

# ATTACHMENT D

## ATTACHMENT D

**DISCUSSION OF HOW THE  
RESOLUTIONS OF MAY 2004 HAVE  
BEEN MET WITHIN THE DRAFT LEP  
AND DRAFT DCP FOR THE  
CARLTON AND UNITED BREWERIES SITE**

# ATTACHMENT D

## Assessment of extent to which resolutions of May 2004 have been implemented within the draft LEP and draft DCP

- (a) *appropriate built form controls for the site (such as height and floor space ratio controls), that achieve an appropriate scale, recognising the built form in the area (including providing adequate consideration to the objectives of the provisions under Amendment No. 1 to South Sydney (Heritage and Conservation) DCP 1998, and which seek to improve upon the existing controls applying to the site*

**Comment:** the draft LEP includes revised height and floor space ratio controls that have been developed following an extensive site analysis and built form exercise. This exercise has been in turn, informed by the range of technical studies undertaken for the site, of which the heritage research has been a central informing study. Whilst Amendment No. 1 to *South Sydney (Heritage Conservation) Development Control Plan 1998* does not apply to the CUB site, its content has been considered in the development of the built form controls.

- (b) *provisions to require a mix of uses*

**Comment:** the draft LEP requires a set mix of residential and non-residential uses and allows for flexibility of uses within the non-residential uses.

- (c) *traffic management to ensure the existing neighbourhood streets are not adversely effected by traffic generated by the site, and to facilitate the equitable distribution of traffic to the road network, appropriate to the role of such roads*

**Comment:** extensive traffic and transport research has informed potential road layouts and traffic management measures (such as street closures to prevent potential for "rat runs") for the future development of the CUB site. This work is largely represented in the draft DCP.

- (d) *the effect of the development on the surrounding public transport networks*

**Comment:** again, research regarding this aspect of transport has been undertaken as part of previous traffic and transport studies. Whilst the access to public transport from the site is very high, there are some concerns regarding the capacity of existing public transport networks. The State Transit Authority (STA) undertook an assessment of bus services for the City. This assessment showed there are some capacity constraints along Broadway but these could be resolved by providing additional services.

- (e) *heritage controls to ensure new development respects the significance of certain buildings and places on the site.*

**Comment:** research regarding the site's significance has been central to informing the draft planning controls at **Attachments A and B** to this report. Specifically a number of new buildings and building elements are proposed for heritage listing in the draft LEP at **Attachment A** to this report. The draft controls seek to develop a richness in the future urban form on the site, developed through the mix of existing heritage buildings with new development.

# ATTACHMENT D

- (f) *appropriate public open space, for both a future population on the site and the local community*

**Comment:** the planning controls accommodate the possibility of a large, single piece of open space, with a minimum area of 5,000 square metres. However it is acknowledged that the delivery of this open space is dependent on the successful completion of discussions regarding the voluntary planning agreement for the site. In this regard, Fosters Ltd has indicated its preference that a voluntary planning agreement be exhibited with the draft planning controls.

- (g) *leading practices in sustainable development, including: design measures to reduce use, and encourage reuse, of resources such as water and energy; reduction in reliance on cars; appropriate use of landscaping*

**Comment:** the draft DCP includes sustainability provisions including water sensitive urban design including, reuse of water on the site and energy usage in non-residential buildings.

- (h) *appropriate provision and design of the public domain, to encourage public use and maximise safety*

**Comment:** whilst the public domain has not been designed in detail at this stage, the planning controls at **Attachments A and B** are considered to facilitate the design and delivery of a high-quality, safe and accessible public domain, including pedestrian and cycling access to and within the CUB site.

- (i) *measures to integrate the site with the neighbourhood such that it does not function as a "gated community" and provides full integration with the fabric and heritage of the existing community*

**Comment:** there are a range of measures that will assist in integrating the redevelopment with its surrounds. In the first instance, the height controls in the draft LEP seek to concentrate higher buildings on Broadway, where the UTS tower and other buildings such as the Mercure Hotel at Central Station create more of a CBD context for development. Height controls also retain the existing height limit for the majority of land that faces Chippendale to the south, (15m). Whilst a road and public domain network for the redevelopment has not been prescribed, the planning controls encourage integration and the continuity and seamlessness of networks. Finally, the draft LEP seeks to retain significant built heritage form on site, whilst the draft DCP provides more detailed guidance as to managing the conversion of this form into new uses and purposes.

- (j) *any new planning controls provide adequate protection against overdevelopment of individual sites and maintain the integrity of any proposed planning controls for the entire site after any future and subsequent subdivision(s) of the site*

**Comment:** it is considered that the planning controls package at **Attachments A and B** to this report represent an integrated, coordinated approach to the redevelopment of this very important site. The controls also foreshadow that the site may be subdivided, or developed in smaller parcels and segments, and thus ensure that parameters set for future development will work whether the site is developed as a whole, or in segments.