


Attachment E


Draft Concept EDP - Response to Agency Comments

CONSOLIDATED COMMENTS
YARRALUMLA BRICKWORKS – DRAFT CONCEPT ESTATE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CIRCULATION 1 – 21 July 2020

All agency comments have been consolidated into the table of response below for the Developer's consideration, response and or action.

AGENCY	NO	COMMENTS	PROPONENT RESPONSE
Deed Management		<p>All responses in preparing a Revised Concept Estate Development Plan are to be addressed. A Nil, Noted or No Comment response will not be considered as addressing a comment.</p> <p>The following are Deed Management comments.</p> <p>a) The IAPZ and OAPZ's proposed need to be confirmed as being maintained to this standard by the relevant land custodian/ refer ESA comments also. If these cannot be resolved or supported, then revised APZ locations may be required.</p> <p>b) The future Block Details Plan should demonstrate regular shaped blocks with regular shaped boundaries. In particular, T10 is not of a regular shape and this area may be better suited as part of the heritage precinct within common property.</p> <p>c) The draft EDP should include a plan detailing which blocks are intended to become part of the community title common property and any easements proposed to be put over this area (for easements for access/utilities etc).</p> <p>d) Cross section should be provided around the pond across proposed block boundaries to describe the interface treatment of blocks with the pond. Please investigate whether slopes require stabilisation/remediation or other treatment to permit leases to be issued over these areas. See also comment on planning controls.</p>	<p>a) An edge road has been proposed to the south of the estate per the ESA requirements. Buildings fronting the bushfire prone area are proposed to be constructed to BAL 29. Please refer to the Bushfire report (Attachment H) for more information.</p> <p>b) Housing blocks have now been addressed with Planning Control Plans and examples of how a dwelling can be situated on these blocks to meet Territory Plan requirements has also been provided.</p> <p>c) Please refer to the Community Titling Plan and Block Details Plan submitted with this application for the requested information.</p> <p>d) Please refer to the landscape documentation and housing plans submitted with this application.</p>

		<p>e) suggest planning controls be considered to assist in responding to agency comments regarding uses and levels of parking proposed for the residential areas. Also suggest setback controls and fencing requirements on blocks fronting the pond to control a uniform outcome on this boundary and deal with overshadowing/safety of these boundaries.</p> <p>f) Road hierarchy plans should nominate road hierarchy for all roads (including private roads) as these still need to meet the requirements of the estate development code.</p> <p>g) Consideration should be given to screening of the development to Dunrossil Drive and encouraging pedestrian access away from this area. Requirement for fencing of this boundary should also be considered.</p>	<p>e) Please refer to the Planning Control Plans submitted with this application.</p> <p>f) The Road Hierarchy plan shows all roads and their classifications.</p> <p>g) Please refer to the Fencing Plan submitted with this application.</p>
<p>ACT Heritage David Flannery</p>	 20200814 - Advice - Yarralumla Brickworks		<p>The revised CMP has been approved by the Heritage Council. Please refer to Attachment M and AW for more information.</p> <p>A Statement of Heritage Effects (SHE) is being progressed with the Heritage Council parallel to this submission.</p>
<p>Evoenergy Brad Eagle</p>		No comments received	Noted
<p>Conservator Liaison Michaela Watts</p>		<p>I have kept my comments high level hoping that we can get additional information to make more meaningful comments at the next stage. In order to do this we will need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A completed tree assessment that identifies trees to be removed/protected as well as the species, height and quality as per the Tree Protection Act and regulations. A report was mentioned in the documents and it would be helpful to review this for the next stage. 2. An ecological assessment that identifies the environmental values on the site, including in the proposed asset protection zone. The bushfire report mentions that ecological assessments were undertaken in 2014 and updated versions of these, as well as the environmental conditions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please refer to the tree assessment and protection plans submitted with this application. 2. Please refer to the ecological reports submitted with this application. An EIS application has been submitted parallel to this application. 3. Please refer to the stormwater and WSUD documentation and updated bushfire report submitted with this application.

