Detailed information about the amended proposal and DA submission material

1 Overview

1.1 This development application (DA) has been lodged by Urbis seeking approval for 9 residential flat buildings across 6 stages of development at 34 - 42 Tallawong Road, Tallawong.

1.2 This report is based on amended architectural plans lodged on 24 May 2022 and stormwater concept and landscape plans submitted on 17 August 2022.

1.3 The proposed development is split into north and south precincts which are physically separated by Road 2, known as 'Arum Street'.

- The northern precinct proposes 3 buildings A, B and C which feature 'U-shaped' plan forms with communal open space central to the 'u' shape of each building.
- The southern precinct proposes 6 buildings D, E, F, G, H and J which feature rectilinear plan forms that frame inner connected landscaped communal open spaces.

1.4 The proposal development includes:

- 911 apartments in a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms, comprising:

  149 x 1 bedroom

  702 x 2 bedroom

  60 x 3 bedroom
- 989 basement car parking spaces for resident and visitor vehicles including 99 accessible car spaces in 2 shared basement car parks
- onsite loading and waste facilities in the shared basement of the buildings in each precinct
- private open space in courtyards for ground level apartments and in balconies for the apartments above ground level
- associated landscaping and onside resident facilities
- a 2,200 m^2 publicly accessible plaza
- 2 retail premises totalling 160 m^2
- a publicly accessible pedestrian pathway along the southern boundary of the site.

2 Staging of the development

2.1 A staging plan prepared by Kann Finch and a Staging Arrangement letter prepared by Urbis were submitted with the application.

2.2 The development is currently proposed to be constructed in 6 stages.

- Stage 1 will involve construction of building A, communal open space and shared basement car park 1 below building A.
- Stage 2 will involve construction of Building B, communal open space and shared basement car park 1 below building B.

- Stage 3 will involve construction of buildings D and E, communal open space, shared basement car park 2 below buildings D and E, and publicly accessible plaza
- Stage 4 will involve construction of Building C, communal open space and basement car park 1 below building C.
- Stage 5 will involve construction of buildings F and G, communal open space and shared basement car park 2 below buildings F and G
- Stage 6 will involve construction of building H and J, communal open space and shared basement car park 2 below buildings H and J

2.3 Each building in each stage can operate independently as all required resident and visitor parking will be provided, as well as access ramps and waste collection areas.

3 Design report and architectural plans

3.1 An Architectural Design Report and architectural plans have been prepared for the proposal by Kann Finch.

3.2 Kann Finch's report details the proposal's compliance with the relevant planning instruments including the State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development and the Apartment Design Guide.

3.3 Each residential building is articulated as an 8-storey built form and includes the following features:

- a 2-storey off-form concrete frame to form 'the base' will undercut a façade to the ground and lower ground levels
- strong expression of the horizontal for 'the middle' through painted white off-form concrete 'beam banding' the frames glazing and individually colour panels set back from the face of each beam band that contain the beam banding composition in modulated sections that balance the vertical
- a set-back 'top' with floating roof elements including locally coloured roof overhangs that create a distinct modulated cap when viewed from below
- double height 'see through' lobbies that feature individually designed interior spaces and colour reveals to side walls and exterior lobby frames that frames that match the feature the match the feature panels colours of the facades that distinct for each building.
- each building has its own signature feature colour palette and has a combination of colourback glass and off-form concrete. The colour palette includes shades of blue, green, pink, beige, red and orange on painted panels.

4 Commercial/retail component

4.1 The proposed 2,200 m^2 publicly accessibly plaza will include 2 retail premises with a total floor area of 160 m^2 including:

- 64 m^2 within Building D
- 96 m^2 within Building E

5 Traffic and parking

5.1 A Traffic Impact Assessment has been prepared for the proposal by Stantec.

5.2 Stantec makes the following conclusions:

> Considering the sites location within 800 metres of Tallawong Station, the lower parking rates outlined in the TfNSW Guide 2002 are applicable to the site under SEPP 65.

These lower parking rates result in a minimum parking requirement for the proposed development of 815 resident parking spaces and 183 visitor spaces.

The proposed supply of 998 car parking spaces including 815 resident parking spaces and 183 visitor spaces meets this minimum requirement.

A minimum of 305 resident bicycle parking spaces will be provided to meet DCP 2010 requirements. While there is no formal visitor bicycle parking requirement, 76 spaces are proposed within the public domain to encourage more sustainable modes of travel and recognises the obvious changing nature of the precinct.

The proposed basement car park layouts and loading docks are consistent with the dimensional requirements as set out in the Australian/New Zealand Standard for Off Street Car Parking (AS/NZS2890.1:2004 and AS/NZS2890.6:2009) and Off Street Commercial Facilities (AS2890.2:2018).

