

## **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 11 June 2019 at 6:07 pm.**

---

### **Present**

Jan Murrell, Chairperson  
Helen Deegan, Independent Expert Member  
Anthony Reed, Independent Expert Member  
Patrick Ryan, Community Representative

### **Also Present**

Luis Melim, Manager Development Services  
Fausto Sut, Manager Governance & Risk  
Marta Gonzalez-Valdes, Coordinator Development Assessment  
Andrew Ison, Senior Development Assessment Planner  
Patrick Nash, Senior Development Assessment Planner  
Eric Alessi, Development Assessment Planner  
Petra Blumkaitis, Development Assessment Planner  
Julia Hunt, Development Assessment Planner  
Kerry Gordon, Consultant Planner  
Wolfgang Gill, IT Officer  
Lauren Thomas, Governance Officer

---

The Chairperson opened the meeting in the Botany Town Hall Committee Room at 6:07 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**

There were no disclosures of interest.

## **4 Minutes of Previous Meetings**

### **4.1 Minutes of the Bayside Local Planning Panel Meeting - 21 May 2019**

#### **Decision**

That the Bayside Local Planning Panel notes that the Minutes of the Bayside Local Planning Panel meeting held on 21 May 2019 have been confirmed as a true record of proceedings by the Chairperson of that meeting.

## **5 Reports – Planning Proposals**

Nil

## **6 Reports – Development Applications**

### **6.1 DA-18/1183 - Railway Bridge Above Robey Street, Mascot**

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

The following people spoke:

- Belinda Barnet, Ooh!media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Graham Johanson, Commercial Manager – Road - Ooh!media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Christian Slater, In-House Counsel – Ooh!media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

#### **Determination**

- 1 The Panel is satisfied that the proposed modification:
  - i. is substantially the same development as the development for which consent was originally granted and before that consent was modified;
  - ii. has been notified; and
  - iii. has been assessed having regard to the relevant matters in s4.15(1) of the EP&A Act.
- 2 the Panel has considered submissions made concerning the proposed modification and taken these into account the reasons of the consent authority that granted the consent that is sought to be modified.
- 3 The modification application DA-2018/1183 seeking to modify development consent DA93/3067 to replace the bridge mounted general advertising structure

with an integrated digital LED screen on the Railway Bridge above Robey Street, Mascot is APPROVED . The proposal is modified in the following manner:

- i. By amending condition 1 to refer to approved plans and documentation.
- ii. By amending condition 8 to read:  
 Advertisements displayed shall not contain/use:
  - a. Flashing lights.
  - b. Animated display, moving parts or simulated movement.
  - c. A method of illumination that unreasonably distracts or dazzles.
  - d. Images that may imitate a prescribed traffic control device, for example red, amber or green circles, octagons or other shapes or patterns that may result in the advertisement being mistaken for a prescribed traffic control device.
  - e. Text providing driving instructions to drivers.
- iii. By deleting conditions 3, 7 and 12; and
- iv. By adding conditions 13 to 51 as per attached report with the following further changes to be made:

Condition 19, Item B – reference to condition 5 be amended to 17.

Condition 27 – delete the first sentence to Condition 27. (i.e. the LED advertising screen shall be available for 5% of all advertising time each year for the display of road safety messages by arrangement with RMS and Road Safety NSW.)

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Reason for Panel Determination

- The panel is satisfied the modification for LED lighting of the media displays may proceed subject to the above conditions and a trial period to allow monitoring of the dwell time having regard to the safety of motorists.

## 6.2 DA-18/1135 - Overbridge O'Riordan Street, Mascot

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

The following people spoke:

- Christian Slater, Legal Counsel – Ooh!media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Belinda Barnet, Ooh!media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Graham Johanson, Commercial Manager – Road - Ooh!media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Christian Slater, In-House Counsel – Ooh!Media, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

### Determination

1. The Panel is satisfied that the proposed modification:
  - a. is substantially the same development as the development for which consent was originally granted and before that consent was modified;
  - b. has been notified; and
  - c. has been assessed having regard to the relevant matters in s4.15(1) of the EP&A Act.
2. The Panel has considered submissions made concerning the proposed modification and taken into account the reasons of the consent authority that granted the consent that is sought to be modified.
3. The modification application DA-2018/1135 seeking to modify development consent DA96/487 to convert existing illuminated general advertising structure to LED digital display on the Railway Bridge above O'Riordan Street, Mascot is APPROVED. The proposal is modified in the following manner:
  - \*a. By amending condition 1 to refer to approved plans and documentation.
  - \*b. By amending condition 20 to read:
    20. *The applicant being informed that this approval, in relation to the south facing sign, shall be regarded as being otherwise in accordance with the information and particulars set out and described in the Development Application registered in Council's records as Development Application No. 96/0487 of the 13th day of February, 1996. Any alteration, variation, or extension of the use, for which approval has been given would require further Town Planning Approval from Council.*
  - \*c. By deleting condition 10
  - \*d. By adding conditions 21 to 66; and

