

Attachment 3

Summary of Agency Submissions to the 6-8 Colden Street and 62-64 Menangle Street, Picton, NSW 2571 Planning Proposal

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
Subsidence Advisory NSW	23/11/2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal does not overlie any coal mining or coal exploration leases. SA NSW records indicate there are no historical mine workings under the site. 	<p>Subsidence Advisory of NSW were consulted on the proposal and confirmed the site does not overlie any coal, mining or coal exploration leases. Furthermore, no historical mine works are under the site.</p> <p>Based on this advice it is considered that the Subsidence Authority NSW has no issues with the proposal.</p>
Heritage NSW	25/11/2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considered the proposal will not have a direct physical or visual impact on any heritage items listed on the State Heritage Register and/or State significant historical archaeology. ▪ Noted the site is in a heritage conservation area and in proximity to the following heritage items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Former Catholic Presbytery ○ Former Wollondilly Shire Hall ○ St Anthony's Catholic Church and school hall ○ Soldiers Memorial School of Arts ▪ Considered the mitigation measures in the Statement of Heritage Impact are appropriate, 	<p>The response from Heritage NSW indicates that the principle of the proposed increase in height is acceptable from a state heritage perspective.</p> <p>From a local heritage perspective Heritage NSW notes that the proposal has the potential to impact on the Picton Conservation Area and local heritage items. Notwithstanding, it was concluded that the mitigation measures noted by GBA Heritage in the Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) are considered appropriate.</p> <p>An independent Heritage Assessment has been undertaken by GML Heritage. This report is</p>

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
		<p>and should inform detailed design at the development application stage</p>	<p>generally supportive of the PP and notes that the future redevelopment of the site to a new increased permissible height limit of 16 metres will need careful consideration if it is be consistent with the LEP objectives for Heritage Conservation.</p> <p>The concept building design within the Urban Design Report seeks to mitigate adverse impacts on neighbouring items of heritage significance by transitioning the building height from four to two storeys as it presents to Colden Street. In addition, building articulation including upper floor setbacks at 3rd floor level are illustrated to provide further transition to the neighbouring buildings to the north and south, noting the Masonic Hall adjoins the site to the south.</p> <p>Subject to the development of a site specific DCP it is considered that the PP will not materially impact on the heritage conservation of Picton town centre.</p> <p>No heritage items or elements are required to be demolished. The site is an existing at-grade carpark away from any natural streams or banks, reducing likelihood of buried items of indigenous heritage significance.</p>
Sydney Water		<p><u>Potable Water</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Based on the information presented the proposed Building 'D' can be served by a new connection to the existing 100mm watermain in Colden Street. 	<p>Sydney Water have confirmed that the site can be served by potable water through a new connection to the existing water main on Colden Street. Further information on this extension will be required at the DA stage.</p>

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fire-fighting requirements for the proposed Building may require amplification of water mains. Any amplification would need to be supported by a Statement of Available Pressure and flow that has the proposed amplification included in the computer model. ▪ To service the greater Town Centre Masterplan, as a minimum, amplification or duplication of the Colden Street and Margaret Street water mains will be required. ▪ Further details of amplifications will be supplied as more detail of the proposed changes to existing land use become available. <p><u>Wastewater</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A minor extension of the wastewater network would be required to service Building 'D'. ▪ Amplification of the network would be required as part of the overall Town centre development. ▪ As a minimum, any new wastewater pipe asset within the Town Centre would need to be DN225 in preparation for downstream amplification / adjustment of assets. ▪ However, the site including Building D is within the Picton Water Recycling Plant (WRP) catchment. The WRP currently has no capacity to accept growth that has not previously been considered. ▪ Development within the Town Centre may need to be delayed until the effluent management strategy is finalised and any upgrades to the plant are confirmed. The strategy is due for 	<p>With regard to wastewater; Sydney Water advised that the site is within the Picton WRP catchment, which currently has no capacity to accept growth.</p> <p>The correspondence received from Sydney Water was issued to the applicant and additional information regarding wastewater was requested.</p> <p>A response was received on 27 January 2021. This response outlined the correspondence undertaken by the applicant with Sydney Water to date and included two undated planning advice letters from Sydney Water. These letters confirm the Picton WRP is at capacity but also advises that Sydney Water can provide services to the proposed expansion of the CCCP. An extract of this advice is provided below (BOLD our emphasis added):</p> <p><i>Picton Town Centre is currently serviced by Sydney Water. The updated growth number indicates that additional EP has increased from 100 to 158, resulting additional average dry weather flow increase from 0.2 l/s to 0.3 l/s Since it is a minimal dry weather flow increase to WRP, Sydney Water can provide services to proposed expansion based on the following conditions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Health check should be carried out on all new development to ensure that no wet</i>

