5-9 Croydon Street, Lakemba
Urban Design and Planning Responses to Request for Further Information

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012	
1.	**Floor space ratio / car parking** Pursuant to Clause 4.4(2) of the CLEP 2012 the subject site has a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.1:1. In accordance with the dictionary, any car parking above the requirements needed to meet the consent authority is included in the gross floor area. Based on the Guide to Traffic Generating Developments – Metropolitan Regional (CBD) Centres (which is the applicable rates for your site) the proposed development requires 124 car spaces (plus a car wash bay), whereas 183 car spaces (plus a car wash bay) are proposed, a surplus of 59. The additional 59 car spaces form part of the gross floor area and would result in a breach to the FSR, which we cannot support. The proposed development shall be amended to remove the surplus car parking, this will also provide opportunity for more deep soil planting to be provided.	Council has confirmed that the Metropolitan Subregional Centre RMS rates apply to the site, rather than the Metropolitan Regional (CBD) Centre rates. On this basis the proposal requires 163 car spaces plus a car wash bay. The Architectural Plans at Attachment C have been amended accordingly.
	State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartments	
2.	**Part 3F Visual Privacy** <u>Building A</u> • Levels 1-4 south elevation requires a 6m building separation (habitable room). • Level 5 south elevation requires a 9m building separation (habitable room). • The proposed building separation setback of 5.6m to the habitable window (i.e to the bedroom – south elevation) on levels 2-5 should be a high sill window or a blinkered window to be considered as a non-habitable window to go towards addressing this requirement. <u>Building B</u> • Levels 5, 6 and 7 south elevation requires a building separation of 13.5m (H to NH) and 15m (H to H). The proposal provides a separation of 11.7m and does not satisfactorily meet the visual privacy objectives of the ADG.	<u>Building A</u> • This building is setback from the boundary in this location by 5.6m, and has a minimum separation to the adjacent building of 8.95m to part of the building and 10.35m to the main building façade. • No windows are located on Level 1. • Only secondary windows are located on this elevation for Levels 2 to 4, which are identified as blinkered windows on the Architectural Plans. • The separation almost entirely with ADG criteria. <u>Building B</u> • Building separation in this location is 11.850m to the adjacent three storey building. • No unit is proposed at the ground floor adjacent to neighbouring building. • Blinkered windows have been added to Levels 2 to 7 to minimize maintain visual privacy. • This is shown on the Architectural Plans.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	Building C • Building C with sites to the adjoining north and west does not comply on levels 9 and 10 which requires a building separation of 12m from the boundary. The proposal provides a separation of 10.4m. The apartments on levels 9 and 10 could re-designed (such as, but not limited to deletion of one of the ensuites to each of the three-bedroom apartments) to achieve compliance with the required building separation requirements of the ADG. Buildings A/B • Buildings A and B Levels 1-4 requires a building separation of the 9m (H-NH) and 12m (H-H). The proposal provides an 8.75m building separation. • Levels 5-7 requires a 13.5m (H-NH) and 18m (H-H) building separation. The proposal provides a 8.75m building separation. • Your response to Council's request for information (RFI) letter, dated 30 November 2021, refers to the use of blinked windows, however this is unclear on the submitted plans and therefore it cannot be determined if these windows would meet the non-habitable window (i.e high sill etc) requirement. Buildings B/C • Buildings A and B Levels 1-4 requires a building separation of 12m (H-H). The proposal provides a 9.25m building separation. • Levels 5-7 requires a building separation of 13.5m (H-NH) and 18m (H-H). The proposal provides a 9.25m building separation. • The response to Council's RFI letter dated 30 November 2021, states this is appropriate given no windows to habitable rooms. However, there are windows which service bedrooms and under the ADG are defined as habitable rooms. The windows across the two buildings should also comply with Figure 3F.6 in the ADG which outlines different privacy interface conditions. The proposal has not demonstrated compliance. The proposed design solution in any form of blinkered windows or high sill windows will only be considered acceptable once other controls such as solar and daylight access and natural ventilation is met (see details below).	Building C • The ADG objective is that *'Adequate building separation distances are shared equitably between neighbouring sites, to achieve reasonable levels of external and internal visual privacy.'* • Council cites no privacy issues at L1-8. • To the north, the future controls anticipate an 18m building height (5-6 storeys). Accordingly, the proposed 10 storey building will not address a similar scale and the notional 24m separation is not relevant. • To the west, the future controls anticipate an 11.5m building height (3 storeys). Accordingly, the proposed 10 storey building will not address a similar scale and the notional 24m separation is not relevant. • Additionally, council's site specific DCP anticipates the northern neighbouring property should adopt a 3m boundary setback for the lower levels of a future 5-6 storey building, which differs from the ADG guidance. The proposed development is consistent with the DCP setback controls and achieves appropriate building separation at each opposing level. Building A/B and B/C Council has indicated that 8.75m and 9.269m setbacks respectively are appropriate subject to use of blinkered windows. Blinkered windows are shown in the Architectural Plan for Building B for windows overlooking the through site link.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
3.	**Part 4A – Solar and daylight access** • Council's calculation is that 74/144 or 51.38% do not receive the required 70% 2 hours of solar access between 9am and 3pm at mid-winter to their living rooms and private open spaces. • The development does not achieve criteria that a maximum of 15% of apartments receive no direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm in midwinter. The proposal results in 28 apartments or 19.4%. Council's analysis highlights specific apartments which do not achieve the required solar access.	Additional solar modelling is included in the Architectural Plans which demonstrate that 70.8% of apartments can achieve the ADG criteria. This relies on only three apartments having a skylight for solar access, with these three apartments exceeding the solar access criteria. This demonstrates that the development will achieve a high level of solar amenity for future apartments.