A loading dock suitable for accommodating two service vehicles up to 10.5-11 metres long is proposed in both the north and south precinct basements. When considered in combination with the four loading bays for use by smaller service vehicles such as vans and utes within the basement car parks, these facilities are considered suitable for accommodating the loading demands of the site. On-street parking would also accommodate food delivery services and set-down/ pick-up activity.

The site is expected to generate around 174 and 137 vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hours respectively. This represents an increase of up to 10 vehicle trips in any weekday peak hour from that assessed as part of the Planning Proposal.

The traffic generation associated with the proposed 914 apartments represents a 0.25 per cent increase in traffic through the key Tallawong Road/ Schofields Road intersection from what was previously assessed in the Ason TIA as part of the Planning Proposal. This is negligible and very much previously assessed in the Ason TIA as part of the Planning Proposal. This is negligible and very much within typical daily variations in traffic volumes.

Overall, the development can be supported from a traffic and transport perspective.

5.3 Amended Plans were submitted by the applicant on 24 May 2022 which reduced the amount of apartments from 914 to 911. Adjustments to the on-site parking were also made so that each of the north and south precincts would comply independently with the minimum Apartment Design Guide rate, and maximum site-specific car parking rate in State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts - Central River City) 2021. The amended plans now demonstrate 807 residential car spaces and 182 visitor spaces.

6 Landscaping and communal open space

6.1 Landscape plans, prepared by Arcadia Landscape Architects, were submitted with the application.

6.2 The total landscaped area proposed is 17,464 m^2, which is 54.3% of the 32,159 m^2 site area.

6.3 The landscape plans show details for:

- Public footpaths
- BBQ areas
- Garden seating/lounge areas
- Village green
- Playground equipment
- Outdoor running track
- Fitness stations
- Indoor 'health club' including pool, gym

- Publicly accessible plaza including children's play areas, lawn areas, table tennis table, picnic table and seating and a timber deck.
- Deep soil zones

7 Communal open space management plan

7.1 A Communal open space management plan, prepared by Urbis, was submitted in support of the application.

7.2 The plan establishes access to and management criteria for the use of the communal open spaces with the proposed northern and southern precincts. The proposed 6,806 m^2 of communal open space (or 9,007 m^2 if public plaza is included) is distributed between the 9 residential flat buildings with ground floor access.

7.3 The publicly accessible plaza will be accessible to residents and the public.

7.4 Access to the private communal open space areas, from public areas, will be by key access.

7.5 The communal open space areas will be managed by strata management, which will endorse the Management plan including relevant terms of use and register the space under a Building management committee as shared facilities.

8 Crime prevention through environmental design

8.1 A Crime prevention through environmental design report, prepared by Urbis, was submitted in support of the application.

8.2 Urbis recommends that lighting, landscaping and maintenance strategies be prepared to provide safe pedestrian movements throughout the night, particularly due to its proximity to Tallawong Station, which is a highly activated space. It is also recommends that a Construction management plan and Plan of management (for the outdoor areas of the proposal) be prepared prior to the issuing of a Construction Certificate and Occupation Certificate respectively.

8.3 Urbis concludes that the proposal's design incorporates the 4 crime prevention through environmental design principles including surveillance, access control, territorial reinforcement and space management. It concludes that, with the implementation of the recommendations, the proposal will create an attractive and activated environment which minimises crime risk.

9 Heritage - view lines from Rouse Hill House

9.1 A Heritage Impact Response letter, prepared by Weir Phillips Heritage and Planning, was submitted in support of the proposal.

9.2 A Visual Impact Assessment letter, prepared by Ethos Urban, was also submitted in support of the application.

9.3 Weir Phillips Heritage and Planning and Ethos Urban also prepared the respective documents that accompanied the Planning Proposal to amend State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 to increase the maximum building height on the subject site from 16 m to 26 m.

9.4 Ethos Urban's Visual Impact Assessment 2019 that accompanied the Planning proposal considered the impacts of the height increase on key view corridors from Rouse Hill House and Estate. The maximum RL tested in this assessment was RL 89.77 m.