		<p>overlaid on the development plans would be beneficial in making more detailed comments at the next EDP stage.</p> <p>3. WSUD/water quality/control modelling would be appreciated in order to review and comment on the onsite stormwater treatment and hydrological environment</p> <p>Comments from Tree Protection Unit. The Lyneham Precinct code states (in 1.6 Tree retention and canopy cover) that there is no applicable rule – I think this should mention that the <i>Tree Protection Act 2005</i> (the Act) covers any regulated trees on the site.</p> <p>6.6 Vegetation states that there are several</p>	<p>There seems to be an error in this comment as the Lyneham Precinct Code does not apply to this proposal.</p> <p>This comment is not complete.</p>
<p>Emergency Services Agency Chris Zeithofer</p>		 <p>ACTESA Response.pdf</p>	<p>An edge road has been incorporated to the south of the estate fronting Section 94. The blocks fronting this edge road are proposed to be constructed to BAL 29. This has been included in the Planning Control Plans and is proposed to be uplifted to the Precinct Code. Emergency vehicle access has been provided across the estate. Please refer to the revised bushfire report (Attachment H) for more information.</p>
<p>Environment Protection Authority Narelle Sargent</p>		<p>Contaminated Lands Advice EPA records indicate that the Site was formerly occupied by a brickworks, that fuel storage facilities were present at the Site and that historic landfilling activities have occurred at the Site. As such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Site must be assessed and remediated in accordance with the guidelines endorsed by the EPA by a suitably qualified environmental consultant in accordance with EPA endorsed guidelines as detailed in the Contaminated Sites Environment Protection Policy. • The adequacy of the assessment and remedial works must be independently audited by an EPA approved environmental auditor. • Prior to the commencement of remediation works the remedial action plan (RAP) for the proposed remedial works must be reviewed and endorsed by the auditor with a copy of the RAP endorsement provided to the EPA. 	<p>The EIS submitted parallel to this application sufficiently addresses the contamination and potential noise impacts and proposes mitigation measures. Please refer to the EIS (Attachment AR) and associated documents submitted with this application for more information.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the commencement of development works Auditor interim advice indicating that the commencement of development will not impact on the on-going assessment and remedial works at the site must be reviewed and endorsed by the EPA. • Prior to the area being used for other purposes the findings of the independent audit into the Site's suitability for its proposed and permitted uses from a contamination perspective must be reviewed and endorsed by the EPA. <p>Comments</p> <p>The ACT EPA Contaminated Sites Environment Protection Policy 2017 list fuel storage facilities, brickworks and landfilling as activities associated with land contamination.</p> <p>The ACT Government's Strategic Plan Contaminated Sites Management, 1995 specifically requires that potentially contaminated land be investigated at the earliest stages of the planning process to ensure a site is suitable for the proposed development.</p> <p>To ensure a site is suitable for its proposed and permitted land use(s) an assessment must be undertaken to determine the level of risk associated with the past potentially contaminating activities at the site.</p> <p>To ensure accurate recording and auditing of the results of an assessment an independent review by an EPA approved contaminated land auditor must be undertaken to confirm the results of the assessment and certify that the site is suitable for the proposed land use.</p> <p>Noise Comments</p> <p>An acoustic assessment of noise impacts on the Site needs to be undertaken to determine if the Site is suitable for the proposed uses. This assessment should be conducted in accordance with the <i>Noise Environment Protection Policy</i> and the <i>Guidelines for the preparation of Noise Management Plans for development applications</i> to ensure that legislative requirements including the need to prevent or minimise environmental harm and to demonstrate how environmental noise pollution will be managed for the Site and any developments on the Site.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>The principles include that the acoustic environmental values secured through noise standards should protect the health and wellbeing of the community and the individual and that regulatory controls should enable economically desirable or socially acceptable activities to take place provided that all reasonable steps consistent with the expectations of the overall community will be taken to minimise noise from such activities.</p> <p>The factors to be considered when preparing the acoustic assessment include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that residential development must meet the ‘design sound level ranges’ recommended for residential buildings of AS/NZS 2107 and commercial accommodation developments should meet AS/NZS 2107 for sleeping areas; and • noise from all permitted uses identified as being noisy, regardless of whether the noisy permitted use is utilised, must be attenuated at the building design stage or • measures that allow the attenuation to be incorporated in the future should a permitted use be activated. Alternately, noisy uses that will not be activated should be removed from the permitted uses for the Site. 	
<p>Icon Water Nabin Dahal</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Control AI-02 – Is the sewer main at the block boundary. 2. Control AL-04 – is the stormwater structure within the watermain trench? 3. Without knowing the depth of sewer. The water main should be outside the zone of influence of sewer when they are at the same side. 4. The water main should be 2m away from the block boundary and sewer 1.2m. 5. The Clearance between trees and IW assets in know clearly shown. This should meet IW clearance requirements. 6. The connection point at Lane-Poole place will change and will be close to the cul de sac. The water main after the hydrant in Lane-Poole place will be removed as part of the landscaping plan for the area. 7. All dead end water main should be looped as documented in clauses 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 in the standard. 8. The watermain in the driveway servicing block T1, T2 and T3 is not acceptable. The water main should be out of driveway in open space and connect to the water main in Road 01. 	<p>Note that the typical cross sections have been updated to reflect the outcomes of the discussions with Icon Water. Icon Water is being consulted separately to address matters raised.</p>

