

4-18 Northwood Rd, 274 & 274A Longueville Road, Lane Cove - DA 113/2020 - Submissions received by Council

The following table outlines the comments made by members of the public during public exhibition of the DA with response provided for each.

Key Issues	Comments	Frequency	Response																															
Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increased traffic generation on local due to single vehicular access point and decreased safety of locals and driversTraffic analysis completed by the applicant was done during school holidays and COVID, not an accurate representationDCP objectives for traffic not metTraffic and Parking Impact Assessment suggesting 'rat-run' alternativesReluctance for Council/RMS to install roundabouts/traffic light intersections at accident prone intersections which will be subject to increased trafficVehicles between 5-8m will have difficulty negotiating alternative route.	134 (plus 15 pro forma) 6 late submissions	<p>The traffic analysis estimates that compared to the existing land uses on site, the proposed development will generate a net change of -12 vehicle trips in the morning peak hour (12 in, 0 out) and +13 vehicle trips during the afternoon peak hour (+16 in, -3 out). This level of net change in traffic is relatively minor and is not expected to noticeably impact the existing conditions of the surrounding road network. Notwithstanding, visitors and staff will be encouraged as part of Pathways orientation/induction information to take primary routes directly to Pacific Highway rather than routes through local streets.</p> <p>The Traffic and Parking objectives in the draft DCP are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">To improve the site’s accessibility.To reduce the impact of vehicle crossings to Northwood Road.To improve the public domain for pedestrians. <p>The proposed consolidated vehicular access significantly improves safety and traffic flow at the site, as discussed in the access/ingress response below. Further the proposal incorporates a 2-3 metre front setback which allows for improvements to the public domain including a new high quality footpath and landscaping including street trees. The proposed improvements to the public domain will improve pedestrian accessibility in front of and into the site.</p> <p>The proposed development does not generate articulated vehicle development traffic along the local streets, specifically Arabella Street. Any construction traffic generated by the development will be strictly monitored and adhere to a haulage route as approved by Council within the provided Construction Traffic Management Plan. Ongoing delivery vehicles for the subject site will be limited to an 8.8m length Medium Rigid Vehicle or smaller.</p> <p>The traffic surveys were undertaken during COVID which was unavoidable giving the timing of the project. However, the traffic surveys were undertaken on 1 July 2020 which was within Term 2, as school holidays commenced on 6 July 2020.</p> <p>In the Traffic comments prepared by Council on 23 September 2020 the following was noted in relation to the roundabout:</p> <p>"Council is the process of gaining approval for a roundabout at the Northwood Road/River Road intersection. Given the development is restricted to left in/left out access, the proposed roundabout will facilitate westbound movements from the development which will potentially reduce rat-running through local streets".</p> <p>Refer to the Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment submitted with the DA and subsequent Traffic Response Letter (submitted 8 October 2020) for further detail.</p>																															
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Lack of car spaces (15 car spaces to serve 143 rooms)DCP objectives for parking not metLack of parking further magnified by irregular public transportWill erode on street parking availabilityLack of parking for future retail/commercial tenancies	100 (plus 14 pro forma) 4 late submissions	<p>The proposed development has provided parking in accordance with Lane Cove Council’s Development Control Plan and the Seniors SEPP. It is noted that the parking rates in the Seniors SEPP are standards that cannot be used to refuse consent not development standards. The table below demonstrates compliance with the required parking spaces for the development.</p> <table><tr><th>Land Use</th><th>Type</th><th>Scale</th><th>Rate</th><th>Parking Required</th><th>Parking Provided</th></tr><tr><td>Commercial</td><td>Shop</td><td>2,051m² GFA</td><td>1 space per 40m²</td><td>51.3</td><td>51</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">Residential</td><td rowspan="3">Aged Care</td><td>101 x 1-bed units</td><td>1 space per 10 beds</td><td>10.1</td><td rowspan="2">15</td></tr><tr><td>21 x 2-bed units</td><td>1 space per 10 beds</td><td>4.2</td></tr><tr><td>40 staff</td><td>1 space per 2 staff</td><td>20</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>86 (85.6)</td><td>86</td></tr></table> <p>As the proposal complies with the parking rates for both the Seniors component and commercial component, there will be no need for staff or visitors to use on street parking. The site is located in close proximity to six (6)</p>	Land Use	Type	Scale	Rate	Parking Required	Parking Provided	Commercial	Shop	2,051m² GFA	1 space per 40m²	51.3	51	Residential	Aged Care	101 x 1-bed units	1 space per 10 beds	10.1	15	21 x 2-bed units	1 space per 10 beds	4.2	40 staff	1 space per 2 staff	20	20	TOTAL	-	-	-	86 (85.6)	86