- \*e. By inserting advice 1 to 3.f. The insertion of conditions 64, 65 and 66 to reflect the trial period conditions outlined in Item 6.1, noting the default dwell time to be 25 seconds in lieu of 24 hours and the trial time be 10 seconds in lieu of 60 seconds. The satisfaction of these additional conditions will be at the discretion of Council's engineers.

- g. That condition 38 be amended by deleting the first sentence.

4. That the objectors be notified of the Panel's decision.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Reason for Panel Determination

- The Panel is satisfied the LED illuminated signage may be approved subject to the above conditions and the trial period to have regard to the safety of motorists.

### 6.3 DA-18/1067 - 7 Kurnell Street, Botany

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

The following people spoke:

- Chris Jarrett, owner, spoke against the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Simon Robert Hanson, Director - Bureau SRH Architecture, spoke against the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Eugene Kirkwood, Architect - Bureau SRH Architecture, spoke against the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

#### Determination

1. The Bayside Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority pursuant to s4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 supports the variation to the FSR standard, as contained in Clause 4.4A(3)(d) – FSR of Botany Bay LEP 2013 as it is satisfied that the applicant's request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by cl4.6 of that plan, and the proposed development would be in

the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of that particular standard and the objectives of the zone.

2. The Development application DA-2018/1067 for: the demolition of existing structures; Torrens title subdivision into two lots; and the construction of a semi-detached dwelling arrangement at No. 7 Kurnell Street, Botany, is APPROVED subject to the recommended conditions and amended as follows:

**\*Condition 7**

(a) is to be re-worded as follows:

*The rear first floor balcony is to be amended to provide a maximum depth of 900mm in a Juliet style.*

(d) is to have added

*The north-facing upper bedrooms 1 and 2 are to provide fixed opaque glazing to 1.5 metres.*

\* a further condition is to be inserted to amend the landscape plan of the front yards to replace the middle water gum by a *tuckeroo* located more centrally on the site to avoid conflict with the canopy of the street tree.

The above changes shall be shown in the plans prior to the issue of the construction certificate.

3. That the objector be notified of the Panel's determination.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Reasons for Panel Determination**

- The panel considers the amended plans reasonably respond to the concerns expressed by the panel when the matter was deferred. In particular improved solar access to the rear yard of the southern neighbour and improved streetscape presentation by additional soft landscaping and the provision of canopy trees.
- The panel notes the applicant has offered to replace the solar panels for the adjoining owner to the south and this was accepted.

#### 6.4 S82-2019/3 - 294-296 Coward Street, Mascot

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

The following people spoke:

- Mr Mark Armstrong, Design Director - Arc, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- Mr Chris Mavrocordatos, owner, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

#### Determination

The Bayside Planning Panel resolves, pursuant to Division 8.2 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, that Review Application No. DA2019/3 for the proposed change of use (to vehicle hire premises with associated storage, operating 7am – 5pm Monday to Friday; 8am to 1pm Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays and construction of a new administration building and signage) at 294-296 Coward Street, Mascot, is granted **APPROVEAL**, subject to the conditions of consent attached to this report, pursuant to Division 8.4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Reason for Panel Determination

- The panel has the benefit of the advice of Council's Engineer with respect to the issue of flooding and the imposition of a 5 year time limited consent, and notes the applicant has submitted a flood management plan and risk assessment for insurance purposes. On the basis of the above and the recommended conditions the panel considers the change of use application is satisfactory.