<p>Development Assessment Trent Varlow</p>	<p>We have no comments regarding the proposal as most of this looks to be strategic based rather than Territory Plan based at this stage. We take note of the different types of housing, including single dwelling, multi unit (townhouse) and multi unit apartment blocks. Strategic Planning comments and TCCS comments will be key at this stage of the proposal due to the conceptual nature and emphasis on traffic analysis.</p> <p>We would ask that in the next submission that a more detailed plan showing blocks and possible planning controls would be appreciated.</p> <p>The following has been identified as issues that need more clarification or justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why some of the single dwelling blocks are of irregular shape, T7, T10 & T12 in particular • Why are some single dwelling blocks being filled and not others when there seems to be a slope on almost all blocks? • Please provide a block section plan to show that the single dwelling blocks are not sloped in a way it cannot be built on • Please provide details of potential retaining walls throughout the site, especially between the pond and the single dwelling blocks • Will there be fencing provisions in place for the single dwelling blocks where the boundary faces out onto the open space pond area? • There appears to be trees being retained in the middle of blocks T13 and T14, please provide details on how this will not impact future development. • I couldn't find anywhere that detailed the block sizes, please provide each block size. <p>To provide more in depth comments, further plans such as a planning controls plan and the block details plan would be needed.</p>	<p>These comments have all now been addressed in the Block Typology Plans, Planning Control Plans, and Block Details Plans submitted with this application. Proposed planning controls for the Yarralumla Precinct Code accompany the Planning Controls Plans.</p> <p>In addition, the submission includes a Single Dwelling Housing Compliance Assessment for each standard block against the requirements of the Single Dwelling Housing Development Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed single dwelling blocks meet the requirements of the Estate Development Code to comply with rule 47 and these blocks can accommodate a suitable building envelope. Refer to Block Compliance Plan included in the EDP submission. • Sections of the estate are proposed to include retaining walls along road to Bentham Street, refer to plans included in this EDP submission. • Fencing provisions have been applied to blocks within the estate as noted on the Planning Control Plans. • Please note the labelling for the Draft EDP has changed from the Concept EDP. Block T13 is now T12 and block T14 is block T13. No trees are proposed to be retained on these blocks. • Block sizes are noted on the Block Details Plan included in this submission.
<p>Impact Assessment Brad Maxwell</p>	<p>a) An application for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping document for the development of the Brickworks site was lodged 27 November 2019. On 16 January 2020 the EIS scoping document was issued. The scoping document is available on the Legislation Register at NI2020-32.</p> <p>b) On review of the submission report/drawings, the proposed development footprint appears to be consistent with what was presented as part of the application for scoping document.</p>	<p>The final EIS application has been submitted parallel to this Draft EDP submission.</p>