4.	**4B Natural ventilation** The proposal fails to meet the 60% requirement for units to be naturally ventilated. Council's calculation is that 82/144 or 56.9% are not-cross ventilated. Council's analysis highlights specific apartments which do not achieve the required cross ventilation.	Clarifications have been made to the cross ventilation diagram including to remove a number of apartments which cannot achieve cross ventilation and to show high level windows which will enable other apartments to achieve the criteria. This demonstrates that 60.4% of apartments can achieve cross ventilation, exceeding the ADG criteria. This is supported by a natural ventilation statement prepared by Windtech confirming this level of cross ventilation can be achieved (Attachment K).
5.	**4D Apartment size and layout** The following apartments do not meet the minimum internal area of 75sqm: • Building A: A24, A34, A44, A54, A64 and A73. • Building B: B26, B36, B46 and B56. • Building C: C29, C39, C49, C59, C68, C83 and C93. The following apartments have bedrooms of less than 3m (excluding wardrobe space), and do not achieve adequate usability and functionality as required by the ADG. • Building A: A14-2C and A15-2E.	All apartments and bedrooms now achieve the minimum requirements of the ADG.
6.	**4E Private open space and balconies** <u>Balconies:</u> A number of balconies do not meet the required minimum area or depth as required under the ADG. <u>Private open space</u> A number of ground floor apartments do not achieve the required 15sqm and/or 3m depth for private open space. • Building A: A12-2B and A13-2B. • Building B: B15-2I.	<u>Balconies</u> All balconies now achieve the minimum requirement of the ADG of 10sqm in area and 2m depth. The Architectural Plans have been updated accordingly. This is with the exception of the three bedroom apartment A72-3D which has a generous 29sqm north facing balcony which is 2.58m deep at its widest point. A total area of 12sqm of the balcony has a width of 1.91-2.58m which is generally compliant and able to achieve a high level of

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	• Building C: C13-2A, C18-1D, C15H-2H and C16-2H.	amenity / functionality. This is illustrated in the Architectural Response Report at Attachment B. <u>Private open space</u> The ground floor units across each of the 3 buildings have been designed to provide generous outdoor living spaces set within landscaped surrounds. The terraces are located in front of the living rooms of each unit and vary in scale from 11sqm to 45sqm. All balconies under the minimum size have direct access to the communal space. The ADG objective states that: *Apartments provide appropriately sized private open space and balconies to enhance residential amenity.* Further detail on how these terraces achieve a high level of amenity is provided in the Architectural Response Report at Attachment B.