9.5 The Visual Impact Assessment letter submitted for this proposal considers the increase in the maximum RL across the proposed development of 90.87 m (a 1.1 m increase). Ethos Urban conclude:

- *An increase of 1.1m results in negligible changes to the assessment of Visual Impact Assessment 2019*
- *The DA is consistent with the recommendations and conclusions of Visual Impact Assessment 2019.*
- *No additional mitigation measures (such as landscaping) are required to satisfy the original findings outlined in the Planning Proposal documentation as the proposal will not be visible above the surveyed tree line from Rouse Hill House.*

9.6 The Heritage Impact Response letter submitted for this proposal concludes that Weir Phillips Heritage and Planning concur with the conclusions of Ethos Urban the increase in height results in negligible changes to the Visual Impact Assessment and the development application is consistent with the conclusions in the assessment, namely:

- The proposal will not negatively impact on features which are associated with the high visual significance or scenic qualities of view corridors from Rouse Hill House to the south and south west because the proposal will not be visible above the tree line.
- The existing tree line is assumed to be retained because these trees/vegetation form part of the proposed local parks and the Rouse Hill Regional Park. The importance of this vegetation to the setting of Rouse Hill House and Estate has been well established by several studies.
- There are other structures such as the Sydney Water Reservoir already established within the view corridor. The height and scale of the proposal is consistent with the Tallawong Station Precinct. The subject site is further removed from Rouse Hill House than the Water Reservoir.
- The view composition is retained in all views.
- No view loss or blocking is apparent.

10 Aboriginal cultural heritage impact assessment

10.1 An Aboriginal Due Diligence Assessment update letter prepared by Extent Heritage Advisors was submitted with the application.

10.2 The report considers there to be a low risk of Aboriginal objects being present in the study area.

10.3 Extent Heritage Advisors recommends that in the event of any unexpected (or potential) Aboriginal objects, sites or places are discovered, all works in the vicinity are to cease and the proponent should determine the subsequent course of action in consultation with a heritage professional and/or the Department of Planning and Environment as appropriate. A process of consultation with Aboriginal community representatives would also be required.

11 Geotechnical investigation

11.1 A Geotechnical Investigation report prepared by AssetGeoEnviro was submitted with the application.

11.2 The investigation assessed the surface and subsurface conditions and included fieldwork and laboratory testing.

11.3 AssetGeoEnviro recommends that a qualified and experienced Geotechnical Engineer be engaged to provide further input during the design development; including site visits during construction to verify the site conditions and provide advice where conditions vary from those assumed in this report. Development of an appropriate inspection and testing plan should be carried out in consultation with the Geotechnical Engineer.

12 Contamination

12.1 A Stage 2 Detailed Contamination Assessment, prepared by Geotechnique Pty Ltd, was submitted with the application.

12.2 The assessment included a site reconnaissance, review of site historical, geological and hydrogeological information, sampling and testing.

12.3 In its report, Geotechnique concludes that the site can be made suitable for the residential land use subject to the implementation of recommendations prior to site preparation and earthworks as summarised below:

- Slash dense vegetation/long grass to enable detailed site investigation of the entire site.
- Assess soil in the footprints of former and existing site features after demolition and removal to determine contamination status and make recommendations regarding any remediation works, if required.
- Assess soil within the boundaries of previous dams.
- Assess imported fill that has been placed within the site. In the event of contamination, detailed assessment, remediation and validation will be required.
- Further assess identified locations of soil contaminated with asbestos and benzo(a)pyrene (BaP) to delineate the extent of contamination
- Following delineation of the contamination, prepare a Remedial action plan to provide details for remediation and validation.
- Following remediation, in accordance with the Remedial action plan, undertake site validation to ensure the success of remediation.

13 Waste management

13.1 A Waste management plan, prepared by Elephants Foot Recycling Solutions, was submitted with the application.

13.2 The plan outlines the operational waste management of the development which is split into the northern and southern precincts.

14 Building Code of Australia

14.1 A Building Code of Australia Assessment Report prepared by Blackett Maguire + Goldsmith was submitted with the application

14.2 The report identifies key compliance issues that require further resolution, either by way of fire engineered performance solutions or plan amendments prior to the Construction Certificate stage.

14.3 Blackett Maguire + Goldsmith concludes that the proposed development can readily achieve compliance with the Building Code of Australia subject to the resolution of matters identified in its report.

15 Bushfire assessment

15.1 A Bushfire Assessment prepared by Sydney Bushfire Consultants was submitted with the application.

15.2 Sydney Bushfire Consultants provides recommendations including asset protection zones, landscaping, non-combustible materials, access provisions and services.

15.3 A letter relating to fire safety design has also been prepared for the proposal by Stantec.

15.4 A fire engineering review of the preliminary design was undertaken by Stantec and it was concluded that the buildings would be able to comply with the performance requirements of the Building Code of Australia without major changes to the current design.

16 Access review

16.1 An Access Review report prepared by Morris Goding Access Consulting was submitted with the application.

16.2 Morris Goding Access Consulting concludes that accessibility requirements, pertaining to external site linkages, building access, common area access, sanitary facilities and parking can be readily achieved subject to the recommendations and mitigation measures within its report being addressed in further design stages.