## **6.5 DA-2018/214 - 22-26 Keats Avenue, Rockdale**

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

The following people spoke:

- Ms Shuai Yu, affected neighbour, spoke for the officer's recommendation.
- Mr Jonathon Reid, affected neighbour, spoke for the officer's recommendation.
- Rudy Jasin, CDA Architects, spoke against the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

### **Determination**

1. the Bayside Local Planning Panel exercising the functions of the Council as the consent authority pursuant to s4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 does not approve a variation to the building height standard prescribed by cl4.3 of the Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011, as it is not satisfied that the applicant's request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by cl4.6 of that Plan, and the proposed development would not be in the public interest because it is not consistent with the objectives of the Height of Buildings standard and zone objectives and therefore the development is not in the public interest.
2. The development application DA-2018/214 for Integrated Development – Demolition of existing structures and construction of an eight (8) storey mixed use development comprising fifty one (51) residential apartments, three (3) commercial tenancies, three (3) levels of basement car parking and a roof top terrace at 22-26 Keats Avenue Rockdale 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, it is considered that the proposed development does not satisfy Clause 4.3 of the Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 relating to building height.
  - b. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not satisfy the Design Quality Principles within Schedule 1 of State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 - Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development, Part 4.2 - Streetscape and Site Context, Part 5.2 - Residential Flat Buildings, Part 5.3 - Mixed Use and Part 7.5 - Rockdale Town Centre in that the proposed development contains insufficient setbacks from the southern boundary to suitably regulate the bulk and scale of the building, to maintain the amenity of neighbouring residential development and to respond to the local context.
  - b. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal is unsatisfactory with respect to Clause 4.6(8)(ca) of Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 in that the development exceeds the 25m building height limit and does not provide demonstrable public benefits.



- c. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and (iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal is inconsistent with the requirements of Part 3E - Deep Soil Zones of the Apartment Design Guide.
- d. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not satisfy Part 4.6 Car Parking, Access and Movement of Rockdale Development Control Plan 2011 as the design of the circulation area in the basement results in vehicular conflicts and the use of the rear lane is not suitable for vehicular manoeuvring due to its insufficient width.
- e. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal does not satisfy Part 4.5.2 Social Equity - Equitable Access of Rockdale Development Control Plan 2011 in that the pre and post adaptable unit plans for 403, 503 and 603 are inconsistent with the design of those apartments within the submitted floor plans and equitable access from those dwellings to the rooftop terrace (served by Lift A only) is unclear.
- f. The proposed development, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, results in an undesirable and unacceptable impacts on the streetscape and adverse impacts on the adjoining residential building to the south.
- g. The proposed development, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, is not considered to be suitable for the site, in terms of the extent of gross floor area sought, inadequate building setbacks and the likely associated impacts upon the streetscape and neighbouring properties.
- h. Having regard to the issues raised in submissions received by Council in opposition to the proposed development, pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(d) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposal results in unacceptable impacts on adjoining /nearby properties and the streetscape.
- i. 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.

3. That the objectors be advised of the Panel's decision.

Name	For	Against
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Reason for Panel Determination**

- The applicant has not satisfied to the panel that the proposed development warrants approval given the environmental impacts and the lack of public benefit.

**6.6 S82-2019/4 - 38 Russell Avenue, Sans Souci**

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

The following person spoke:

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

**Determination**

The Bayside Planning Panel resolves:

- \* To confirm refusal of the 4.55(2) modification application after reviewing Development Application No. DA-2017/523/B, pursuant to Division 8.2.
- \* The Section 4.55(2) modification application for two storey secondary dwellings with parking on ground floor at 38 Russell Avenue, Sans Souci is REFUSED pursuant to Section 8.4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 for the following reasons:
  - The modification application, assessed on its merits, does not warrant approval as the approved dual occupancy development including single level secondary dwellings at the rear already maximizes the development potential of the site.
  - It is unnecessary and unwarranted to provide parking for secondary dwellings.
  - The additional bulk of raising the secondary dwellings to present as a two storey element is unnecessary and unreasonable given the bulk of the already approved development on the site.
  - The objectives of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, the Rockdale Local Environmental Plan and the zone objectives are not satisfied.

<b>Name</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>
Jan Murrell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Reason for Panel Determination

- The Panel considers on a merits assessment the modification application represents an over development of the site.

### 6.7 DS18/891 - 19-25 Robey Street, Mascot

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

The following person spoke:

- Josh Thompson, Inca Property Group, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

### Determination

The Council officer's report and recommendation is endorsed by the Panel.

The DA-2016/165/4 (DS18/891), being a Section 4.55(1A) application for modifications to include: an accessible entry from Robey Street; provision of colorbond fencing to the rear boundary; metal fencing to ground floor terraces 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8; and reduced glazing and sliding doors to side and rear elevations is APPROVED except that part of the application to delete Condition number 116a, relating to the public right of footway along the northern boundary between Elizabeth Avenue and John Curtin Reserve. This condition is retained. The consent is to be amended in the following way.