7.	**4F Common circulation spaces** • Buildings A, B and C have corridors greater than 12m from the lift core with no articulation. • Common circulation spaces of Buildings B and C on levels 1 to 5, are long continuous corridors with no articulation or foyer area which results in poor amenity for the residents. • Building B has a 29.5m long corridor on levels 1 to 5. The only source of natural light and ventilation on these corridors are provided by a snorkel window at the east end of the building beside the lift core. • Building C has a long corridor with 26m length, with no access to natural ventilation. The void next to the lift core with a fixed window is not considered sufficient to provide ventilation to the corridors. • In accordance with the design guidance of the ADG, daylight and natural ventilation should be provided to all common circulation spaces above ground level. The proposal should be amended to comply.	Articulation is already provided along the corridors as follows: • Building A has a relatively short, straight corridor with a window at each level. Articulation exists at the northern end. • Building B includes a longer corridor from L2-5, shorter at L6-7, with a window at each level, and 2 at ground floor. Articulation exists at the eastern end. • Building C includes a longer corridor with four points of articulation along its length. From L2-7 the corridor derives amenity from a series of double/triple height voids opening to a skylight (L5-7) and the naturally-lit ground floor (L2-3). L8-10 have a short, articulated corridor with a window. Further articulation is proposed along the corridors of each building to create variety and interest. Each apartment entry is articulated in a way that celebrates the arrival point into each apartment. The door threshold is widened and deepened to create an entry portal that includes the door, unit number, a shelf and lighting. Each Building has a unique material palette that gives each building its own character. This is discussed further in the Architectural Response Report at Attachment B and will be further addressed at the detailed design stage.
8.	**4H Acoustic privacy**	Building separation is addressed under Item 2.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	• The siting of the buildings results in a non-compliance with Objective 4H-1, this is a result of the inadequate building separation and therefore the proposal would need to be revised to achieve compliance. • A number of units have bedroom doors/entries facing living areas. The units should be revised to ensure noise impacts within apartments are mitigated as required by Objective 4H-2 of the ADG.	It is acknowledged that in some instances bedrooms open directly into the adjacent living spaces within the same apartments. This is further addressed in the Architectural Response Report at Attachment B including as summarised below: • The apartment plans raised in the RFI are common, well-established and familiar types regularly used in apartment projects across metropolitan Sydney without any particular acoustic issues arising. • They include primarily 2 bedroom apartments, which tend to be occupied by smaller numbers of residents (a couple or small family) where acoustic issues are inherently more manageable. • The units will be appropriately acoustically treated in accordance with the guidance provided by the ADG. • A mix of unit types and sizes is provided throughout the proposal including many 2 and 3 bedroom apartments which are planned with the bedrooms zoned away from living spaces, providing considerable choice.
	Council Urban Designer Comments	
9.	**Priority issues** • The built form of buildings A, B, and C should align with the CDCP 2012 and ADG controls in terms of the building depth and length, separation distance, and visual privacy. • Potential built form solutions should be investigated to improve the solar access provisions and natural ventilation on buildings A, B, and C. • Convenient, secure, and easy access to the bicycle parking and storage area should be provided for the residents in buildings B and C. • The proposed subterranean units at Building A are not supported as they will result in poor visual privacy, natural ventilation, and solar and daylight access outcome.	These matters are addressed elsewhere as follows: • Building separation / visual privacy – item 2 • Building Depth – item 10 • Building length – item 11 • Solar access – item 3 • Cross ventilation – item 4 • Bike parking – item 12 • Subterranean units – item 42.
10.	**Building depth** Building Depth: Building A and C exceed the maximum 18m building depth per ADG (2E) and DCP (F10.5.1, C1), and results in poor visual privacy and residential amenity outcomes. Although the greater depths have provided generous balconies and numerous corner apartments, there is not enough evidence to demonstrate other relevant controls such as visual privacy, solar and daylight, and natural ventilation can be achievable within this depth. This may require significant building separation.	Addressed in item 14.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
11.	**Building length** Buildings B and C have building lengths greater than 40m and are not aligned with CDCP (F10.5.2: C1). The greater length results in less distance between buildings and does not respond properly to the relevant development controls such as visual privacy, natural ventilation, and solar and daylight controls. The proposal should provide a better design solution for the building layout to meet the controls.	Addressed in item 15.
12.	**Bicycle parking and storage** The proposed bicycle parking and storage area for all the apartments have been located in building A basement, resulting in inconvenient access for residents in buildings B and C. Per ADG (objective 3J-2) Secure undercover bicycle parking should be provided that is easily accessible from both the public domain and common areas. As per the ADG (objective4G-1) Storage should be accessible from either circulation or living areas, due to the controls better design solution should be provided to meet the requirements.	Bike parking has been relocated to the basement Level 1 near each core. This has been updated in the Architectural Plans. The Canterbury DCP requires the following bike parking: • 1 space per 5 dwellings for residents • 1 space per 10 dwellings for visitors. The required 14 visitor spaces are located at the ground level within the communal space. 30 resident bike spaces are also located in the basement adjacent to the lift core for each building. This will be complemented by storage cages for each apartment.
