Annexure 6 – Revised Arborist Report. Annexure 7 – Revised civil plans.
6.2	Conflicts/Inconsistencies are evident between landscape plans and civil design plans.	Noted. A revised set of civil drawings are included in the annexures.	Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans. Annexure 7 – Revised civil plans.
6.3	The landscape plans detail the retention of car park tree however the civil drawings show car park reconfiguration works that prevent the retention (noting the arborist report identified a number of trees as being unsuitable for retention, ie. 84-100).	Please refer to Sym Studio's addendum.	Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans. Annexure 7 – Revised civil plans.
6.4	Conflicting layouts for the car park area north-west of K-Mart	Please refer to Northrop's addendum for updated plans. We note the previous Northrop plans submitted were inconsistent with both the Architectural and Landscape drawings.	Annexure 7 – Revised civil plans.

6.5	Central retaining wall to create 2.0-2.5% cross fall grades leading to max 600mm retaining wall between parking bay aisles. Landscape plan reflects tree retention within this alignment however appears unfeasible as well the retaining wall is not detailed on the landscape plan.	Please refer to Northrop's addendum for updated plans. Retaining wall removed and car park regraded to reflect this change.	Annexure 2 – Revised Architectural Plan Annexure 7 – Revised Civil drawings.
6.6	Having regard to the retaining wall, the suitability of retaining wall is questioned in terms of pedestrian movement and safety, as well vehicle safety, ie. wheel stops.	Noted. See above as retaining wall is to be removed.	
6.7	Changes to the existing water detention area are noted with the proposed inclusion of retaining walls. Details of the proposed retaining wall for the existing detention basin are required in terms of finish and appearance (Council is concerned the wall if untreated from an aesthetics perspective it will detract from the existing soft landscaped appearance of the detention basin). Concept details are to be submitted to Council for approval prior to determination.	Please refer to Northrop's addendum for updated plans. Note, proposed retaining wall will match existing retaining walls presently in situ.	Annexure 8 – Detention Basin retaining wall details.
7.0	Arborist Report		
7.1	The south and south-western interface is a concern particularly in understanding the overall impact of vegetation removal as a consequence of the proposed parking. The revised Arborist report dealing specifically with this interface identifies and confirms Council's initial concerns however, does not put forward a detailed report of the overall resultant impact from the proposed parking. The Arborist recommends that further investigation is required upon review of more detailed civil design plans. Based on the information provided by the arborist it appears the arborist report has been derived from basic information .	Noted. Further detail of the overall impact of tree removed along the southern boundary is provided in the updated Landscaping plan. Please refer to plans DA-L01 in Annexure 5 which shows the extent of the proposed tree replacement (providing adequate screening) along with the new 'Tree Replacement Strategy'. Note that additional planting, providing adequate screening along the interface has now also been included in the landscaping plans.	Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans Annexure 6 – Revised Arborist Report

7.2	Furthermore, the recently submitted plans nominate a detailed civil RW design for the subject interface however it appears the arborist may not have had these plans at hand to put forward a detailed impact of the proposal in terms of identifying trees that will be directly impacted by works and identifying opportunities for replacement.	Further detail of the southern boundary is provided in the updated Landscaping plan. Please refer to plans DA-L01 in Annexure 5 which shows the extent of the proposed tree replacement (providing adequate screening) along with the new 'Tree Replacement Strategy'.	Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans
7.3	As a result, an on-site meeting should be held for Council to convey its concerns rather than relying on the CC stage to provide clarity on the impact where it is believed the impact at DA stage has not been adequately justified. The on-site meeting can discuss the interface concerns pertaining to a boundary vegetation buffer between adjoining residential land and proposed parking resulting in vegetation loss.	Further detail of the southern boundary is provided in the updated Landscaping plan. Please refer to plans DA-L01 in Annexure 5 which shows the extent of the proposed tree replacement (providing adequate screening) along with the new 'Tree Replacement Strategy'. As noted the revised Arborist report and amended landscape adequate screening can still be achieved along this boundary.	Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans
7.4	Note, reliance on landscaping of Council's drainage reserve is not accepted.	Noted.	
8.0	Signage		
8.1	The resubmission of the application noted the proposed Pylon Signs have been deleted from the application. At the recent meeting however concerns were raised about the proposed signage of the dining precinct and how this would be consistent with an overall signage regime for the Centre.	Noted. All external signage will be the subject of a separate Development application.	
8.2	As discussed at our meeting, a condition will be imposed that any signage requires separate development consent.	Noted. All external signage will be the subject of a separate Development application.	

