

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 **Thursday 15 August 2019** at **6.12 pm**.

Present

Robert Montgomery, Chairperson
Jan Murrell, Independent Expert Member
Stephen Moore, Independent Expert Member
Jesse Hanna, Community Representative

Also Present

Clare Harley, Manager Strategic Planning
Fausto Sut, Manager Governance & Risk
Michael McCabe, Director City Futures
Josh Ford, Coordinator Strategic Planning
John McNally, Urban Planner
Howard Taylor, Urban Planner
Helena Miller, Director, MG Planning
Michael File, Consultant Planner, File Planning
Anna Johnston, Consultant Planner, File Planning
Tracey Hau, Senior Urban Designer, SJB Architects
Lauren Thomas, Governance Officer
Wolfgang Gill, IT Support Officer

The Chairperson opened the meeting in the Botany Town Hall Committee Room at 6:12 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

Nil

5 Reports – Planning Proposals

5.1 Draft Planning Proposal - 2 and 4 Guess Avenue, Wolli Creek

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

The following people spoke:

- 1 Michael File, Director – File Planning, for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.
- 1 Anna Johnston, File Planning, for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

Note: Due to Council's interest in the site (i.e. future acquisition), File Planning was engaged to prepare an independent assessment of the options for the site and to prepare the draft Planning Proposal.

Panel Commentary

It is recognised that this Planning Proposal was initiated following an earlier resolution of the Council relating to acquisition commitments for open space. Indeed, it is valid for a Council to review its future commitments based on contemporary practice in provision of open space, population change, ability to acquire public land and demand for local, district and regional open spaces.

The Panel acknowledges the correspondence from the NSW Department of Planning Industry and Environment dated 16 July 2019 in that department's capacity as the owner of Lot 102 and Council's reply dated 22 July 2019.

The Panel supports retention of the RE1 zone over part of the site. However, the Panel is concerned about the following aspects of the proposal.

- 1 Whether there is adequate justification for the deletion of some 3,700m² of future local open space, in an area which has experienced significant population growth;
- 2 Whether the local community has an expectation that the entire site would be developed as a park in the future;
- 3 Whether the amenity of the future open space will be compromised by development on Lot 101 up to 12 storeys; and
- 4 Whether the proposed 3:1 FSR and maximum building height of 42 metres are appropriate controls for Lot 101 when zoned B4.

In arriving at a recommendation, the Panel considered a number of aspects relating to the four matters listed above. These considerations are summarised as follows:

1 Justification for Reduction in Open Space

Prima facie it would seem counter-intuitive to reduce the provision of open space areas in this location, which is characterised by multi-storey apartment buildings. However, SGS Economics and Planning carried out a detailed review of open space demand based on contemporary practice. This review concluded that a local park of 4,000m² in this location is adequate to meet demand for existing and future population. Open spaces larger than 4,000m² would typically provide district type facilities such as playing fields. SGS notes that district facilities are available within the area in good proximity to the site. The SGS analysis highlighted, that beyond the site, it will be important to consider access to major district and regional reserves where access is constrained due to the absence of river crossings and barriers to crossing the Princes Highway as a pedestrian.

2 Community Expectation

Given that the entire area of lots 101 and 102 is currently zoned RE1 Public Recreation, it is likely that the local community would have an expectation that the whole site would become a public park in the future.

Should this planning proposal proceed, there will be opportunity for the community to be heard through the public consultation process required by Part 3 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979* and the conditions of any future Gateway Determination.

3 Amenity of Proposed Open Space

As presented, this planning proposal would facilitate 6 storey and 12 storey residential towers, as shown in the indicative built form massing diagram within the Urban Design Report prepared by SJB Architects. The location of such large towers immediately adjoining the eastern edge of the proposed 4,000m² park is likely to have significant impacts on the amenity of the park.