Land Use	Type	Scale	Rate	Parking Required	Parking Provided																													
Commercial	Shop	2,051m² GFA	1 space per 40m²	51.3	51																													
Residential	Aged Care	101 x 1-bed units	1 space per 10 beds	10.1	15																													
		21 x 2-bed units	1 space per 10 beds	4.2																														
		40 staff	1 space per 2 staff	20	20																													
TOTAL	-	-	-	86 (85.6)	86																													

Key Issues	Comments	Frequency	Response
			nearby bus stops which provide regular services to Lane Cove, Riverview and the City (via North Sydney). Further, a total of 65 bicycle parking spaces are provided on site to encourage staff and visitors to utilise green travel options.
Access, Ingress/Egress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of a single vehicular access point Site access restricted to the site's eastern boundary Access for emergency vehicles not adequate, will be forced to navigate rat run through Arabella, Woodford and Kenneth Streets Left turn in left turn out not adequate Potential for decrease in pedestrian safety 	85 (plus 14 pro forma) 3 late submissions	<p>The existing access arrangement on the site consists of five (5) separate driveways, two (2) of which are non-compliant with respect to current road standards. The proposal seeks to provide one consolidated driveway which is offset 30 metres from Kenneth Street. The consolidated driveway will improve pedestrian and vehicular safety by reducing pedestrian and vehicle conflict.</p> <p>The proposed location of the driveway was recommended by the RMS and is in line with RMS best practice to limit the number of driveways onto arterial roads to help improve traffic flow efficiency and reduce road safety considerations. The access arrangements will be restricted to left in, left out which will be enforced through the division of a raised median within Northwood Road.</p> <p>Adequate provision for ambulance access has been provided, with an ambulance able to use the loading bay or the drop-off / pick-up area provided on site if required</p>
Non-compliance with building setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency with Draft DCP - requires a 5m, 3rd storey setback Sited too close to Northwood Road 	71 (plus 10 pro forma) 1 late submission	<p>The draft DCP requires a maximum street wall height of 2 storeys along Northwood Road, with a recessed 3rd storey. This control, however, is inconsistent with DPIE's finalisation report for the Planning Proposal, which envisaged a 3-5 storey built form, with 3 storeys along Northwood Road (refer to below extract).</p> <div style="background-color: #f0f0f0; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><i>The Department therefore recommends that a height of RL 66.25 (as defined within Lane Cove LEP 2009) would result in an appropriately scaled development being three storeys at Northwood Road and five storeys at the rear. This is consistent with the character of similar higher density development in the local area, while being sympathetic to the surrounding predominately low density residential properties.</i></p> </div> <p>Further, on 27 April 2016, Council approved a development at 16 Northwood Road, Lane Cove (which forms part of the subject site) for a 3-storey mixed use development. This development was approved with a nil setback for the first 2-storeys and 3.5 metre setback for the 3rd storey.</p> <p>The proposed street wall provides a scale and form that reinforces the street edge on a highly visible intersection. The height and presentation of the building at Northwood Road is consistent with that anticipated in the B4 Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>The site immediately adjoins R4 and R2 Zoned land which contain a two storey residential flat building and single storey detached dwelling, respectively. Although these residential buildings are located in different zones to the site and are subject to lower building height, the proposed development has given detailed consideration to the presentation to the street and minimising impacts on adjoining properties.</p> <p>The proposed 3 storey street wall does not result in any adverse impacts on the adjoining residential properties in terms of visual privacy and overshadowing. Therefore, the proposed street wall assists in creating a defined neighbourhood centre in a key location on Northwood/Longueville Road. The 3 storey street wall height is therefore consistent with that envisaged by the amendment to the Lane Cove LEP gazetted on 20 May 2020.</p> <p>The proposed building is setback 2-3m from Northwood Road which is an increased setback compared to some of the existing buildings on the site which have a zero setback to the front boundary. As the entire building is setback, this allows for public domain improvements and additional landscaping within the front boundary.</p>