9.0	Recycling/Waste		
9.1	The Centre should consider the contents of the general waste and the additional waste from new dining facility wastes, as it is likely that a substantial proportion could be separated as compostable food waste, saving on disposal costs for Centre Management. (General waste will likely have higher disposal costs than compostable food wastes disposed to food compost facilities). High capacity dehydration and composting systems are available to manage this waste hygienically with odour controls and pest problem prevention. Dehydration reduces the weight for transport and disposal and increases storage capacity and manageability.	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
9.2	There may also be other recyclable wastes that could be separated from the general waste bin. It is noted that the Waste Management Plan states “Stockland will continue to investigate other recycling opportunities with a view to introducing additional recycling services when they become available in the area.” Has enough room been allowed for future waste separation bins?	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
9.3	How are hazardous wastes (electronic waste, used batteries, used light globes, liquid wastes and other such operational, facility maintenance and unsaleable stock managed) from the mini-majors and specialty shops?	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
9.4	Will a three-bin system be provided in the public areas for waste disposal, with a separate food waste bin, recyclable containers bin and residual non-recyclables garbage bin, that will parallel the domestic waste services in Lake Macquarie City Council area from mid-2016?	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.

9.5	Has a waste audit been undertaken to establish if waste separation is reduced by the existing configuration of bins, which does not have the same bin availability for recycling at each waste dock? Usually when people have to walk further to dispose of recycling, it more frequently is disposed of in general garbage bins instead of recycled. If this is an issue, will this be addressed by reconfiguring the bin types at each dock?	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
9.6	Will each commercial unit have space sufficient to store a day's equivalent of waste volume prior to transfer to the communal disposal dock?	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
9.7	The Demolition and Construction Waste Management Plans will be required, prior to work commencement. If the demolition wastes are not going to be reused in the new construction, where will these be sent for reuse or recycling? How will construction wastes be minimised and of construction wastes generated, how much will be reused or recycled?	Noted. Stockland will provide a construction waste management plan prior to work commencement.	
9.8	A detailed design is not provided, but pathways for retailers to access bin docks will need to have no steps and be no steeper than 1:14 grade, and doors and gateways will need to be wide enough for bins to pass easily through. If the new waste area is to be a small waste room or gated area, there must be enough room to stand in front of each of the bins and lift waste into the bins.	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
9.9	How will the bins be moved from the new waste area to the garbage vehicle collection point – will this collection point be immediately adjacent in the car park when shops are closed, or by which route will the bins be wheeled around to the back? Will the cooking oil waste be pumped out or handled differently?	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.

9.10	Are all new retailers supposed to use the new waste area or only the ones in the central food court space? Is there sufficient space allocated for enough bin capacity? Takeaways are estimated to generate about 80 litres of waste per 100m2 floor area per day, but cafés can create more and restaurants may create up to 790 litres of garbage and recycling per 100m2 floor area per day. (For an increase of 1860m2 dining net lettable area, this could be 1490L/day for 100% takeaway or up to 14,508L/day for 100% restaurants).	Noted. See additional information from Stockland's Waste Management consultant Kumite.	Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum.
------	--	--	---

We trust our responses meet with your needs, however please don't hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience should you require any further information.

Yours faithfully,



Kirrily Lord
Development Manager
Stockland Development Pty Ltd

Annexures Enclosed:

- Annexure 1 – Amended Plans
- Annexure 2 – Architectural Plans - Ground floor layout plan
- Annexure 3 – Supplementary DDA advice
- Annexure 4 – Car Park and Operational Management Plan
- Annexure 5 – Revised Landscaping Plans
- Annexure 6 – Revised Arborist Assessment
- Annexure 7 – Revised Civil drawings
- Annexure 8 – Detention Basin retaining wall details
- Annexure 9 – Waste Management Addendum