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
		<p>completion in the second half of 2020. Sydney Water is looking to assess all Planning Proposals reliant upon Picton WRP EPA licence variations and will work with the council to ensure we have all relevant data and understand timescales.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council should engage with their Sydney Water account manager, regarding the timing of the proposed Town Centre development. 	<p><i>weather flow is discharging into Sydney Water system.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The new assets from the development will reduce the current inflow infiltration in the system.</i> <p>In addition to the above, the applicant also provided a Feasibility Letter from Sydney Water dated 20 May 2020. This letter specifically relates to the Council administration building rather than the wider CCCP and advises that (BOLD our emphasis added):</p> <p><i>Development within the Town Centre may need to be delayed until the effluent management strategy is finalised and any upgrades to the plant are confirmed. The strategy is due for completion in the second half of 2020 and it is anticipated that upgrades to the plant should be completed by late 2025, subject to Sydney Water funding approvals.</i></p> <p>Based on the above timeline, it is expected that the upgrades with the Picton WTP will be completed by 2025. Should the PP proceed to Gateway, it is considered it would not be finalised until late 2021. A DA for the Council administration building would then need to be formal lodged and assessed by Council. On this basis, the timeframe of 2025 for the completion of the Picton WTP upgrade works is</p>

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
			<p>considered acceptable as it aligns with the delivery of the Council administration building.</p> <p>This position is supported by Council's Health and Regulatory Services Team who advised that Council should ensure that Sydney Water can provide the necessary wastewater disposal prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate for the works.</p> <p>Given the timeline for the administration building PP it is considered that this matter can be dealt with the DA stage and should not preclude the PP from progressing to Gateway Determination.</p>
TfNSW		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consideration should be given to the provision of pedestrian refuges to assist pedestrians in crossing the local roads and to encourage mode shift through safe crossing opportunities to access the site. TfNSW recommend this is discussed with Council (traffic team). ▪ TfNSW recommends a site specific Development Control Plan (DCP) accompanies this planning proposal to set out the access points, service vehicle arrangements and travel demand management measures to guide the assessment of the future development application(s). ▪ The intersection performance should be modelled to assess the impact of the development on the network in the absence of the Picton Town Centre Transport Plan 2026 	<p>The provision of a pedestrian refuge is a detailed planning matter and can be dealt with at the DA stage. The increase in the height control at this site will not materially impact pedestrian safety.</p> <p>The requested development of a site specific DCP is supported and recommended.</p> <p>The requested intersection performance modelling, AIMSUN files trip rate information has been issued to TfNSW for review.</p> <p>With regard to funding mechanisms, SLR and GTA have both advised that the proposal would not be of a scale to trigger regionally significant transport requirements. Notwithstanding, any future DA over</p>

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
		<p>network improvements (realignment of the Argyle Street/ Lumsdaine Street intersection to include signal control; proposed improvements to the Argyle Street/ Prince Street intersection; right turn ban to traffic turning from Menangle Street at the Argyle Street/ Menangle Street intersection; and proposed upgrade to signal control at the Menangle Street/ Prince Street intersection). TfNSW notes that the status of proposed changes to the road network outlined within the Picton Town Centre Transport Plan 2026 are uncommitted/unfunded, as it was prepared “to discuss this plan with elected members and the wider community, with a view to securing support and funding to allow delivery of the plan by 2026”. As these improvements are not funded at this stage, modelling should be conducted to assess and document the impact of the planning proposal on the road network without these improvements in the event they are not delivered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TfNSW requests that the electronic copies of the AIMSUN modelling files (and any model development/calibration and validation report) are provided for our review and comment. ▪ Table 12 of the Traffic and Transport Report – Trip rates: The trip rate assumed (presumably vehicle trip rate) for Administration Building (1.65 vtph AM and 1.28 vtph PM per 100sqm) appears to reflect the average rate for office premises from the former RMS TDT 2013/04a Updated Traffic Surveys. It should be noted that 	<p>the site will be assessed against the applicable Contributions Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that the requested information by TfNSW and has been issued to the applicant. On 16 December 2020, the applicant provided a response to the matters raised by TfNSW. This response has been issued to TfNSW for review. A second round of comments from TfNSW are expected however they are still outstanding at this stage.</p>

AGENCY	DATE OF SUBMISSION	COMMENTS	ASSESSMENT RESPONSE
		<p>the mode share of the localities surveyed had high public and active transport mode share and were mostly in close walking distance to high frequency heavy rail services in Sydney. It is not expected that these rates would be reflective of the subject locality which has an approximate mode share of 4.74% to public transport for travel to work according to Australian Bureau of Statistics census data from 2016. We recommend that a rate is sourced from a comparable site with consideration to mode share and accessibility factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An appropriate funding mechanism should be in place to help ensure that developer contributions are obtained on an equitable basis for the provision of state and regional transport infrastructure required to support development uplift and future growth in the Picton Town Centre. 	