

MINUTES

of a meeting of the
Bayside Local Planning Panel
held in the Committee Room, Botany Town Hall
Corner of Edward Street and Botany Road, Botany
on **Tuesday 26 February 2019 at 6:04 pm.**

Present

Jan Murrell, Chairperson
Robert Furolo, Independent Expert Member
Lindsey Dey, Independent Expert Member
Christopher Middlemiss, Community Representative

Also Present

Luis Melim, Manager Development Services
Fausto Sut, Manager Governance & Risk
Marta Gonzalez-Valdes, Coordinator Development Assessment
Pascal Van De Walle, Coordinator Development Assessment
Ben Latta, Coordinator Development Assessment
Patrick Nash, Senior Development Assessment Planner
Petra Blumkaitis, Development Assessment Planner
Kimberley Bautista, Student Development Assessment Planner
Ben Tesoriero, Consultant from CPS Planning
Lauren Thomas, Governance Officer
Ian Vong, IT Officer

The Chairperson opened the meeting in the Botany Town Hall Committee Room at 6:04 pm

1 Acknowledgement of Traditional Owners

The Chairperson affirmed that Bayside Council respects the traditional custodians of the land, elders past and present and future leaders, on which this meeting takes place, and acknowledges the Gadigal and Bidjigal Clans of the Eora Nation.

2 Apologies

There were no apologies received.

3 Disclosures of Interest

Robert Furolo declared a Less than Significant Non-Pecuniary Interest in Item 6.2 on the basis that he knows the architect but is not a friend. The Chair decided this would not exclude him from Panel discussions or the determination.

Robert Furolo also declared a Less than Significant Non-Pecuniary Interest in Item 6.4 on the basis that he knows the planning consultant but is not a friend. The chair decided that this would not prevent him from taking part in the consideration of this item.

4 Minutes of Previous Meetings

4.1 Minutes of the Bayside Local Planning Panel Meeting - 12 February 2019

Decision

That the Minutes of the Bayside Local Planning Panel meeting held on 12 February 2019 are confirmed as a true record of proceedings.

5 Reports – Planning Proposals

Nil.

6 Reports – Development Applications

6.1 DA-2018/268 - 331 West Botany Road, Rockdale (Ador Reserve)

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following person spoke:

- Stuart McDougall, Project Manager, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

Determination

1. The Development Application (DA-2018/268) is APPROVED pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(a) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* and subject to conditions attached to this report with the following amendments:
 - Condition 7 is to have the additional words added: "in the event the report fails to demonstrate and certify that the lights fail to comply with the Australian Standard a modification to the installation of the lighting is to be made and accompanied by a report from an illuminologist to the Council demonstrating that the modified lighting complies with the Australian Standard. The lighting shall not be used until such time that compliance with the AS is met.
 - Condition 23 is to be deleted and the heading for this condition is to be "Prior to the Commencement of Use" and the words in condition 24 shall be commencement of the use to replace issue of the occupation certificate.

2. That the objectors be advised of the Panel's determination.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- The panel is satisfied that the development to allow lighting for the sports field is in the public interest and the conditions will ensure compliance with the Australian Standard.

6.2 DA-2017/340/A - 413-425 Princes Highway, Rockdale

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following person attended the meeting:

- Ziad Chanine, architect, for the officer's recommendation.

Determination

The Modification Application No DA-2017/340/A, to extend the period from 12 to 24 months to satisfy the Deferred Commencement period is approved. This is a Section 4.55(1A) application to amend Development Consent Number 2017/340, for the construction of a seven (7) storey mixed use development comprising two (2) commercial tenancies at ground level, a hotel containing eighty-eight (88) guest rooms and basement car-park at 413-425 Princes Highway, Rockdale As such the deferred Commencement consent is modified in the following manner:

By amending the deferred commencement condition to read as follows:

- An amended energy performance report prepared by an accredited energy auditor or certifying consultant is required to be submitted for Council's records. The report should contain the following information: -
 - The total anticipated energy consumption of the hotel before occupation.
 - Details of all passive and active energy efficient design measures incorporated into the development.
- The Architectural Plans are to be amended so as to demonstrate the following:-