		<p>c) Currently, the authority is waiting for the draft EIS to be submitted. The draft EIS is required to address all impacts identified in the scoping document.</p> <p>d) It should be noted that the EIS will be assessed as a Bilateral EIS, in accordance with the Bilateral Assessment Agreement between the ACT and Commonwealth governments. The Bilateral EIS process applies to proposals that require both an EIS under the ACT <i>Planning and Development Act 2007</i> and approval under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i>.</p> <p>e) Once the EIS process is complete, an impact track development application (DA) for the proposal can be submitted for assessment, unless one is submitted concurrently with the draft EIS. If a DA is submitted concurrently with the draft EIS, both applications will be publicly notified together. It should be noted that a concurrent DA cannot be decided until the EIS process is finalised. Notwithstanding this, any DA for the proposal will take into account the findings and recommendations of the EIS and any conditions of approval related to the Commonwealth Government decision.</p>	
Jemena Steve Donnelly		No comments received	Noted
NCA Ilse Wurst		<p>The NCA provided Works Approval some time ago related to the widening of Dudley Street, which was associated with the development of the Brickworks. Other than that I don't think we have had any other engagement. The proposal to manage Block 2 Section 103 as OAPZ should not be an issue. If there is a need to remove any vegetation as part of OAPZ management, then a Works Approval application to the NCA would be required before any works are undertaken.</p> <p>At a high level, the other matters (connections and screening) might be worth discussing further, however input from Government House may be required regarding security. In terms of active travel connections, it would be beneficial to connect new development to existing networks. I can't imagine that NCA would have any objections about paths traversing Designated Areas, but I can imagine there are multiple land owners/managers who would also need to be consulted. Once there is</p>	<p>Offsite works related to the OAPZ would be limited to Block 2 Section 127 and therefore would not require a Works Approval.</p> <p>Government House has been consulted on the development. The proposed shared path network will connect to the broader existing network within the locality. Letters of authorisation would be obtained from Lessee/Custodians where required.</p>

		further information available, the NCA could provide more detailed comment.	
Strategic Planning & Policy Steven Gianakis		Strategic Planning & Policy advised that they will not be providing comments on this proposal at this stage.	Noted
Suburban Land Agency Stephan Walter		No comments received.	Noted
TCCS Asset Acceptance Aleks Aster-Stater		<p>GENERAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The plans could not be assessed in great detail as they have been prepared more in-line with an Indicative Development Plan (IDP) rather than a Concept EDP. b) The utilities plan does not show the electricity or telecommunications. c) The locality plan is missing a number of locations in Yarralumla including Weston Park, Yarralumla Primary School, Yarralumla Oval etc. d) Proponent must adhere to the concerns that may raise by the Governor General's office. e) The road between the DOMA development is a new access road, not an extension of Dudley St as it is labelled on at least one of the plans. f) As part of the Design Review approval for the Dudley St upgrade and the Canberra Brickworks access road project, TCCS has provided direction to apply DSUI (legacy standards) to the full length of the estate access road. All other elements must be designed in accordance with TCCS' MIS. g) Match SL columns/luminaries between CW and developer works. TCCS previously recommended 9m column heights to be applied, in-lieu of the 6.5m high Forde Columns, to reduce spacing/cost however no further correspondence present. h) Road reservations not consistent - Road Hierarchy Plan (dwg 17) shows Street and Main Collector Road with Design widths of 13.5m (5/3.5/5m), 16.5m (5.5/5.5/5.5m) and 22.5m (6.25/10/6.25m – Dual Carriageway). The sections provided on dwgs 19.1 and 19.2 indicate carriage widths of 17.5m boundary to boundary with dual carriageway and approximately 20m single carriageway elsewhere. <p>TRAFFIC</p>	<p>General</p> <p>The designs have been further progressed to address comments received. TCCS has been directly consulted for the proposed road hierarchy and other relevant matters raised in the comments.</p> <p>Traffic</p>