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of beds increased by 10% from original proposal Overdevelopment FSR too high 	47 (plus 4 pro forma) 1 late submission	<p>The Planning Proposal identified that approximately 130 beds could be accommodated in the future residential aged care facility. However, this number was indicative and in preparing the DA plans it was determined 143 beds could be accommodated within the building. A large portion of the proposed rooms are double rooms, designed to accommodate couples who wish to live together. It is unlikely that there will be 143 residents across the 128 rooms, as only 6 rooms are likely to have couples.</p> <p>The LCLEP Floor Space Ratio Map identifies a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 1:1 for the subject site. When combined with the additional FSR of 0.85:1 allowed under Clause 6.9(2)(b) of the LCLEP, the site is subject to a maximum FSR of 1.85:1. The GFA of the proposed RACF has been calculated in accordance with the GFA definition in the Seniors SEPP, while the GFA of the commercial components of the development have been calculated in accordance with the LCLEP definition.</p>

Key Issues	Comments	Frequency	Response
			The proposal complies with the FSR controls contained in the LCLEP.
Bulk and Scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive bulk and scale Apparent rezoning against advice of Lane Cove Council 	28 (plus 3 pro forma)	<p>The proposal complies with the FSR control which establishes the bulk of development permitted on the site.</p> <p>The proposal substantially complies with the height control which establishes the scale of development permitted on the site, with the exception of minor breaches created by the roof parapet, lift overrun and rooftop plant.</p> <p>Further, the proposal incorporates substantial building setbacks to position the building appropriately on the site, including a 6m setback to the northern boundary and 2.5m (lower ground levels) and 11.5m-18m (upper levels) setbacks to the southern boundary.</p> <p>As demonstrated on the material elevations submitted with the DA, the use of different colours and materials across the building façade not only creates visual interest, but “breaks up” the building bulk.</p> <p>The bulk and scale of the proposal is compatible with the existing and future desired character of the area, being located in a B4 Mixed Use zone and presenting as a 3 storey building to Northwood/Longueville Road.</p>
Green Space/Bushland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of green space, most of which will be on roof top. Lack of access to the outdoors Reduction of 10m eastern setback (to the bush) Removal of 11 out of 17 existing trees on the site Massing of development negatively impact local bushland corridor 2 Sydney blue gums proposed for the front can grow up to 50m - dangerous for occupants 	22 2 late submissions	<p>As shown on the amended Landscape Plans (Drawing LP02) submitted to Council, 11 trees are proposed to be removed however a total of 43 replacement trees are proposed. This results in a replacement planting ratio of 3:1, which exceeds the replacement planting ratio of 2:1 included in the draft DCP.</p> <p>The proposal involves the creation of a new bush regeneration area (approximately 200 sqm) at the rear of the site and includes mass planting areas within the rear setback to create a buffer between the building and bushland.</p> <p>In terms of the 10m rear setback, the draft DCP requires a 10m setback from the rear boundary, not from the bushland. Therefore, a strict 10m setback has not been applied to the “rear sides”. The intent of this control is to reduce impacts on the adjacent bushland, which the proposal achieves as demonstrated in the accompanying Flora and Fauna Assessment. Refer to section 6.3.2 of the SEE and DCP Compliance Table for further justification.</p> <p>As detailed on the Landscape Plans, the proposed street trees are Water Gums which will grow to a mature size of 5-15m.</p>
Non-compliance with building height	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breach of the height control 	20 (plus 3 pro forma)	<p>Pursuant to Clause 6.9 of the LCLEP, the subject site has a maximum building height standard of RL 66.25 metres. The proposed building has a maximum height of RL 68.65 metres to the top of the lift overrun resulting in a 2.4m variation. The extent of the height breach is limited to the parapet, stairs and plant which create minor encroachments.</p> <p>In the draft exhibited DCP, the indicative section diagram identified the maximum RL of 66.25 being measured to the underside of the top ceiling. However, given the height is associated with a site-specific clause in the LCLEP, the height has been measured using the LCLEP definition, which is defined as “the vertical distance from the Australian Height Datum to the highest point of the building”. This definition requires plant equipment and lift overruns to be included in the height measurement.