- 2.1 Solar screens are to be provided to the four (4) facades of the building in accordance with the recommendations of the amended energy performance report. Screens are to be designed and positioned to respond to their specific orientations so as to improve the building's environmental performance and contribute to its architectural aesthetics of the building.
 - 2.2 Without exceeding the maximum permissible height of 22 metres from the natural ground level (as stipulated under the Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011), servicing strategy drawings are to be prepared by a registered mechanical engineer / hydraulic engineer demonstrating the incorporation and coordination of building services including air-conditioning, elevators, etc. The architectural drawings are to specify the extent and location of reduced ceiling heights as documented in drawing No. DA 3003 - Revision 'A' to accommodate the proposed services, whilst complying with the requirements of the Building Code of Australia (BCA).
 - 2.3 Location of the electricity kiosk and the emergency exits are to be clearly identified in the architectural plans and they must be located behind the building line. It is noted that the structures should be located at appropriate distances from the boundaries and ideally screened by plantings.
 - 2.4 The amended plans should incorporate articulation to the glass wall facades concurrent with the evaluation of energy performance of the building.
3. Amended Landscape Plans are to be provided so as to demonstrate the following:-
- 3.1 For the 3rd level roof slab landscape.-
 - a. In collaboration with the landscape architect and engineers, design details are required to ensure set-downs (seating areas) and appropriate soil depths, widths and volumes are incorporated in locations that are beneficial to the growth of the proposed landscape spaces,
 - b. Specify waterproofing methods, irrigation system and adequate drainage provided.
 - c. Specify the type of lightweight soil mixes on slab (soils should be free draining), porous and suitable for the selected plants species.
 - d. Details of the technical irrigation system. Please note that the irrigation system has to be connected to stormwater drainage as part of the Water Design Urban Design Principle (WDUDP).
 - e. A centrally located pedestrian corridor (with an east-west orientation) from the Third Floor Level so as to provide an equitable access to the landscaped area for maintenance and customer amenity purposes.

- f. A copy of the Maintenance Management Plan demonstrating the cycle plant replacement, de-weeding and automatic irrigation system maintenance.
- 3.2 For the Ground Floor nature strip (Princes Highway interface).-
 - a. Callistemon "Great Balls of Fire" proposed along frontage shall be replaced with low growing shrubs and ground covers under, to reach maximum 700 millimetre height to address Crime Prevention and the Assessment of Development Applications.
 - b. Street tree refereed as TFH in landscape plans, Ficus Hilli Standard shall be replaced with Platanus species (London Plane) as per Rockdale Street tree Master Plan and Council's specifications. All telecommunication and utility services are to be placed underground along Princes Highway frontages.
- 4. Based on the findings of the Stage 1 of the Site Contamination Report, a Stage 2 "Detail Site Investigation" is required to be provided in response to the provisions of the State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55- Remediation of the Land.
- 5. The site is subject to "minimum flood level" restrictions. Amended Stormwater Drainage Design Plans for the management of stormwater. Design certification(s) as specified in the Rockdale Technical Specification Stormwater Management and drainage design calculations are to be submitted with the plans. Council's Rockdale Technical Specification Stormwater Management sets out the minimum documentation requirements for detailed design plans. Stormwater management requirements for the development site, including the final discharge/end connection point, must comply with Rockdale Technical Specification Stormwater Management. The drainage plans must show how groundwater is managed within basement including shoring walls, temporary and permanent. Subsoil drainage shall be provided and designed to allow the free movement of groundwater around any proposed structure but is not to be connected to the internal drainage system. The design shall take into consideration any geotechnical recommendations.

Please note:

- a) The subsoil drainage for groundwater management for the proposed development shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Rockdale Development Control Plan 2011 and its Clauses 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 together with the Rockdale Technical Specification — Stormwater Management.
- b) The basement pump-well size shall be in accordance with Clause 4.2.4 of the Rockdale Development Control Plan 2011 Technical Specification for Stormwater Management. Implement all recommendations contained in the preliminary geotechnical investigation report prepared by Douglas Partners Pty Ltd, Report Ref: Project No. 84654, dated 30 January 2015.

