

# Wahroonga Estate MOD 8 - IPC Meeting

## Ku-ring-gai Council Feedback

The following information is supplementary to the Verbal submissions made by Ku-ring-gai Council Officers to the IPC on 22 October 2019.

### 1. B1 Urban Design

Council is of the view that drawing 'Section 75W -Urban Form Control Diagram Building Footprint' Issue D too high level of detail on drawings for concept plan. The inclusion of such details will fetter council's ability to apply the same design controls that are required of other similar development in Ku-ring-gai. A number of these elements should be subject to a more detailed merit consideration at DA stage in order to achieve the optimum design outcomes.

- Council's DCP controls require that basements be located under building footprints so as to maximise deep soil landscaping on site to facilitate the establishment of tall canopy trees, a key element of the Ku-ring-gai character. Of particular concern is the building E where the basement and car park access occupy the full 10m front setback. This will prevent the establishment of any substantial trees in the front setback.
- Nominated carpark access points should be removed as they have the potential to limit good design outcomes on future buildings. The optimum number and location of carpark access should be considered and negotiated at the DA stage.
- Car parking adjacent to access road should be removed from the plans (particularly if visitor parking is to be within basements) and could be considered at DA stage. Car share parking allocation and last-mile freight/deliveries should be located at-grade and located to ensure maximum visibility to all proposed RFBs, and potentially visible to other land uses in the Wahroonga Estate.

#### *Recommendation*

That drawing 'Section 75W -Urban Form Control Diagram Building Footprint' Issue D dated 21.05.2019 be modified as follows:

- Removal of all basement lines on drawings.
- Remove areas adjacent to access roads shown as 'potential street parking'
- Remove specified 'basement carpark entry' points

### 2. B5 Bushfire

#### *Differing approaches – Vegetation Transition Management Line (VTML) and E2 Environmental Conservation Zone boundary*

It does appear that the calculation of APZ widths for some previous applications has been taken from the VTML as opposed to the boundary of the E2 Zone. This is in contradiction to

Condition B5(1) of the Concept Plan Approval and should have been reason to reject previous applications. The fact that it is being called in to question now when it hasn't been previously is only an indication that it was previously overlooked by assessors.

After the Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) was prepared the proponent began calculating proposed APZs from the VTML. The conditions of the Concept Plan Approval, however, relate to the Concept Plan and the proponent never applied to have the Concept Plan amended to reflect the vegetation boundary changes indicated in the BMP. The plans submitted for the Sydney Adventist Hospital (SAN) Expansion (MP 10\_0070) and Wahroonga Adventist School (SSD 5535) do indicate APZs calculated from the VTML but it is not clear from these plans that the proposed APZs encroach on the E2 Zone and are therefore non-compliant with Condition B5(1). Improper assessment of previous applications is not reason to knowingly approve non-compliant applications now.

Vegetation Transition Management Line adopted for Wahroonga Adventist School and Sydney Adventist Hospital (The SAN)

In hindsight it is clear that these applications are non-compliant with Condition B5(1) and should not have been approved. It is recognised, however, that it is not reasonable to now reduce the size of approved APZs to retroactively comply with Condition B5(1) as this would result in APZs that would then be non-compliant with bushfire protection requirements. It is also recognised that the intent of Condition B5(1) is to ensure no net loss of biodiversity within the development site and particularly the E2 Zone and the continued management of existing APZs is not necessarily inconsistent with this intent.

### *Recommendations*

The Department's recommendation for approval of the Modification Application and the proponent's proposed amendment to Condition B5(1) are generally supported, contingent upon the following;

- Those areas between the E2 Zone boundary and VTMP already being managed as APZs should be managed as Outer Protection Areas and the BMP should be amended to reflect this,
- Any areas between the E2 Zone boundary and the VTMP not required to be managed as APZs should be revegetated and the BMP should be amended to reflect this, and
- The Department's proposed Condition B5(4) should remain in place.

### **3. B9. Car parking**

The Transport Management Access Plan (revised) prepared by Halcrow (2009) for the Wahroonga Estate Concept Plan notes in Section 4.3 that:

*The Church proposes to build on its already high car pooling practice and introduce an innovative car pooling system [better known as car share] for staff, students and **residents who will reside in the new residential community on the Estate** [emphasis added]. Cars would be booked in advance, in a similar manner to a number of schemes which currently operate within the Sydney metropolitan area [such as GoGet, Popcar etc].*

and

*The proposal includes a condition of occupation / ownership that all residencies (excluding aged care) would pay a levy to support the car share scheme and provide capital for its operation.*

The Transport Management Access Plan by Halcrow also proposed reduced (constrained) parking provision for the residential (non-aged care) dwellings within the Estate, which would be complemented by the car share scheme.

Ku-ring-gai Council supports TfNSW and RMS comments that consideration should be given to reducing proposed parking and promoting sustainable transport options. By simply aligning the proposed parking provision rate for 2 bedroom units (1.5 per dwelling) with those in the Ku-ring-gai DCP (1.25 per dwelling) and generally adopting the Ku-ring-gai DCP rates, this would not necessarily provide the incentive for residents to make choices in terms of car ownership and travel needs. The relatively generous parking provision proposed by the applicant combined with a small number of car share vehicles and the apparent lack of condition of occupation that all residencies would pay a levy to support the car share scheme would reduce the effectiveness of parking constraint and the complementary car share scheme as tools to reduce travel demand.

Application of the residential parking rates in the original Concept Plan approval (including condition of occupation that all residencies, excluding aged care, would pay a levy to support the car share scheme) would send the best price signal to residents and force residents to critically assess their travel needs. A larger number of car share vehicles would also be available for staff and students, which was also the intention of the Transport Management Access Plan by Halcrow.

#### *Recommendation*

The original Concept Plan approval required the following parking spaces per dwelling (for residential uses):

- 1 bedroom apartment: 0.5
- 2 bedroom apartment: 1.0
- 3 bedroom apartment: 1.0
- Visitor parking: 1 per 4 dwellings
- Car share parking: 1 per 6 dwellings