13.	**Façade design** The façade design and materiality of the buildings do not provide the visual interest of the building and the character of the local area. Better design solutions should be provided to address this requirement. • A more detailed, textured and robust material such as brown feature brickwork be used for the masonry components to add more visual interest and create a more human scale to the development (building A and C). • The use of natural materials and finishes that are sympathetic to the predominant character of the locality and exhibits a high degree of design excellence is encouraged. (CDCP Objective F10.3.2).	The facade design for the proposal has been amended to give greater diversity and character to each building within the proposal. The material palette for each building was developed to reflect the predominant materials of the context. This is addressed in the Architectural Response Report at Attachment B and the Architectural Drawings at Attachment C.
Canterbury DCP – Part F10 Croydon Street Precinct, Lakemba		
14.	**Building depth** F10.5.1, C1 outlines the maximum building depth for residential uses (18m glass line to glass line or 22m balcony edge to balcony edge). The proposal fails to comply with the maximum building depth as follows: • Building A –20.4m glass line to glass line and 20.7m balcony to balcony Levels 1-7.	Whilst the building depth exceeds the DCP requirement it is noted that appropriate apartment depths, generous balconies and numerous corner apartments will ensure a high level of amenity. In particular all apartments can achieve the requirement for a maximum depth of 8m from face of glass to back of kitchen wall.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	• Building C – 24.5m glass line to glass line 24.7m balcony to balcony levels 1-10.	The proposal also demonstrates that apartments will achieve a high level of amenity with the development meeting solar and cross ventilation criteria in the ADG.
15.	**Building length** F10.5.2, C1 outlines that the maximum building length is 40m with articulation provided through indentations every 10-15m. The proposal fails to comply with the maximum building length as follows: • Building B – 44.3m levels 1-5. • Building C – 41.8m levels 1-7. Buildings B and C have building lengths greater than 40m. the proportions of indentations should comply with ADG objective (4B-2) where width to depth ratio should be a minimum of 2:1. The proposal shall be amended to comply.	Building B has been amended to provide additional articulation across the 44.3m length including a void and additional setback of the balconies to the west of the void. This is shown in the Architectural Plans. Building C has a minor exceedance but provides a high level of articulation along the façade. The proposal achieves a high level of amenity and meets solar and cross ventilation criteria in the ADG.
16.	**FSR** F10.5.4, C1 requires the maximum floor space ratio shall comply with the Canterbury Local Environment Plan 2012 Clause 4.4. Refer to point 1 above for discussion.	Addressed in Item 1.
17.	**Upper level setbacks** <u>Building B</u> 7 Storey building (facing laneway) - 6 storey wall height with 7 storey wall height setback 3m. The balconies to level 7 (facing the laneway) shall be provided with an edge of landscaped planters. As required by control C3. The private open spaces to these apartments shall still meet the minimum requirements for balconies as required by Objective 4E-1, Design Criteria 1 of the ADG. <u>Building B</u> 1.5m setback (along laneway) minimal articulation provided. Concept plans previously provided to Council indicated two breaks of 3m x 3m each within the façade to Building B facing the laneway. This should be provided.	Building B and C have been amended to: • Include landscaping within the upper level setback • Include a void within building B and to setback the balconies to the west of the void to provide greater articulation and façade variation. This is shown in the Architectural Plans and Landscape Plans.
18.	**Deep soil zones** Part F10.5.8, C2 requires deep soil zones within the separation distances between the residential flat buildings. Control C3 states where this is not possible alternative forms of planting can be provided. Refer to comments made by Council's landscape architect under point 34 regarding discussion on planting on structures/alternate forms of planting.	See response to Item 34.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
19.	**Substations** Part F10.6.5, C6 requires substations to be incorporated into the built form. Further justification shall be provided to Council that clarifies access to the substation via the grass area will meet Ausgrid requirements. Council will not support the substation being relocated forward along the Croydon Street frontage.	Additional advice has been provided detailing how the proposal meets Ausgrid's requirements for access (Attachment M).
20.	**Vehicle access** Part F10.8.3, C3 and C5 regarding vehicle access and driveway width. Please refer to point 24 for further discussion by Council's Development Engineer.	See response to Item 24.
21.	**Basement car park design** Part F10.8.5, C5 states that basement car parking is to be generally below the natural ground level and any protrusions are not to exceed 1m. Part of the basement protrude above 1m to buildings A and B, this shall be amended to comply.	Additional dimensions have been added to the plan to clarify exceedances (Attachment B). Where the basement exceeds 1m above ground level, this is typically to achieve the flood planning level for habitable floor space. Landscaping is used to screen the basement wall in these locations as shown in the Landscape Plans. All ground floor apartments have a direct relationship with the adjoining street.