- c) Since the site is subject to a minimum flood level, the design of the basement car-park access ramp crest level is to be 500 millimetres above the 1 in 100 year flow level.
 - d) Provide stormwater control details to the driveway area draining to basement.
6. Confirmation from Sydney Trains of approval/certification of the following final version items:-
- 6.1 Geotechnical and Structural report/drawings that meet Sydney Trains requirements. The Geotechnical Report must be based on actual borehole testing conducted on the site closest to the rail corridor.
 - 6.2 Construction methodology with construction details pertaining to structural support during excavation. The Applicant is to be aware that Sydney Trains will not permit any rock anchors/bolts (whether temporary or permanent) within its land or easements.
 - 6.3 Cross sectional drawings showing the rail corridor, sub soil profile, proposed basement excavation and structural design of sub ground support adjacent to the rail corridor. All measurements are to be verified by a Registered Surveyor.
 - 6.4 Detailed Survey Plan showing the relationship of the proposed developed with respect to Sydney Trains easement and rail corridor land.
 - 6.5 If required by Sydney Trains, an FE analysis which assesses the different stages of loading-unloading of the site and its effect on the rock mass surrounding the rail corridor.

The period of the Deferred Commencement is **twenty-four (24)** months from the date of Determination. Upon receiving written notification from Council that the above requirements have been satisfied, your consent will become operable and will be subject to the following Conditions.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- The Panel is satisfied that, given the size and nature of the development as approved, the period in which to satisfy the deferred commencement conditions should be extended.

6.3 DA-2017/323 - 19 Barnsbury Grove, Bexley North

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following person spoke:

- Mr Tim O'Keefe, architect, spoke against the officer's recommendation of refusal and responded to the Panel's questions.

Determination

1. The Development Application No. DA-2017/323 for the construction of a single storey childcare centre with capacity for 54 children operating from 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday to Friday and 9:00am to 5:00pm for four (4) Saturdays throughout the year with basement parking and demolition of existing structures, is REFUSED for the following reasons:
 - a. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal satisfy the requirement to demonstrate that the site can be made suitable for the proposed development as required by cl. 7 of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 – Remediation of Land. The proposal is noted as having the potential to contain contamination from uncontrolled imported fill which has not been further investigated as recommended in the submitted Preliminary Site Investigation.
 - b. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not comply with the nondiscretionary minimum outdoor play space development standards of Schedule 5 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017. The proposal has insufficient outdoor play area for 54 children, requiring 378m² of unencumbered outdoor play space.
 - c. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development does not comply with the requirements of Clause 1(2) of Schedule 5 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017 as it is inconsistent with the provisions of Part 4 of the Child Care Planning Guideline (Education and Care Services National Regulations), specifically in relation to the provision of natural light and ventilation to indoor areas used by children, administrative space for staff, soil assessment requirements and emergency evacuation procedures.
 - d. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as the proposed development does not satisfy the requirements of Clause 4.4.2 Solar Access of the Rockdale DCP 2011. The proposal will result in significant reductions in the solar access to private open space of adjacent dwellings located to the west of the site.