	<p>i) There is no Traffic Assessment Report (TAR) attached to this concept EDP, beyond the single traffic-related paragraph in the planning report. TCCS is currently liaising with the traffic consultant (AECOM) for the preparation of an AIMSUM model covering off all access points from the site. It is noted that this will likely be provided with the next iteration of the concept EDP.</p> <p>STORMWATER</p> <p>j) The proposed alignment of the SW connection between the Dudley St extension (by TCCS) and the developer works into the estate needs to be checked.</p> <p>k) Further investigation is needed on the existing TCCS assets within 21/102 Yarralumla to ensure development impacts are avoided and all tie-in points are accounted for.</p> <p>l) The current design doesn't provide any detail on WSUD elements within the estate.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>m) Proponent must ensure tree species and spacing is in accordance with the TCCS MIS Design Standards. This can be reviewed at formal EDP stage; however, a clear statement about adhering to TCCS standards should be provided in the EDP report. Note that a species planting plan appears to have been circulated to TCCS some time ago by Sellick consultants but is now excluded from this circulation.</p> <p>n) It is noted that the entirety of the primary access road into the estate will remain a public road with the remainder of the internal circulation roads (and landscaped area) under community title, however, TCCS will require all internal access road to be in-line with EDC requirements.</p> <p>o) Confirmation is needed as to the size of Lot T10 and why it includes the top of the knoll overlooking the lake. This location is likely to benefit community use, such as public lookout overlooking the lake and also with views to the heritage Brickworks.</p> <p>p) Disconnect of naming conventions and treatments, for example, 'The Village Green' conveys a large central green space but in the plan is presented as a combination of several lawn spaces within large expanses of paving. Other areas titled 'The Machineries', 'The Long Table', 'The Garden' or 'The Resident Break' and 'Work out Garden' lack any detail on function and don't appear to convey the design intent.</p>	<p>A revised Traffic report has been submitted with this application (Attachment C).</p> <p>Stormwater</p> <p>j) There is a high point near the connection between the Dudley Street extensions and the estate road, so no continuation of the stormwater is required. We have had to introduce KIS sumps to allow sufficient space to other services. No other changes required.</p> <p>k) Sellick Consultants has been liaising with Icon Water in relation to the services at the end of the Lane Poole cul-de-sac and have reached an agreement on the proposed layout.</p> <p>l) WSUD included in Alluvium Stormwater Report (Attachment B)</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>m) Landscape design will formally adhere to all relevant TCCS MIS Design Standards with a thorough review undertaken prior to final submission of EDP report.</p> <p>n) All roads are designed in accordance with EDC provisions.</p> <p>o) It seems this comment is related to Block T9. Lot designs have considered the natural ground levels and to reduce requirement for substantial cut and fill. The end portion of this block is substantially elevated from the adjacent Quarry park and therefore it is best that is included within Block T9 boundary (it would be difficult to provide accessible path of travel to this portion from the Park). The typology considered for this block proposes the buildings to be located to the southern portion of the site.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>q) The trees along the Quarry Road median appear to be planted in quite a narrow space. Appropriate soil volumes and sufficient space for mowers (if grassed) should be considered along with opportunities for passive irrigation where tree planting is proposed within a road median.</p> <p>r) Please confirm if the trees marked for removal on the Tree Impact Plan have already been approved for removal by TCCS Urban Treescapes. A number of trees are shown to be removed as they fall within the development footprint however it appears possible to retain them, for example trees 431, 432, 433 as they are located in future open space. A Tree Assessment Plan has not been included in the submission so it's unclear as to the quality or species of these trees but TCCS' general position is to retain as many of the trees as possible.</p> <p>s) Section AL-1 (Ch240.00) shows – tree offset in verges as approx 1.2m from path edge which is not compliant with TCCS guidelines. Also, trees are shown within the property line and not within the verge and 2.5m wide footpath is partly located across property boundary. Please confirm.</p> <p>t) The plan indicates that all paving with the “Public Open Space” system, wetlands and associate with the lake / pond comprises Decomposed Granite paving. It's desirable if some variety is incorporated into the design relating to area functionality and location. The proponent should review and develop a paving hierarchy within the landscape zones and consider a combination of coloured in-situ concrete, stabilised gravel and decomposed granite.</p> <p>u) The design intent of the lake / pond, as noted in the report, is to provide a catchment system within the design to provide a water supply within the estate, however, the lake edge treatment currently shows no detail. The design needs to provide some level of interest to the pond treatment and also allow for water level fluctuation and some form of aquatic planting edge to break up the pond edge. Some tree planting associated with the lake / pond and also the “Bird Island” should be explored.</p> <p>v) Confirm the design intent and differentiation between Informal “Natural” Planting, Informal “Garden” Planting and Existing Landform Features Wetland. The location and functional treatment of these is unclear.</p> <p>w) The current design doesn't address the distinction between Native, Evergreen or Deciduous planting.</p>	<p>p) MCGC to review naming conventions and refine terminology / definitions of landscaped areas.</p> <p>q) Typically, in this application a structural soil cell system (strata vault etc.) would be utilised to ensure adequate un-compacted soil volumes are met – providing the required conditions for the health and longevity of the trees. This would be subject to Design and Siting DA.</p> <p>r) A Tree Assessment Plan has been provided with this submission (Attachment G). The revised Tree Protection Plan submitted with this application has been prepared based on the Tree Assessment. It is the shared sentiment of MCGC that all existing trees are to be retained where possible. This is subject to the arborists assessment of the tree's quality and condition. MCGC cannot confirm the Tree Impact Plan has been formally approved by TCCS Urban Treescapes, however understand a rigorous assessment was completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 431 for example is being retained based on its quality - trees 432, 433 are flagged to be removed based on the arborist assessment. <p>s) The location of the trees and paths is a continuation of the arrangement prepared by AECOM for the Dudley Street extension. This arrangement has already been approved and is being constructed for the extension.</p> <p>t) The intention was always to explore the application of various paving treatments in these areas as the design moves into detailed design development. MCGC will review extent of decomposed granite paving and look to introduce a variety of paving</p>
--	---	--