22.	**Basement location** Justification shall be provided for Council's consideration as to why compliance cannot be achieved with Part 10.8.5, C7 which states, *"Basements are to be located directly below building footprint other than narrow links to another building basement to maximise deep soil areas".*	The development provides a consolidated basement following the footprint of buildings above, eliminating the need for separate basement entries which would have significant impact on streetscape, façade design, amenity and pedestrian safety. Further clarification regarding provision for planting on structures is provided at in the response to Item 34.
23.	**Overland flow path** Part F10.11, C10 states: *"Development of lots that are impacted by the existing overland flood path or contain existing underground stormwater infrastructure shall produce plans for approval for the relocation and upgrade the existing stormwater drainage infrastructure within the proposed overland flow corridor. These works shall be undertaken at the developer's costs and may require a specific agreement with Council".* To facilitate this development, the pipes will need to be replaced, at the Applicant's cost. Should the application be recommended for approval, this will be conditioned. Please acknowledge that this work will be undertaken as part of the development works.	The landowner does not accept this position on the following basis: • There is no connection the stormwater works and this development. • Public infrastructure works would need to be levied through a s.7.11 plan not a DCP. • The development does not rely upon or utilise the pipes. • The development will not impact (during construction or post development) the use, maintenance or upgrade of the pipes. • The costs associated with any upgrade or relocation proposed are not the responsibility of the developer. • The DCP requirement is manifestly unreasonable and ought not be imposed and doesn't arise based on the design which avoids the pipes.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	Council engineer comments	
24.	**Basement ramp access** • The applicant has to submit a longitudinal section of the basement access ramp, from the new laneway kerb invert up to the finished floor level of the basement no 2, providing levels and distances from each grade variation point, to enable us to assess the AS2890.1:2004 requirements for grade variation limitations. • The basement access needs to accommodate separated driveways for ingress and egress having separate laneways to each of the basement parking levels. Alternatively, justification shall be provided by your Traffic Engineer that the proposed basement entry/exit arrangement is in accordance with the relevant AS and will not create adverse traffic implications of vehicles entering and exiting the basement carpark. • The first 6.0 m into the car park should have a maximum of 1in 20 (5%) grade as per AS 2890.1:2004.	The Architectural and Traffic Drawings have been updated to: • Include longitudinal sections • Increased driveway width to 6 metres. Grades are compliant with and meet AS 2890.1:2004.
25.	**Main access roadway** • The Vehicular Footway Crossing (VFC) access from Croydon Street and Railway parade should have a minimum setback of 1.0 m from the side boundaries as per the VFC policy. • The current submission shows the splay of the VFC at Croydon Street encroaching on adjacent property. • The proposed Building 'C' and the new laneway are in close proximity to the existing Council's drainage infrastructures. There are no existing easements over these pipelines. When the aged pipe lines are replaced, and the appropriate easement widths are created, the Building C may encroach on the newly created drainage easements.	The Traffic Drawings show general compliance, and this is reflected in the Architectural Drawings. Any requirement for an easement can be conditioned.
26.	**Car parking arrangement and safe maneuverability** • A dedicated turning bay should be provided in each basement level, for vehicle users to reverse safely, when the car parking spaces are all occupied. • The intersection area between the ramp and the parking isles shall be designed so that both the approach roadways and the intersection areas are wide enough to accommodate turning vehicles and there is adequate intersection side distance as per Clause 2.5.2 (c) of AS 2890.1:2004. The current design does not satisfy the above requirement. Appropriate swept path	• The traffic drawings show compliance with all requirements and this is reflected in the Architectural Drawings. • A dedicated turning bay is provided on each level • Updated swept path diagrams demonstrate adequate maneuverability and compliance. • Small car spaces and stacked car spaces have been removed.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	analysis should be submitted to satisfy the above. • The following car parking space numbers 03,04,08 & 09 in basement 1 and 61,62,63,64,71,72 & 77 in basement 2 are considered as critical spaces for safe manoeuvrability. Swept path analysis diagrams for entry and exit from each of the above spaces are required to assess the safe manoeuvrability. • Stack parking arrangements for different apartments are not supported and are not acceptable. Stack parking will only be accepted for the same apartments in accordance with part B1.4.1, C16 and C17 of the CDCP 2012. • Small car parking space are also not acceptable. • The dimensions of space 141 need to comply with AS2890.1 Fig 2.2. • Blind Isle safe setback distance of 1.0 m should be provided at those blind isle locations.	