- e. The proposed development is unsatisfactory, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as the proposed development does not respond or appropriately relate to the natural topography of the subject site, resulting in adverse privacy, acoustic and visual amenity impacts upon surrounding properties. The proposal is inconsistent with the provisions and objectives of Clause 4.1.6 Development on Sloping Sites and 4.4.5 Visual Privacy, as per Rockdale DCP 2011.
 - f. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not provide satisfactory ceiling height to provide adequate natural light within indoor play rooms or opportunity for natural ventilation. The proposal is inconsistent with the provisions and objectives of Clause 4.4.3 Natural Lighting and Ventilation, as per Rockdale DCP 2011.
 - g. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not provide a safe basement car-parking area with adequate separation of pedestrians from vehicle movements and as such does not comply with the equitable access requirements of Clause 4.6 Car Parking, Access and Movement of Rockdale DCP 2011.
 - h. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not satisfy the requirements of Clause 6.1 of Rockdale DCP 2011. Specifically, the requirements for the provision of Child Care Places, Location, Visual and Acoustic Impact, Indoor and Outdoor Space, Parking and Pedestrian Safety, and Hours of Operation are not satisfied.
 - i. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the constraints of the site necessitate excessively high acoustic fencing in order to mitigate acoustic impacts to adjoining residential neighbours.
 - j. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) and Section 4.15(1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, insufficient information has been provided by the applicant to allow a proper and thorough assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the suitability of the site for the development.
 - k. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the site is not suitable for the proposed development.
 - l. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(d) & 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, having regard to the reasons noted above and the number of submissions received by Council against the proposed development, approval of the development application is not in the public interest.
2. That the objectors be advised of the Bayside Planning Panel's determination.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- While the architect, on behalf of the applicant, expressed concern about requests for meetings to Council to discuss a number of issues, the Panel is not satisfied that the significant issues such as contamination, together with the other matters in the report, can necessarily be addressed and resolved. The panel noted the applicant has the opportunity to submit amended plans and accompanying documentation through the process of a Section 8.2 Review.

6.4 SF18/1613 - 7 Kurnell Street, Botany

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following people spoke:

- David Furlong, Planner at Plan Urban, spoke against the officer's recommendation of refusal and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Simon Hanson, Architect and Director of Bureau SRH, spoke against the officer's recommendation of refusal and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Eugene Kirkwood, Architect at Bureau SRH, spoke against the officer's recommendation of refusal and responded to the Panel's questions.

Determination

That the Bayside Planning Panel has decided that this matter be deferred to allow the applicant the opportunity to submit amended plans to address issues that have been raised, in particular:

- A reduction in the bulk and scale at the rear to improve solar access for the adjoining property at number 9 (this includes a material improvement to the open space and a demonstration of solar access for existing or replaced solar panels). This would also include a reduction in the upper floor and balcony for the south west to reduce impacts on the adjoining neighbour.
- The streetscape presentation of the development needs to be further considered to improve soft landscaping and provide the opportunity for canopy trees. In this regard, the applicant may also wish to consider a central driveway and the replacement planting of street-trees or alternatively, redesign the paving entries and driveways to provide more soft permeable areas for trees and landscaping.

- The applicant is to submit amended plans and documentation, including overshadowing diagrams and a landscaping plan within 4 weeks to allow an assessment by Council officers and a timely report to be made back to the Panel for determination.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- The panel is not satisfied that the current proposal is appropriate in terms of impacts on the adjoining neighbour and the streetscape. However, the applicant should be given the opportunity to amend the plans to minimize these impacts prior to a determination by the panel.

6.5 DA-18/1109 - 2 Swinbourne Street, Botany

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following person spoke:

- Gamze Erkoru, applicant, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

Determination

1. The Panel, exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979, approves a variation to the Floor Space Ratio development standard prescribed by Clause 4.4 of Botany Local Environmental Plan 2013.
2. The Panel has determined that a DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT CONSENT be granted, pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(a) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, to Development Application No.2018/1109 for alterations and a first floor addition to an existing attached dwelling at 2 Swinbourne Street, Botany.

The Deferred Commencement Conditions are as follows:

- a. The ensuite on the first floor plan must be deleted and the length of the first floor reduced accordingly. There shall be no changes to the dimensions of any other areas within the first floor plan.

- b. The floor-to-ceiling height of the rear addition must be reduced from 2.7 metres to 2.4 metres to reduce the bulk of the development when viewed from Kurnell Street and in relation to the existing roof to be retained.
3. The conditions, as recommended in the Council Officer's report, with the exception of condition 6, become the operational conditions after the deferred commencement conditions have been satisfied by the Manager of Development Assessment.

The deferred commencement conditions must be satisfied within six months of the date of this approval.

4. That objectors be advised of the panel's decision.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- The Panel considers the development is worthy of approval subject to amended plans to address the visual presentation of the extension from the public domain. As such the panel has determined a deferred commencement consent is appropriate in the circumstances.