By amending Condition 1, to read as follows:

The development is to be carried out in accordance with the following plans and endorsed with Council's stamp, except where amended by other conditions of this consent. Reference documentation is also listed.

Plans	Author	Date Received
Cover Page, Drawing No. DA001, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Site Analysis Plan, Drawing No. DA101, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Site Plan, Drawing No. DA102, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Demolition Plan, Drawing No. DA103, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
<del>Ground Floor Plan, Drawing No. DA201, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <del>Ground Floor Plan, Drawing No. DA201, Rev E dated 12 July 2018</del>		<del>1 March 2018</del> <b>8 August 2018</b> <b>(DA-2016/165/02)</b>

<del>(DA-2016/165/02)</del> <b>Ground Floor Plan, Drawing No. DA201, Rev F dated 26 October 2018</b> <del>(DA-2016/165/02)</del>	DKO Architecture	<b>2 November 2018</b> <b>(DA-2016/165/04)</b>
<del>Level 1 Plan, Drawing No. DA202, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <b>Level 1 Plan, Drawing No. DA202, Rev D dated 26 October 2018</b> <del>(DA-2016/165/04)</del>		<b>1 March 2018</b> <b>2 November 2018</b> <b>(DA-2016/165/04)</b>
<del>Level 2 Plan, Drawing No. DA203, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <b>Level 2 Plan, Drawing No. DA203, Rev D dated 26 October 2018</b> <del>(DA-2016/165/04)</del>		<b>1 March 2018</b> <b>2 November 2018</b> <b>(DA-2016/165/04)</b>
<del>Level 3 Plan, Drawing No. DA204, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <b>Level 3 Plan, Drawing No. DA204, Rev D dated 26 October 2018</b> <del>(DA-2016/165/04)</del>		<b>1 March 2018</b> <b>2 November 2018</b> <b>(DA-2016/165/04)</b>
<del>Level 4 Plan, Drawing No. DA205, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <b>Level 4 Plan, Drawing No. DA205, Rev D dated 26 October 2018</b> <del>(DA-2016/165/04)</del>		<b>1 March 2018</b> <b>2 November 2018</b> <b>(DA-2016/165/04)</b>
Roof Terrace, Drawing No. DA206, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Basement 1 Plan, Drawing No. DA207, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Basement 2 Plan, Drawing No. DA208, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Adaptable Units, Drawing No. DA209, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
<del>South Elevation, Drawing No. DA301, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <del>South Elevation, Drawing No. DA301, Rev D.1 dated 25 February 2019</del> <del>(DA-2016/165/02)</del> <b>South Elevation, Drawing No. DA301, Rev D dated 26 October 2018</b> <del>(DA-2016/165/04)</del> <del>(DA-2016/165/04)</del>		<b>1 March 2018</b>  <b>2 November 2018</b>

<del>North Elevation, Drawing No. DA302, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <i>North Elevation, Drawing No. DA302, Rev B dated 26 October 2018</i> (DA-2016/165/04)		<del>1 March 2018</del> <b>2 November 2018</b> (DA-2016/165/04)
<del>East Elevation, Drawing No. DA303, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <i>North Elevation, Drawing No. DA302, Rev B dated 26 October 2018</i> (DA-2016/165/04)		<del>1 March 2018</del> <b>2 November 2018</b> (DA-2016/165/04)
<del>West Elevation, Drawing No. DA304, Rev A dated 27 February 2018</del> <i>North Elevation, Drawing No. DA302, Rev B dated 26 October 2018</i> (DA-2016/165/04)		<del>1 March 2018</del> <b>2 November 2018</b> (DA-2016/165/04)
Section A, Drawing No. DA305, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Section B, Drawing No. DA306, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Section C, Drawing No. DA307, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Streetscape, Drawing No. DA308, Rev A dated 27 February 2018		1 March 2018
Landscape Concept Ground Floor Plan, DWG No. LSDA-201, Issue C dated 7 February 2018	Greenplan	1 March 2018
Landscape Concept Roof Floor Plan DWG No. LSDA-202, Issue C dated 7 February 2018		1 March 2018
Landscape Planting Ground Floor DWG No. LSDA-301, Issue A, dated 7 February 2018		1 March 2018
Landscape Planting Roof Floor, DWG No. LSDA-302, Issue A dated 7 February 2018		1 March 2018
Landscape Details Planting, DWG No. LSDA-401, Issue A, dated 7 February 2018		1 March 2018
Landscape Details Typical Construction, DWG No. LSDA-404, Issue A dated 7 February 2018		1 March 2018
Cover Sheet, Drawing No. SW100, Revision A dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018
Stormwater Concept Design – Basement 2 Plan, Drawing No. SW200, Issue A, dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018

