DA113/2020 Response to Council's Comments		8-Oct-20

Council Comment		Consultant	Comment
Aboricultural Comments:			
1	The existing Arborist report is to be updated to reflect: - The % encroachment for impacts on all retained trees	Arborist - Stuart Pittendrigh	Refer to accompanying Tree Protection and Management Plan prepared by Stuart Pittendrigh (dated September 2020).
2	An accurate demonstration of how retained trees subject to major TPZ encroachment will be managed at an acceptable level (this is in addition to the calculated % impact) simply stating 'bridge over roots is not sufficient nor is it a demonstration of how the impact will be mitigated.		
3	A legible site plan to review tree numbers		
4	A new report to be submitted showing all tree protection measures and tree management during the development phase. Council will need to see a comprehensive tree protection plan and work method statement.		
5	Council stated that the preference replacement planting ratio is 1:3, also indicated that offset planting will be acceptable and that canopy trees would be preferred on site over the transplant of Palm trees.	Landscape - Svalbe & Co	As shown on the amended Landscape Plans (Drawing LP02), a total of 43 replacement trees are proposed resulting in a replacement planting ratio of 1:3. As discussed with Council the palm trees are proposed to be removed.
Health and Environment Comment:			
6	Council is still of the view that an ERM report is to be submitted.	City Plan	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 to this matter and accompanies this table.
Bushland Comments:			
7	A light and sound assessment is to be carried out to determine if the artificial light and noise produced will have any detrimental effects to the wildlife inhabiting the bushland. This is to be assessed with the ecological report to determine best practice.	Ecologist - Cumberland Ecology	Refer to accompanying Amended Flora and Fauna Assessment prepared by Cumberland Ecology (dated 30 September 2020). Section 4.5 includes the requested light and sound assessment. Relevant mitigation measures have also been added at Sections 5.1.6 and 5.1.7.
8	Semi permeable pavers for rear setback to be explored	Landscape - Svalbe & Co	Refer to amended Landscape Plans which now include permeable paving along the pathway in the rear setback.
9	Replacement tree plantings to be addressed in revised landscaping plan. It is assumed that this will address the tree replacement ratio, species list and quantities. Native tree canopy species are the preference.	Landscape - Svalbe & Co	As shown on the amended Landscape Plans (Drawing LP02), a total of 43 replacement trees are proposed resulting in a replacement planting ratio of 1:3. Species list and quantities are identified on Drawing LP02.
10	Further information on bushland buffer for the "rear sides".	City Plan	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.

11	Please provide updated copy of Aboriginal Heritage advice.	N/A	An email from David Watts (Aboriginal Heritage Manager) was submitted to Council on 28 August 2020 which identified there are no Aboriginal heritage issues for the proposed development. A condition can be added to consent that if an Aboriginal object is found while carrying out work all work must stop and relevant persons be notified.
12	Stormwater outlet was jutting out into bushland. It is recommended that the stormwater plan is redesigned so that the stormwater outlet is to be within the property boundary and for the stormwater to be dispersed via a dispersal trench over a long distance (width of the development) as to not cause a channelling effect which in turn causes erosion.	Civil Engineer - ACOR	Refer to Stormwater Response below.
13	The 10m bushland buffer must be adhered to.	City Plan	A minimum 10m buffer to rear boundary has been provided. Refer to section 6.3.2 of the SEE and DCP Compliance Table for justification and response to item 10 above.
Landscaping Comments:			
14	Council's landscaper to talk to proponent landscaper about the paving options	Landscape - Svalbe & Co	Done
15	Updated Landscape Plans and Checklist to be submitted to Council	Landscape - Svalbe & Co	Updated Landscape Plans and Landscape Checklist have been prepared and accompany this response to Council.
Engineering comments:			
16	Sediment control devices are required along the rear fence line.	Civil Engineer - ACOR	The following response has been provided by Acor: At yesterday's site meeting (on 7 October 2020) we discussed the current stormwater discharge strategy to disperse the water across a portion of the eastern boundary. We discussed that this is currently occurring on site and that the downpipes from the existing buildings appear to be discharging to the existing bushland in a flow concentrated manner. Our proposed strategy is at least meeting current scenario and improving site discharge into the bush by spreading the flow across the length of the dispersion system. Council's stormwater engineers passed on from the Council directors that the preferred strategy was to discharge to the street and suggested pumping the water to the street. We discussed that the issues with this strategy: - the volume of water onto the street increases and increases the flooded depth of water. - Possible changes in the existing bushland hydrology with regards to reducing the stormwater volume (by sending the stormwater discharge to the street), creating long term impacts to the flora and fauna of the bushland. It is preferred to maintain current bushland hydrology (ie discharge to bush) to mitigate any potential impact on the bushland - The size of the below ground basement pumpout tank would be very large with very large pumps to pump the major storm events. - the power requirements to operate the pump would be very large (which is not an environmentally sustainable solution) and noisy. Also the in the event that the pumps fail then the entire basement will be under water. An agreed stormwater discharge strategy was not resolved in the meeting. Following on from yesterday's meeting additional survey and CCTV is being carried out tomorrow on an exposure pipe identified on yesterday's site walk (through the bush) not previously
17	The OSD system shall be designed as per appendix 14 of Part O of Council DCP. Detailed design for a proposed OSD system is required		
18	The pipe system should show pipe sizes and invert levels up to connection point; confirming pipe system satisfies part O of Council' storm water DCP.		
19	Subsoil agg-line drainage is required around proposed retaining wall, dwelling, or it is necessary and connected to proposed drainage system		
20	The seepage water and the runoff from driveway shall be collected by grated driveway pit and connected to pump out system at basement.		
21	The pump out system in basement shall satisfy section 5.4 of part O of Council's stormwater DCP. The full details of the hydraulic calculation for pump out system shall be included in stormwater management plan submitted to Council.		
22	Pit 2/04 and pit 1/01 shall be connected to OSD system to control flow rate to down stream		
23	A gross pollutant trap suitable for this site needs to be designed and added to the amended plans within the property boundary prior to the connection to the street system. The details of this GPT shall be shown in stormwater plan. The access to the GPT for future maintenance is required.		
24	Existing Council pipe system within the easement/reserve at rear must be accurately located and marked on stormwater management plan with pipe size and invert level at connection point to confirm this connection satisfy Council requirements. As per Council mapping, there is a pipe (300mm) system at rear to Gore Creek.		