27.	**Storm water drainage** Drainage details have not been provided. This should be submitted to Council for consideration and assessment.	This is included in the updated Civil Plans at Attachment E.
	Council's Traffic Unit comments	
28.	**Swept Paths** • As stated by the Waste Services Officer, waste collection is to be serviced by a HRV. Swept paths are to be amended to show HRV access to the laneway and waste collection area. Note that access to the waste collection area is to be forward entry, forward exit. • Impact on parked vehicles on Croydon Street and Railway Parade – driveway may need to be widened.	Swept Path Diagrams have been updated and included in the Architectural Drawings for HRV, demonstrating appropriate accessibility.
29.	**Traffic surveys, distribution, modelling** • The intersection counts were taken in February 2018. Updated counts are to be provided to reflect the current traffic conditions. Most notably a median island has since been installed on Haldon Street at Railway Parade since the counts and modelling have been undertaken, restricting movements at the intersection. • The traffic distribution is to also be updated to reflect the current conditions and further evidence is to be provided for the nominated values. • The modelling is to be updated to reflect the current conditions.	Council has confirmed this is not required as traffic study was for the purpose of creating the DCP. Furthermore, the Traffic Consultant has advised as follows: *The AM peak hour from the site is 29 vehicles, 10 of which could potentially be affected by the median. This is considered a negligible number and less than typical variations in hourly traffic. Additional modelling is not required as the re-distribution of these 10 vehicles to either Lakemba and Haldon St will not significantly impact the operation of those intersections given they are already LOS A.*

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
30.	**Access driveway** The width of the access driveway to the basement is to be increased to comply with AS 2890.1	The driveway width has been increased to 6m to demonstrate compliance.
31.	**Bicycle spaces** Section 4.3 of the traffic report states that 16 visitor bicycle parking spaces are provided "above ground" level. This is to be shown on the plans.	Visitor bike racks for 16 bikes are located within the through site links and are shown on the Architectural Drawings and Landscape Drawings.
	Council's Landscape Officer comments	
32.	**Deep soil zones** <u>Site specific DCP – deep soil</u> Consideration is given to the provisions of the site specific DCP (Part F10.5.8 Separation) as follows: • *"C2 Deep soil zones shall be provided within the separation distances between the Residential Flat Buildings within R4 zone."* The documentation provided on Drawing 1916-17(D) Deep Soil Plan - nominates areas within this zone as being "deep soil <6m", this does not specify the minimum or greater than depth. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if this is in fact deep soil at all, and if it complies to the requirements of the DCP. • *"C3 When it is not possible to achieve deep soil requirements as suggested by the ADG objectives, possible alternative forms of planting can be provided on top of podium/structures."* - The documentation provided in Drawings 1916-09(D), 1916-10(D), 1916-11(D) and 1916-18(D) show numerous sections and details through this area of interest in the required deep soil zones between buildings. No depth is shown anywhere in this documentation and no indication of soil typology other than lightweight planter box mix, which is only suitable for rooftop or planter box applications. Alternative forms of planting may not only refer to species sizes and or types, but could refer to technology in tree planting, eg: strata cells, structural soil and other means by which canopy trees can be planted in "deep soil" zones. The depth and type of soil in these areas needs to be articulated in the drawings. <u>Apartment Design Guide</u> Objective 3E-1 of the ADG required 7% deep soil with minimum dimensions of 6m for sites greater than 1,500sqm. Deep soil areas are areas of soil within a development that are unimpeded by buildings or structures above and below ground and exclude impervious surfaces to allow for and support healthy plant and tree growth.	• The deep soil diagram shows deep soil as only being located outside the basement footprint. • Soil depth and type for planting over structures is now shown in the Landscape Drawings (Attachment D). This shows a minimum soil depth of 900mm. • The development achieves 362sqm / 7.8% of the developable site area (4,611sqm) as deep soil with a dimension of greater than 6m in width achieving the ADG deep soil criteria. This increases to 739sqm (16%) when taking into consideration deep soil less than 6m width.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	The statement that the total deep soil within the developable area = 739sqm (16% of developable area) is not correct as the depth of "deep soil" is not specified and it is less than 6m. <u>Site specific DCP – basement locations</u> Consideration is given to the provisions of the site specific DCP (Part F10.5.8 Separation) as follows: • *"C7 Basements are to be located directly below building footprint other than narrow links to another building basement to maximise deep soil areas."* The documentation provided on Drawing 1916-17(D) Landscape Area Plan - nominates areas within this zone as being >1m soil depth, then adjacent Deep Soil Plan states it as <6m depth – the proposed depth of soil shall be indicated on the plans. The DCP states this should be deep soil as per the indicative diagrams above. These two diagrams on Drawing 1916-17(D) create ambiguous and almost information. The information regarding deep soil and this requires clarification.	