Stormwater Concept Design – Ground Floor Plan, Drawing No. SW201, Issue A, dated 26 February 2018	SCG Engineering	1 March 2018
Stormwater Concept Design – Roof Plan, Drawing No. SW202, Issue A, dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018
Stormwater Concept Design – Details Sheet 1 of 2, Drawing No. SW300, Issue A, dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018
Stormwater Concept Design – Details Sheet 2 of 2, Drawing No. SW301, Issue A, dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018
Erosion & Sediment Control – Plan & Details, Drawing No. SW400 dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018
Stormwater Concept Design – Music Catchment Plan, Drawing No. SW500, Issue A, dated 26 February 2018		1 March 2018
Survey Plan (Ref: 3558), dated 7 June 2016	Cedar Surveying Services Pty Ltd	16 September 2016
Ground Floor Swept Paths – 6.4m SRV, Drawing No TX.01 Rev C, dated 23 February 2018	Traffix Traffic and Transport Planners	1 March 2018
Ground Floor Swept Paths – B85 & B99 Drawing No TX.02 Rev C, dated 23 February 2018		1 March 2018
Basement Level 1 B99 Circulation & Passing, Drawing No. TX.03, Rev C dated 23 February 2018		1 March 2018
Basement Level 2 B99 Circulation & Passing, Drawing No. TX.04, Rev B dated 18 January 2018		1 March 2018
Ramp Profile, Drawing No. TX.05, Rev C dated 23 February 2018		1 March 2018

Reference Document(s)	Author	Date Received
Amended Statement of Environmental Effects	Chapman Planning Pty Ltd	1 March 2018
Amended Clause 4.6 variation to the height development standard dated 27 February 2018	Chapman Planning Pty Ltd	1 March 2018

Statement of Compliance: Access for people with a disability (Ref: 216196), dated 26 February 2018	Accessible Building Solutions	1 March 2018
SEPP 65 Report dated 26 February 2018	DKO Architecture	1 March 2018
Traffic Impact Assessment Rev B- Ref: 17.607v02, dated 23 February 2018	Traffix Traffic and Transport Planners	1 March 2018
<del><b>BASIX Certificate No. 902705M_02 dated 25 February 2018</b></del> <b>BASIX Certificate No. 902705M_03, dated 31 October 2018</b>	Senica Consultancy Group Pty Ltd	<del><b>1 March 2018</b></del> <b>5 November 2018</b>
NATHERS Certificates with various dates	Senica Consultancy Group Pty Ltd	1 March 2018
Acoustic Report- Ref: 20161114.1/1104A/R1/RL (Rev 1), dated 11 April 2017;	Acoustic Logic	21 April 2017
Arboricultural Assessment Report (Ref: R 17/11), dated 24 August 2016.	Angophora Consulting Arborist	16 September 2016
Arboricultural Assessment Report - Tree Impact Statement & Root Investigation dated 12 April 2017;	Naturally Trees	21 April 2017
BCA Compliance Assessment Report No. 18/002, dated 23 February 2018	Paul Aramini Consulting Pty Ltd	1 March 2018
Waste Management Plan 2018/02034 dated 22 February 2018	Senica Consultancy Group	1 March 2018
Stage 1 Desktop Environmental Site Assessment (Ref: E29461KHrpt dated 20 July 2016.	Environmental Investigation Services (EIS)	16 September 2016
Stage 2 Environmental Site Assessment (Ref: E29461KHrpt2-interim) dated 16 September 2016;	Environmental Investigation Services (EIS)	16 September 2016
Geotechnical Investigation- Ref: 29461ZRppt dated 20 July 2016;	JK Geotechnics	16 September 2016

**[Amendment 4 – S4.55(1A) amended on 11 June 2019]**

**Name**                      **For**                      **Against**

Jan Murrell



Helen Deegan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Reed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Ryan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Reasons for Panel Determination**

- In making its determination the Panel has considered the original report and reasons and considers the public access way to the park is a community benefit as well as a benefit to the development.
- The panel considers all the other modifications to be satisfactory.

The Chairperson closed the meeting at 8:20 pm.

Certified as true and correct.

Jan Murrell  
**Chairperson**