24	The condition of the existing pipe system in Gore Creek reserve is not known. The applicant must investigate into this pipe system and carry out a CCTV survey. The full reports of the existing pipe system with CCTV report are to be submitted to Council.		surveyed. Early next week the Environmental Geotech is carrying out bore holes and monitoring wells across the site. The contractor is testing ground contamination (specially hydrocarbons), ground water levels, ground water flow (to determine ground water flowrate and velocity). This information and study will be used support the current stormwater discharge and provide Council assurance that the stormwater discharge strategy is the optimum solution with Council's best interest in mind. A tentative meeting is scheduled in 2 weeks time with Sebastian Szewcow Council's Manager of Assets and Engineering after the testing is completed.
26	The proposed pipe from site to existing Council pipe system is 450mm. The existing Council pipe at reserve is 300mm. Council does not support any connection of bigger size pipe into a smaller size pipe.		
27	By considering the issues on pipe sizes and pipe conditions, Council recommends improving existing pipe system in reserve satisfying Council's Bushland DCP to accommodate future stormwater from this proposal.		
28	A plan with longitudinal section of the proposed pipe system and easement from the site to the Gore Creek pipe system with relevant calculations are required for further assessment and/or approval. This plan should satisfy section 12 of part O, Council's DCP.		
29	The applicant must submit Council a plan showing all civil reconstruction works around site and get approved by Council		
30	All retaining structures greater than 1m in height are to be designed and certified for construction by a suitably qualified engineer. The structural design is to comply with, all relevant design codes and Australian Standards		
31	A Construction methodology is required. This shall include traffic management plan as well as storage and manoeuvring areas and impacts on public assets being prepared?	CareStruct	Refer to accompanying Construction Environmental Management Plan (dated 21 September 2020) prepared by CareStruct
Planning Comments:			
32	There is no real justification in varying the maximum building height RL under the LEP as the height has been set	City Plan	Height breach relates only to architectural features and stair overrun on the roof. Refer to Clause 4.6 request submitted with DA for justification of the proposed variation to maximum building height.
33	10m "rear" buffer and side setback variations – non-compliances need to be addressed as per draft DCP	City Plan	Refer to section 6.3.2 of the SEE and DCP Compliance Table for justification.
34	8m third storey front setback – non-compliances need to be addressed as per bulk and scale and streetscape visual impact and as per draft DCP.	City Plan	Justified in Section 6.3.1 of SEE and in DCP compliance table
35	Slip lane?	Traffic - McLaren	Traffic Impact Assessment does not indicate requirement for slip lane.
36	Parking – retail/medical as per Lane Cove DCP Part R; residential care facility as per Seniors SEPP? Seeking confirmation. No parking rate in draft DCP.	Traffic - McLaren	Refer to Traffic Impact Assessment – Council DCP and Seniors SEPP parking rates satisfied.
Traffic Comments:			
37	A safety and functionality report for the traffic signals for the one way ramps has been asked for.	Traffic - McLaren	Refer to accompanying response letter prepared by McLaren Traffic Engineering dated 8 October 2020.
38	The development provides two accessible parking spaces where one space is not in accordance with the standard. The development is required to provide a total of 86 parking spaces including 3 accessible parking spaces. The accessible parking spaces are to be in accordance with AS2890.6.		
39	Access in/out of spaces 18 and 19 require vehicles to reverse onto the circular ramp with limited visibility. As such, these spaces are to be deleted.		
40	The accessible parking spaces are required to be located as close to the lift as possible;		

41	All parking spaces are to be line marked according to their relevant component;		
42	Driveway to be designed as left in and left out only. The design should prevent right turn movements by installing a triangular median Island at the entry/exit of the driveway. Detail of the driveway showing this restriction is to be provided;		
43	AutoCAD files of the ground clearance test is to be provided for a B99 and MRV as the plan provided is unclear;		
44	It is noted that the height clearance provided is not in accordance with AS2890.2. Ramp sections are to be provided indicating the height clearance for the largest design vehicles accessing the development;		
45	The traffic report must consider the following future upgrade projects:		
46	River Road/Longueville Road upgrade – Modelling is required to be updated as per the TCS provided;		
47	Northwood Roundabout – 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. As such, the developer is required to contribute funding towards the construction of the proposed roundabout.		
Architectural Plans:			
48	Updated Architectural Plans		To ensure consistency with above amendments the following Architectural Plans have been updated: - DA101 - Rev 3 - DA102 - Rev 5 - DA103 - Rev 2 - DA104 - Rev 2 - DA201 - Rev 3 - DA205 - Rev 2 - DA210 - Rev 3 - DA215 - Rev 2 - DA303 - Rev 2 - DA501 - Rev 3 - DA802 - Rev 2