6.6 DA-18/1110 - 4 Swinbourne Street, Botany

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following people spoke:

- Ms Helen Smith, affected neighbour, spoke about the officer's report.
- Gamze Erkoru, applicant, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

Determination

1. That the Panel, exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979, approves a variation to the floor space ratio development standard prescribed by clause 4.4 of Botany Local Environmental Plan 2013.

2. That Development Application No.2018/1110 for alterations and first floor addition to an existing attached dwelling at 4 Swinbourne Street, Botany is granted a DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT CONSENT pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(a) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

The deferred Commencement conditions are as follows:

- a. The ensuite on the first floor plan must be deleted and the length of the first floor reduced accordingly. There shall be no changes to the dimensions of any other areas within the first floor plan.
 - b. The floor-to-ceiling height of the rear addition must be reduced from 2.7 metres to 2.4 metres to reduce the bulk of the development when viewed from Kurnell Street and in relation to the existing roof to be retained.
3. The conditions, as recommended in the Council Officer's report, with the exception of condition 7, become the operational conditions after the deferred commencement conditions have been satisfied by the Manager of Development Assessment.

The deferred commencement conditions must be satisfied within six months of the date of this approval

4. That objectors be advised of the panel's decision.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- The Panel considers the development is worthy of approval subject to amended plans to address the visual presentation of the extension from the public domain. As such the panel has determined a deferred commencement consent is appropriate in the circumstances.
- The panel is satisfied the conditions address the adjoining owners concerns by ensuring the chimney remains in situ and a dilapidation report is required prior to construction.

6.7 S82-2018/4 - 61 Iliffe Street, Bexley

An on-site inspection took place at the property earlier in the day.

The following person spoke:

- Mr Ali Hammoud, applicant, spoke against the officer's recommendation of refusal and responded to the Panel's questions.

Determination

1. That Division 8.2 Review Application No.S82-2018/4 for demolition of existing structures; Torrens Title subdivision to create two lots; construction of an attached dual occupancy on the rear lot; construction of a detached dual occupancy on the front lot and Torrens Title subdivision of all lots containing the dual occupancies to achieve a total of four (4) dwellings within the site at 61 Iliffe Street, Bexley be REFUSED pursuant to Section 4.16(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 for the following reasons:
 - a. Insufficient and conflicting information has been provided by the applicant to allow a proper and thorough assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the suitability of the site for the development.
 - b. The proposed development, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, does not achieve the minimum subdivision lot size in Clause 4.1(3B) of Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - c. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i), the extent of gross floor area proposed for Lot 4 does not comply with the Floor Space Ratio development standard within Clause 4.4 of Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011.
 - d. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development does not meet the controls and objectives of Rockdale Development Control Plan 2011 in respect of:
 - Part 4.1.7 - Tree Preservation
 - Part 4.1.9 - Lot Size and Site Consolidation - Dual Occupancy
 - Part 4.2 - Streetscape and Site Context
 - Part 4.3.1 - Open Space & Landscape Design
 - Part 4.4.5 - Visual Privacy
 - Part 5.1 - Residential Subdivision
 - e. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 the proposed development is likely to result in the following adverse environmental impacts:

- i. Natural Environment – Further tree removal.
 - ii. b) Built Environment - Excessive bulk of dwelling 4, privacy/overlooking and insufficient soft landscaping and inadequate attention to good design principles.
 - f. The proposed development, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, is not considered suitable for the site, in view of its density, subdivision pattern, poor presentation of the access corridor the street, non-conformity to the minimum subdivision lot size, tree removal and insufficient soft landscaping.
 - g. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, and in consideration of the impacts and submissions made, the proposed development is not considered to be in the public interest and is likely to set an undesirable precedent.
2. That the objectors be advised of the Bayside Local Planning Panel's decision.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lindsey Dey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roberto Furolo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christopher Middlemiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reason for the Panel's Determination

- The panel considers the site is not suitable for the proposed subdivision and development because of the constraint of the width of the frontage to Iliffe Street.

The Chairperson closed the meeting at 8:40 pm.

Jan Murrell
Chairperson