33.	**Tree planting and landscaping**
	Part B2.3.4 C1 (Water Efficiency) of the Canterbury DCP 2012 requires use of plants that have low water requirements, are drought tolerant and reduce lawn areas to minimise water use. Use native planting where possible. While many of the species are hardy, there is a significant number of exotic species.
	• All deep soil areas are to always be maintained to Council's satisfaction.
	• Please provide a Maintenance Schedule of works with amended landscape plan in accordance with the ADG *"Successful landscape design complements the existing natural and cultural features of the site and contributions to the building's setting. Landscape design includes the planning, design, construction and maintenance of all external spaces"* including:
	  • replacement strategy for failures in plant materials and built works,
	  • maintenance schedule for watering, weeding and fertilizing during the establishment period.
		• A mixture of hardy, low maintenance native and exotic species have been proposed. The exotic species proposed are located within private property, both private residential terrace gardens and private communal spaces. These areas will be maintained by the building owner. These species are regularly used for residential garden design.
		• All garden areas (excluding softscape works within the public laneway and the road verge) will include a fully automated irrigation system connected to the sites rainwater harvesting system (subject to detailed design by a suitably qualified irrigation consultant). This is documented on Landscape Drawing 1916-012 and 1916-013.
		• All deep soil areas within the property boundary will be maintained by the building owner.
		• A 'Maintenance Requirements & Management Plan' has been previously provided (Landscape Drawing 1916-018) which addresses these items.

34.	**On podium / rooftop planter beds / boxes** • The landscape plan is to include adequate soil depths and plant selection to all on podium beds design of planter beds as per recommendations below. The Detail Sheet dwg 1916-018 (D) nominates a soil depth in planters	Planters located above the basement and on the rooftop are shown on Landscape Drawing 1916-020. Minimum soil depths are shown as 900mm.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	of 900mm – this is noted as podium planters, what is the depth of soil on the rooftop area? The roof top terrace also shows trees, Cupaniopsis anacardiopsis with a dimension of 8mH x 7mW – please confirm the depth and detail for the required soil volume and depth for this proposed planting. • The proposed planting to all podium levels and roof terraces shall comply with CDCP 2012 Control B2.3.5 Landscape Structure and Maintenance C4 • Refer to Control B2.3.5 Landscape Structure and Maintenance C5 for recommended minimum standards for volume depth and soil area as per plant sizes and planter boxes. • Please submit details showing the above with the amended landscape plan.	This complies with the Canterbury DCP which sets a minimum soil depth for planter boxes of 750-900mm for small trees.
35.	**Built landscape elements (fences, pergolas, walls, planters and water features):** • No indication is given of the design of the three pergolas located within the communal open space – or adjacent property boundary. • Is there any shade provision on the rooftop near the exercise equipment? Details shall be provided, any awning/shade structure shall not breach the building height. • These items require some articulation to be assessed in context.	The Landscape Drawings have been updated to show the pergola character image on landscape (drawing 1916-016). No shade structures are located on the rooftop for exercise equipment as this would exceed the maximum building height. Roof top trees will provide some shading.
36.	**Site lighting** No exterior lighting is indicated on Landscape or Architectural drawing. This will also assist with the assessment of CPTED / safety risks for pedestrians, residents and visitors.	Lighting can be conditioned. This is reflected as a recommendation of the CPTED assessment at Attachment I.
37.	**Water management and irrigation concept design** • No mention of irrigation is made anywhere on the landscape plans, is the roof top and podium landscape irrigated. Details of irrigation are to be provided for assessment. • The Design Statement refers to hardy species, however no details were provided on water consumption, irrigation or long-term management of the landscape.	• All garden areas (excluding softscape works within the public laneway and the road verge) will include a fully automated irrigation system connected to the site's rainwater harvesting system (subject to detailed design by a suitably qualified irrigation consultant). This is documented on Landscape Drawing 1916-012 and 1916-013. • Detailed irrigation concepts can be prepared at the detailed design stage.