</p> <p>Under the Seniors SEPP, height is measured to the ceiling of the uppermost floor and does not include any roof top structures including the parapet, services, or stair overruns. However, given Clause 40(4) of the Seniors SEPP does not apply to this site (because RFBs are permissible in the B4 zone) the relevant controls are contained in Clause 6.9 of the LCLEP. Therefore, the height definition of the LEP applies and requires measurement to the highest point of the building.</p> <p>Ordinarily the architectural features clause would allow breach by the parapet and associated features. However, in this case, the site specific clause is outside the scope of this clause.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 6.3.1 of the SEE the proposed building does not result in any adverse impacts on the adjoining residential properties in terms of visual privacy and overshadowing.</p> <p>A Clause 4.6 Variation request has been submitted with the DA.</p>
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowance for 65 bikes is too high given bike usage. 	5	A total of 65 bicycle space are proposed which complies with the DCP requirement.

Key Issues	Comments	Frequency	Response
			<p>The following bicycle parking rate is identified in Council's DCP:</p> <p>- <i>Employees 1 per 50m2 GFA and Visitors 2 racks + 1 rack per 200m2 over 200m2 GFA</i></p> <p>Applying the above rates, results in a requirement of 53 bicycle spaces, with 41 for commercial staff, 12 for commercial visitors.</p> <p>The provision of ample bicycle parking aims to encourage both staff and visitors to cycle to and from the site, where possible, reducing the number of car trips.</p>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise disruptions during the construction period 	4	<p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared by CareStruct and was submitted to Council on 8 October 2020.</p> <p>Section 7 of the EMP outlines the Noise and Vibration Management Plan for the project, which includes mitigation measures to ensure noise impacts are minimised during the construction period.</p>
Overshadowing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal overshadows local bushland 	3	<p>Due to the orientation of the site the proposal results in some overshadowing of parts of the bushland in the afternoon in mid-winter.. However, the proposal maintains full solar access to the adjoining bushland between 9am and 12pm in mid winter.</p> <p>As shown on the submitted shadow diagrams, in mid summer overshadowing of the bushland is limited and only occurs in the late afternoon.</p>
Type of Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive Aged Care and Retirement Home development in the vicinity. 	2	<p>Sydney's ageing population will increase demand for aged care services, particularly high care facilities. This proposal is able to directly support the changing needs of the Sydney population by providing 143 residential aged care beds in a high demand and under supplied area of Sydney.</p>
Telecommunication tower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of relocation or incorporation of telecommunication tower into final development 	2	<p>As identified in the Statement of Environmental Effects, this application does not seek consent for the relocation of the telecommunications tower. Notwithstanding, a letter has been prepared by City Plan in response and was submitted to Council on 8 October 2020.</p> <p>The Proponent is in negotiations with the relevant telecommunications provider to relocate and/or remove the existing tower. Telecommunications carriers are responsible for ensuring all towers meet the relevant Radiation Protection Standard.</p>
Fumes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being located next to a busy road is a health risk for aged residents 	1	<p>The front elevation, which is potentially susceptible to fumes, is a closed frontage with no balconies proposed and these rooms will rely on air conditioning. The areas in which residents will be outdoors is at the rear terraces/balconies which are protected from the main road by the building.</p>
View Loss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High reflectivity of panels onto water views 	1	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>We note that this submission has been incorrectly included on the DA Tracker for DA 113/2020. This submission relates to DA 131/2020 at 111B Northwood Road which is located approximately 700m from the subject site.</p>
Golf Course Redevelopment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponents have not considered the impact of the proposed redevelopment of the Golf course to a multi use sports and entertainment facility 	1	<p>The proposal is not anticipated to impact on the future redevelopment of the golf course and vice versa. If and when a formal application for the golf course is submitted, it will need to consider and respond to any environmental impacts. Notwithstanding, the proposal has been designed to manage all potential impacts to the golf course such as noise, light and stormwater.</p>
Responses from Transport for NSW (TfNSW)			
Traffic	TfNSW's letter to Council on 9 October 2020, provides concurrence under Section 138 of the <i>Roads Act 1993</i> 8 .	1	Concurrence has been provided by TfNSW and the conditions can be included in the consent.