The Panel considers that the amenity of the future open space would be greatly improved with height and density controls for Lot 101 being less than proposed. It is also recommended that proposed 423m² of open space to be retained on Lot 101 (shown in Figure 1 of the Officer's report) should be mirror-imaged to the south, so that a larger open space frontage to Guess Avenue is provided. See figure 1 below:

Figure 1: Bayside Local Planning Panel Recommendation.

4 Density Controls for Lot 101

The Panel considers that the density control settings for Lot 101 are crucial to ensure that the amenity of the reduced area local park is protected. It is noted that the planning proposal adopts the FSR and height controls which are significantly higher than those which apply to land adjoining to the east and south.

The Panel considers that there is insufficient justification for the proposal to adopt these higher density controls. The location of tower buildings adjacent to the reduced area of open space is undesirable and has the potential for adverse impact on the amenity of the future local park.

Recommendation to Council

That the Bayside Local Planning Panel recommends that Council proceed with the draft Planning Proposal for 2 and 4 Guess Avenue, Wolli Creek, as prepared by FPD Pty Ltd and outlined in this report subject to the following matters being further investigated and resolved by Council prior to submission to the Department of Planning Industry and Environment for a Gateway Determination:

- 1 Amend the zoning map as recommended by the Panel in Figure 1 of this report;
- 2 Carry out further investigations (as highlighted in the SGS Report) in relation to:
 - a. ways to improve pedestrian access to nearby regional open space, in particular Cahill Park on the eastern side of the Princes Highway,

including enhanced pedestrian links and the feasibility of a pedestrian bridge over the Highway.

- b. Better pedestrian connections to other existing public open space that may be enhanced.
- 3 Investigate FSR and building height controls which will achieve a lower density and height than proposed for the future built form on the part of the site to be zoned B4. This investigation should include consideration of surrounding density controls, minimising the impact on the amenity of the future local park, activating any proposed buildings with the future park, and creating a more appropriate relationship between future buildings and open space.

Name	For	Against
Robert Montgomery	☒	☐
Jan Murrell	☒	☐
Stephen Moore	☒	☐
Jesse Hanna	☒	☐

Reasons for Panel Recommendation

- The Panel supports retention of the RE1 zone over part of the site.
- The Panel is concerned that the height and density controls proposed for the B4 zone are too high and will create unacceptable impacts on the future local park.
- As this Planning Proposal has the effect of reducing the area of future local open space in this locality, it is essential that the controls on adjoining land will facilitate exceptional amenity for the future local park. It is also important to ensure that linkages to other open space areas are enhanced.

5.2 Planning Proposal - Rockdale Town Centre: Interchange Precinct (471-511 Princes Highway; 2-14 Tramway Arcade; and 6 & 14 Geeves Avenue, Rockdale)

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

The following people spoke:

- Ms Anna Anglekis, interested resident, spoke against the officer's recommendation.
- Ms Kate Bartlett, Director - Mecone, spoke for the officer's recommendation and responded to the Panel's questions.

Recommendation to Council

That the Bayside Local Planning Panel recommends to Council that it and the Proponent finalise and update the Planning Proposal Report, the Draft DCP amendments, and relevant supporting documents as outlined above and prepare a heritage assessment of buildings at 471-477 Princes Highway and 6-14 Geeves Avenue, Rockdale prior to referral of the draft Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment for a Gateway Determination.

Name	For	Against
Robert Montgomery	☒	☐
Jan Murrell	☒	☐
Stephen Moore	☒	☐
Jesse Hanna	☒	☐

Reasons for Panel Recommendation

- The Panel acknowledges that the site is within a key strategic location for Rockdale and that it is desirable for development controls to be brought into line with those applying to other key sites within the area.
- The public benefit of formalising and enhancing the pedestrian link from Rockdale Station to the Princes Highway is an important aspect of the proposal.
- The Panel agrees that a heritage assessment should be carried out to further inform the proposal prior to forwarding for a Gateway Determination.

6 Reports – Development Applications

Nil.

The Chairperson closed the meeting at 6:49 pm.

Certified as true and correct.

Robert Montgomery
Chairperson