	Council's Resource Recovery Officer comments	
38.	**Waste Management Plan** The WMP is to include a Plan B if the bin hoist lift breaks down and how the building manager/caretaker will move the bins from the	This is addressed in the updated Waste Management Plan which notes that a bin tug will be used in the hoist breaks down (refer p6).

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	waste rooms on Basement 1 to the Bin Collection Room on Level 1.	
39.	**Recycling cupboards** The Environmental Protection Authority recently released the NSW Waste and Sustainable Materials Strategy 2041, which mandates that all households are to have a Food Organics and Garden Organic (FOGO) collection service by 2030. The need to divert food waste from landfill is a key priority and supported by Council, State and Federal Government strategies and initiatives. It is strongly encouraged that a space for an additional 1 x 240L bin in each recycling cupboard to be provided for food waste.	This has been considered but has not been accommodated due to the issues this would cause incorporating additional bins into the design at such a late stage. This is addressed in the updated Waste Management Plan (refer p6).
	Council's Community Safety Officer comments	
40.	**Plan of Management** The submitted Plan of Management (POM) is basic in terms of community safety though does include aspects relating to access of rooftop and communal space. It is recommended that details in the current POM be implemented and that it be updated to included security and safety of the whole building / development such as; • Car Park • Resident Access • CCTV • Letter Boxes • Key / Swipe Access • Security Procedures	The Plan of Management has been updated to address these matters (Attachment H).
41.	**Safety and security** The Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) is detailed for the development, however it is recommended that a section is included addressing general safety and security.	A CPTED assessment has provided with the previous RfI response. This has been updated to provide further consideration of safety and security (Attachment I).
	General planning matters	
42.	**Subfloor units** As previously raised apartments A01 and A02 are subfloor units and located partly below natural ground level. These apartments are not supported in their current and consideration should be given to the deletion of these apartments from the proposal as they result in poor amenity to the occupants. The amenity of these apartments is further compromised by being adjacent to the storage area and bicycle parking which services all apartment buildings and	• The Architectural drawings have been updated to adjust the levels of the apartment surrounds slightly (Attachment C). • Additional "renders" are included in the Architectural Response Report (Attachment B) to illustrate the high level of amenity that would be achieved. • It is understood Council officers are now supportive of these apartments.

RfI Ref #	Comment	Compliance
	create a noise source. In addition, there are windows to these apartments which face directly into each other with a 1600mm separation and also face into a common passageway. Therefore, these apartments are compromised in terms of acoustic and privacy amenity. Furthermore, these apartments do not provide any natural ventilation nor receive direct solar access. **Bike parking** Clarification is required to the location and allocation of the resident bicycle spaces and storage cages to ensure all residents have access to the bicycle storage and that these spaces do not conflict with the allocated storage cages to specific apartments.	• Clarification of bike parking / storage has been provided in the Architectural Drawings (Attachment C).
43.	**OSD hatch** The OSD hatch located in the private open spaces of apartments C12-3B and C13-2A shall be relocated onto common property.	The OSD hatches on the ground floor have been removed and relocated to the basement.
44.	**Letterboxes** The plans shall clearly mark the mailboxes for Building C, the location must be in accordance with Australia Post standards.	Building C mailboxes are now clearly labeled in the Architectural Drawings and will be in accordance with Australia Post standards.
45.	**Updated documentation** The revised design will likely require updating of the relevant supporting documentation, including but not limited to, the SEE, BASIX Certificate, SEPP 65 Design Verification Statement, access report, acoustic report, landscaping plans and any other relevant plans and documentations. Any revision to the design is to ensure compliance with the relevant planning instruments or justification is to be provided for any variations to the DCP controls for Council's consideration.	The following documents have been updated to reflect the changes the proposal and support the RFI response: • Architectural Plans (Attachment C) • Landscape Plans (Attachment D) • Civil Plans (Attachment E) • Traffic / Swept Path Plans (Attachment F) • Waste Management Plan (Attachment G) • SEPP 65 Design Verification Statement and Compliance Statement (Attachment L). The changes to the proposal are minimal and do not necessitate any updates to the following documents: • SEE • BASIX • Acoustic Report • Access Report • BCA Report.
46.	**Consideration of Submissions** The amended plans were notified and advertised in accordance with the requirements of Council's Community Participation Plan. Three (3) submissions were received in response and should be addressed in the response to Council's request for further information.	The submissions have been considered at Attachment J.