	In a separate letter dated 9 October 2020, TfNSW provided comments on the draft DCP that applies to the site. The main comments are summarised as follows:	1	<p>Active Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RACF component of the development is explicitly for high care residents who are not expected to frequently leave the facility. Notwithstanding, the proposal includes the provision of 65 bicycle parking spaces which will promote green travel options to staff and visitors of both the retail and seniors uses. Further, the

Key Issues	Comments	Frequency	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Active Transport - TfNSW suggests that as part of any future DAs on the subject site, the applicant should prepare a Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan and Green Travel Plan to identify any required improvements for pedestrians and cyclists facilities and promote the use of public transport and other sustainable modes of transport. ▪ Bus Stop and Streetscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ a traffic impact assessment should be conducted to evaluate the impacts, including potential conflicts, and identify mitigation measures in relation to the bus stop on Northwood Road. ▫ Proposed street tree plantings and awnings on the eastern edge of Northwood Road should consider bus design envelope, including bus height clearance of 4.3m and bus mirror extrusion clearance of 230mm. The bus zone area should be clear of street furniture and signage. ▫ street tree plantings should not impede driver sightlines to critical road infrastructure including traffic control lanterns and regulatory signage. ▪ Vehicular Access and Traffic Signals - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ TfNSW would recommend that the site be limited to one access point and that access point should be located towards the southern boundary of the property. ▫ TfNSW recommends that the configuration for this single access point be a left in left out arrangement for road safety and efficiency reasons. To achieve this, the future DA should investigate and include measures to enforce the restriction. ▫ If the traffic signals at Northwood Road and Kenneth Street, Longueville (TCS 936) are affected in any way, they will require a complete review to bring the site up to current standards. Any changes to a Traffic Control Signal (TCS) plan requires the applicant to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD). 		<p>proposed works include upgrades to the footpath along Northwood Road which will improve pedestrian access. Although we do not think this requirement is necessary for the type of development proposed, if deemed appropriate by Council, the preparation of a Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan and Green Travel Plan could be imposed via a condition of consent.</p> <p>Bus Stop and Streetscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to the existing bus stop, the following condition of consent has been suggested by TfNSW: <i>The proponent is to consult with TfNSW and bus operators regarding the relocation of the bus stop at the site frontage on Northwood Road and comply with their requirements.</i> ▪ The proposed street tree planting and awning have been positioned to avoid obstructing any sightlines and ensuring appropriate clearance from traffic. <p>Vehicular Access and Traffic Signals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One access point is proposed towards the southern boundary of the site in accordance with TfNSW's comments. This single access point has a left in left out arrangement and one of the conditions imposed by TfNSW requires that the existing central median on Northwood Road should be extended past the proposed access to physically restrict right turn movements to/from the site. ▪ In the Traffic Response Letter submitted to Council on 8 October 2020, the following was confirmed in relation to the traffic signals: <i>The assessed signalised intersections of Kenneth Street / Northwood Road and Longueville Road / Northwood Road / River Road West retain an existing Level of Service of "A" or "B" during both the AM and PM peak hour periods. This indicates acceptable delays and additional spare capacity maintained. As such it can be concluded that the proposed development will not have an adverse impact upon the operation of the assessed signalised intersection under future road geometry conditions.</i>