		<p>WASTE - Sellicks</p> <p>x) Waste MGB carting distance from T10 appears non-compliant with the 2019 Waste Code.</p> <p>y) Waste collection must be front-in/front-out for all multi-unit sites. This needs to be confirmed as this is likely to impact on proposed development intentions footprints and internal circulation layouts.</p>	<p>treatments to better suit the function of the space. This would be subject to Design and Siting DA.</p> <p>u) Please refer to the Concept Pond Design report by Alluvium (Attachment F)</p> <p>v) The ‘Garden’ style planting refers to those garden beds at the entry feature to the development (item 4). This planting is defined by both the species (less natives) and a more structured approach to the planting design with massing and rows/ smaller groupings. In contrast the ‘Natural’ planting uses more native Australian species and uses a more blended approach to the planting design relying on heavily on the contrast of colour and foliage to give impact and design intent.</p> <p>w) This information can be included in the planting plan/ planting schedules if required (during Design and Siting DA stage).</p> <p>x) Waste collection arrangement has been changed since the Concept EDP submission. Please refer to the submitted Waste Management Plan for more information.</p> <p>y) Please refer to the Truck Turning Paths provided.</p>
<p>Territory Plan Section Helen Hai</p>		<p>The majority of the site is zoned Commercial CZ6 Leisure and Accommodation and a small portion is within the Residential RZ1 Suburban zone. The Yarralumla Precinct Code includes business agency, office and residential use as merit assessible developments.</p> <p>Existing planning provisions for the site in the Yarralumla Precinct Code can be accessed at www.legislation.act.gov.au/DownloadFile/ni/2008-27/copy/90227/PDF/2008-27.PDF and include the following:</p>	<p>A technical amendment was proposed and approved (under Section 87(1)(b) of the Act) to change the RZ1 Suburban Zone land fronting Bentham Street to CZ6 Leisure and Accommodation Zone (TA2022-09). This technical amendment was placed on consultation on 5 August 2022, closing on 2 September 2022. Once this technical amendment is in effect, the site will be entirely zoned CZ6</p>