17 Acoustic impact assessment

17.1 A Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by Stantec was submitted with the application.

17.2 Stantec has assessed the potential noise impact of the development upon the nearest most-affected noise-sensitive receivers and the potential impacts of external noise sources on the proposed development.

17.3 The assessment included a noise survey to understand the local noise environment and establish noise impacts on the development and set noise criteria as off-site noise sensitive receivers surrounding the site.

17.4 An assessment considered the impact of train noise and vibration of the nearby rail corridor in line with the Department of Planning and Environment's 'Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads Interim Guideline' as well as noise impacts from plant and equipment, loading docks and commercial tenancies.

17.5 Stantec provided recommendations on the above and found that the development can comply with all applicable standards and regulations.

18 Tree removal

18.1 An Arborist Report prepared by Birds Trees Consultancy was submitted with the application

18.2 Birds Trees Consultancy recommends the removal of all trees on the subject site due to their condition (poor, declining or dead), there being no visible habitat, the hazard they pose and their encroachment of the construction, earthworks and roadworks.

19 Ecological assessment

19.1 An Ecological Assessment prepared by Molino Stewart was submitted with the application.

19.2 The assessment included detailed desktop studies and field investigations with the following conclusions made:

> No threatened flora was recorded during the field survey. The recorded flora diversity is dominated by exotic species with only remnant vegetation occurring near the north eastern boundary of the development site.
>
> The vegetation in the northern part of the site is consistent with the NSW Scientific Committee's determination for Cumberland Plain Woodland CEEC and the Commonwealth Government's Policy Statement for Cumberland Plain Shale Woodlands and Shale-Gravel Transition Forest. The majority of this community will be affected by the development proposal. Some of the trees outside of the development footprint may be able to be retained (Arboricultural Development Impact Assessment Report, June 2020).

The isolated trees in the central part of the site are consistent with Cumberland Plain Woodland CEEC, but do not meet the criteria for Cumberland Plain Shale Woodlands and Shale-Gravel Transition Forest under the EPBC Act. The majority of the isolated trees will be affected by the development, however many are already deceased and those remaining are in poor condition.

The existing vegetation across much of the development site is introduced grassland degraded with weeds that provide little habitat value to fauna in the area.

The initial fauna survey (August, 2017) recorded one threatened species, the Eastern Freetail Bat (Mormopterus norfolkensis). The available treed habitat on the development site is affected by ringbarking and rabbit grazing; there is likely to be suitable habitat retained in the Riverstone East Precinct.

The removal of the vegetation and fauna habitats from the 'certified lands' has been considered in the assessment of the Riverstone East Precinct Plan.

Removal of vegetation from the development site will contribute to fragmentation of vegetation within the area, however the Precinct Plan conserves vegetation to the east of the site and to the north west along the tributary of First Ponds Creek providing for fauna habitat.

19.3 Molino Stewart provided recommendations to guide the clearing process and reduce immediate short and longer term impact on mobile species currently utilising the site:

Prior to any clearing of the existing vegetation, a pre-clearance survey should be undertaken by a qualified and experienced ecologist to ensure that fauna is not present within the existing vegetation that is to be cleared. This pre-clearance survey should be undertaken immediately prior to the commencement of any clearing activities.

A targeted survey for the Cumberland Plain Woodland Snail and Dural Land Snail should be conducted by a suitably qualified ecologist as part of the pre-clearance survey outlined above.

A two-stage clearing protocol should be adopted for the removal of the two hollow-bearing trees identified onsite

A Translocation Protocol for any native fauna located on the site should be prepared prior to clearing; and implemented should any native fauna be located on the site during the clearing.

A Landscape Plan is to include retention of remnant trees where possible and the provision of native canopy species within the street planting, particularly to provide a connection of retained vegetation on adjoining properties to the east of the property with retained vegetation along the tributary of First Ponds Creek.

20 Cross ventilation

20.1 A Natural Ventilation Statement prepared by Windtech Consultants was submitted with the application.

20.2 The results of the assessment indicate that 61% of the residential apartments can achieve adequate levels of natural cross ventilation which exceeds the 60% required by State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 (No 65—Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development). Natural cross ventilation has been achieved through openings on orthogonal or opposite aspects with direct exposure to prevailing winds or windows located in significantly different pressure regions as defined in Section 4B of the Apartment Design Guide.

21 Building sustainability index (BASIX) report

21.1 A Building Sustainability Index (BASIX) Report prepared by Stantec was submitted with the application.

21.2 Stantec completed an assessment of the proposal and provide the Water, Thermal Comfort and Energy outcomes for each of the 6 stages. The provided BASIX Certificates for each stage indicate that each stage meets demonstrates BASIX compliance.