	<p>Building height – maximum number of storeys for the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential use 3 storeys • All other uses 2 storeys <p>Gross floor areas (GFA) for SHOP and offices on site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHOP except where associated with or related to entertainment, accommodation and leisure uses cannot exceed 500m² GFA • Maximum GFA for office use is 1500m² <p>Setbacks for the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum setback to the northern and eastern boundaries is 20m. <p>Opportunity to provide ongoing provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing provisions are able to be identified as a part of the EDP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Design Intentions Report for Yarralumla Brickworks states the importance of carefully curated non-residential activities on the site to prevent any unwanted activities and allowing the possibility of certain uses may be detrimental and cause overspilling of traffic and impacts into the existing Yarralumla streets. The Territory Plan Section is supportive of this approach and agree that uses must be carefully considered for the site and the Yarralumla local area as a whole. As such, the proponent may wish to identify some development/uses that are currently merit track assessable within the CZ6 zone as prohibited uses for the site. ○ Additional ongoing provisions can also be identified in the EDP. One example is the minimum 20m setback applying to the northern and eastern boundaries. The setback is required to protect the existing Yarralumla residential development from any impacts of the Yarralumla Brickworks development. In this case, ongoing provisions could include more specific details about setbacks as applicable to the proposed blocks, the boundaries of which will be determined by the EDP. • Any ongoing provisions identified as a part of the EDP would be incorporated into the Yarralumla Precinct Code via a Technical Amendment (TA). These ongoing provisions would be advertised along 	<p>Planning controls are proposed to be uplifted to the Precinct Code.</p> <p>The maximum number of storeys proposed for residential use is 3 storeys while other uses proposed are within the heritage buildings which are a maximum height of 2 storeys.</p> <p>The maximum GFA for SHOP use will be 500m² while the maximum GFA for Office use will be 1,500m².</p> <p>Rule 3 currently applies to the estate boundary. It is proposed that the rule is augmented as it would be difficult for all the future proposed block boundaries to provide 20m setback to each of their northern and eastern boundaries without dramatically impacting the developable area (noting this rule would then be applicable to the created individual block boundaries). Proposed setbacks for each block has been identified under the proposed Planning Control Plans which would provide for the intention of the Rule to be met where practicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing provisions have been identified and included on the Planning Controls Plan including noise affected blocks and bushfire protection requirements. Additional controls have been proposed for inclusion in the Yarralumla Precinct Code and included as part of this Draft EDP submission. Residential use and Commercial Accommodation use are proposed to be prohibited for the heritage block. Please refer to the Planning Control Plans for more information. • The need for a technical amendment process to uplift proposed controls is noted.
--	---	---

	<p>with the EDP and provide certainty to the community regarding possible future developments/uses and other ongoing site specific provisions.</p> <p>Additional Comments for internal consideration only</p> <p>The following items may assist in the assessment of the EDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans submitted show 200 non-residential car parking to be provided at block F. Further detail about parking for the proposed multi-unit housing and town housing developments could be provided at the next stage to demonstrate that parking requirements are met making sure that there is no potential car parking overspill onto existing Yarralumla streets. • The efficiency and desirability of the shape of blocks (there are some irregular blocks and some which have shapes that may be difficult to develop) within the proposed subdivision layout, especially for the single dwelling housing blocks and could be further considered. • The potential for overshadowing of private open spaces of the southern end blocks in Precinct 2 and 3 could be further considered. • More detail about how public access to the proposed waterway/pond is to be provided would be helpful. • The provision of a staging plan could be used to manage construction to limit impact on existing residential development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised traffic report (Attachment C) has been submitted with this application that addresses the requirements. • The proposed single dwelling blocks meet the requirements of the Estate Development Code to comply with rule 47 and these blocks can accommodate a suitable building envelope for a residential dwelling. One non-compliant block is identified and 95% of single dwelling blocks achieve block compliance. Refer to Block Compliance Plan included in the Draft EDP submission. The submitted Housing Typology plans clearly indicate that these blocks are well-suited for development of single dwelling housing (the irregular blocks are all large blocks that provide ample opportunity for dwelling siting). • Mitigating overshadowing will be a consideration of the design and siting proposal to be resolved. However, the proposed typologies and block orientation, size, and position consider the natural topography of the land to reduce overshadowing impacts to the south while reducing the amount of cut and fill required for the development. • The Landscape Master Plan included in the Draft EDP submission indicates the proposed pedestrian access to the pond that extends throughout the Quarry Parklands. • A Staging Plan has been prepared and included in the Draft EDP submission.
--	--	--