# **RESPONSE TO COUNCIL'S SUBMISSION**

## REF: DA23/3021

#### **182-186 GERTRUDE ST NORTH GOSFORD**

### ISSUE DATE: 02/02/2024

ISSUES	RESPONSE
WASTE MANAGEMENT	
The proposal in its current form is not supported	Upon contacting the Section manager Darren
in terms of waste servicing for the following	North from Central Coast Council's waste services
reasons:	department regarding these issues. In general, it
	is allowed to propose kerbside waste collection
<ul> <li>The requirement for residents to take their</li> </ul>	twice a week without having the HRV entering
waste from several floors to a basement location	the site or making any turn within the site if we
is not a good, safe or user-friendly outcome for	can meet his requirements.
occupiers over the life of the building. The	
property would benefit from a user-friendly	Key points of his expectation include:
system such as waste 'rooms', or a chute or	
vacuum system located on each floor.	<ul> <li>Locating individual bins on each floor to enable</li> </ul>
	convenient waste management.
• The use of circa 50 individual 240 litre wheelie	<ul> <li>Design of waste room for min.10sqm bulky</li> </ul>
bins, which require manual relocation to and	waste and bins required by council.
from another separate collection point each week	- Consideration of mechanical devices to empty
for on street servicing is not supported by	bins into bulk waste bins and provide storage
Council. The use of bulk bins which are deployed	area for those devices.
in a single storage and collection point, or waste	<ul> <li>Providing space for 7 bulk waste bins in the</li> </ul>
service room would be a safer and more efficient	waste room. 5 of them will be emptied twice a
outcome.	week via kerbside waste collection and 2 of them
	are left as contingency, resulting in a maximum of
<ul> <li>The mention of a commercial collection</li> </ul>	3 bins (the same number as collecting bins from
operator is not supported by Council as this will	the existing 3 dwelling houses) for each
force future residents to not only having to pay	collection.
the legislated domestic waste charge to Council	- Minimize the visual impact of the waste room to
but also an additional commercial operator	the street scape.
charge. The savings made by constructing a low	- Update Waste Management Plan accordingly.
quality and poor outcome waste service is simply	

cost shifting the delivery of an expensive and	In this case, the layout and the waste
inefficient operational and collection service onto	management plan has been updated as per his
future residents for the life of the building.	feedback above and obtained Email confirmation
	of Waste management.
<ul> <li>Generally, for a residential property of this</li> </ul>	
scale, Council would expect, however is not	Detail refers to Updated architectural plans,
provided in this instance, a fully integrated waste	Email confirmation of Waste management and
and recycling management and collection system	Waste Management Plan.
involving the following:	
<ul> <li>Service or collection points within easy reach</li> </ul>	
for residents, such as chutes on each floor that	
transfer separate materials to a suitably sized	
waste service room (total footprint area of bins	
plus 70% for safe maneuvering).	
• A waste service room, containing, at a	
minimum, separate bulk bins for recycling and	
or cimilar. The waste convice room must be easily	
and directly accessed by a LGV collection vehicle	
weekiy.	
• The waste service room would have sufficient	
space to also accommodate bulky waste (circa	
10m2) for weekly servicing and allow for other	
waste items such as batteries or electronic waste	
storage and collection.	
<ul> <li>The proposed onsite garbage collection and</li> </ul>	
removal off site by a Small Rigid Vehicle (SRV) is	
not supported by Council. The use of a Heavy	
Rigid Vehicle (HRV) will require increased/larger	
onsite access and collection areas. In addition, if a	
HRV is to access the site and traverse the interior	
of the development, please ensure adequate	
height clearance is provided clear of services etc.	
Preliminary structural engineering plans are	
requested to ensure a HRV can adequately access	
any garbage servicing area provided within a	
bullaing.	
<ul> <li>Notwithstanding the above concerns, there</li> </ul>	

appears to be no plans, diagrams or movement

pathways that show that the proposed waste	
service proposal is workable and can be	
delivered. Once an improved, efficient and user-	
friendly waste solution is designed and proposed,	
it must contain sufficient supporting details and	
evidence that clearly shows how the service will	
function and can be easily accessed and utilised	
by ALL related parties.	
PLANNING	
The application is not supported in its current form	. The proposal presents significant non-
compliance with height, setbacks and site coverage	which indicate the application is an
overdevelopment of the site, Councils primary plan	ning concerns are summarized below:
<ul> <li>The subject site has a mapped height of 'P'</li> </ul>	As advised by the Department of Planning and
which is 18 metres pursuant to cl. 5.25 – Height	Environment, a height variation could be
of buildings under State Environmental Planning	considered for the northern part of the site,
Policy (Precincts—Regional) 2021. The proposal	subject to the proposal being able to
includes 27.957% (5.85m) variation to the SEPP	demonstrate that the adjoining property to the
height control (top floor is non-compliant). A	south can maintain adequate solar access
reduced height and or compliance with the	amenity, the proposal is sited to achieve setback
height control is recommended.	and deep soil zone requirements and future
	apartments will have adequate amenity.
	In this case, Unit 702 on level 7 has been
	removed to ensure the adjoining property to the
	south can maintain adequate solar access
	amenity. Also, the general layouts have been
	amended to comply with the setback & deep soil
	zone requirement of ADG.
	Deteil refere to Architectural durations NO
	Detail refers to Architectural drawings NO.:
	008
	010
	013a
	017
	010
	019
	110
• The ADG requires a 9m sethack above 4 storeys	Regarding Unit on level 4-6:
including to balconies. The design proposes only	Redrooms and POS on these levels have been
6 metres or 33% non-compliance on parts of the	amended to achieve a minimum setback of 9m to
north south and west boundaries	the side and rear boundary
	Detail refers to Architectural drawings NO.:

Units 401 (level 5) and 501 (level 6) both breach	107
the 9-metre setback and retain a 6-metre setback	108
as with the levels below. The added mass appears	109
to be in relation to bedrooms in these	
apartments. It is considered that these non-	
complying setbacks will result in visual and	
acoustic privacy impacts.	
• The Shadow Plans supporting the application do	Bedrooms and POS on level 4-6 have been
not adequately address the impacts of	amended to achieve a minimum setback of 9m to
overshadowing of the western side of the design,	the side and rear boundary to minimize its visual
particularly in relation to the breaches in setbacks	and shadow impact on neighbors.
on levels 5 and 6. Variation is sought regarding	
privacy issues relating to the western wall but	Shadow diagrams have also been updated to
does not appear to address overshadowing	accurately show the reduced shadow impacts on
concerns. Shadow Plans show breaches of	39 and 41 Hills Street.
setback having distinct impacts on 39 and 41 Hills	
Street in late March and late September. The	Detail refers to Architectural drawings NO.:
shadow plan in late June shows even broader	017
impact further to the south-west.	018
	019
	107
	108
The proposal may result in view loss for the	The proposed development will not result in
adjoining properties. This needs to be addressed	unreasonable overshadowing of the public
in a revised Statement of Environmental Effects,	domain or result in a loss of views or key vistas.
specifically in relation to the proposed setbacks	Generous setbacks to the north and south
and height variations.	boundaries are provided to ensure adequate
	solar access to the proposed development and
	adjoining properties can be maintained.
• The site cover is proposed at 65% which	The proposal meets the ADG requirements
exceeds the 50% maximum permitted under the	below:
applicable DCP. Breach of site coverage is being	
justified by compliance under ADG and DCP of	- FSR: 199:1 (MAX 2:1)
FSR communal and public open space, deep soil	- COMMUNAL OPEN SPACE: 501.92sqm
zones, solar and daylight access, private open	(MIN 452sqm)
space, and balconies. This justification is not	- DEEP SOIL ZONE: 323.74sqm (MIN
considered acceptable.	
	- SULAR & DAYLIGHT ACCESS: 70% OF
	UNITS RECEIVE A MINIMUM OF 3 HOURS
	DIRECT SUNLIGHT BETWEEN 9AM-3PM
	AT MID WINTER 21JUNE. 4% OF UNITS

	9AM-3PM MID WINTER 21 JUNE AS PER
	ADG REQUIREMENTS
	- PRIVATE OPEN SPACE: EVERY SINGLE
	BALCONY HAS MET ITS MINIMUM SIZE AS
	PFR ADG
	Detail refers to Architectural drawings NO.:
	009
	010
	011
	013
	013
• The proposed waste storage arrangement is not	UZI
• The proposed waste storage an angement is not	Menagement continuent of the waste
supported in its current form and will need to be	Management Section.
reconsidered. Additionally, refer to waste	
comments above. Kerbside servicing, in the form	
proposed and for a development of this scale, is	
not a supported by Council.	
An updated Design Verification Statement is	The Design Verification Statement has been
required. Clause 29 of the Environmental	updated.
Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021	
requires the following for a development	Detail refers to the Design Verification Statement.
application to be made:	
(2) The statement by the qualified designer	
must—	
(a) verify that the qualified designer designed, or	
directed the design of, the development, and	
Please also ensure the architectural plans	
supporting the DA are referenced appropriately	
in the updated Design Verification Statement not	
just a summary of the proposed development as	
it remains unclear as to what version, date of the	
development this verification refers to	
• It is noted the BASIX Certificate supporting the	The Basix Certificate has been updated.
application is dated 19 October 2022. Any BASIX	
certificate accompanying a development must	Details refer to the Basix Certificate.
have been issued no earlier than 3 months before	
the date on which the application is made, noting	
the application was lodged with the Department	
on 17 April 2023. A new BASIX Certificate is	
required.	
Owners consent for stormwater easements/	An advice letter from a Sewer Expert and sewer
relocation of sewer etc appears to not have been	plan is prepared for clarification of the sewer
provided. All work required on adjoining	work.

properties must be appropriately detailed in the	There is no sewer work that has impact on or
required Statement of Environmental Effects (and	encroaches neighbors' site in the latest proposal,
any supporting technical reports) and in plan	so the owner's consent if not needed.
form.	
	Detail refers to Advice letter of sewer issues and
	Proposed Sewer Plan.

#### ARCHITECTURAL

Architectural The application is not supported in its current form. The proposal presents significant non-compliance with height, setbacks and site coverage which indicate the application is an overdevelopment of the site and does not exhibit design excellence as required by the Gosford City Centre.

It is considered that approval could only be supported if significant amendments are made to address the following:

• Some height and side setback non-compliance may be supported on the north of the site, if it can be demonstrated that it does not increase overshadowing of this or adjoining sites.

• The front setback complies with the 3m to 4m requirement in the GCCDCP.

• The driveway and particularly the high side wall are moved further from the boundary and significant landscaping is provided to screen it from the adjoining site and the street.

• It is noted that unit 204 is shown as a 1-bedroom unit but has a large storage area opening to the balcony through glass doors. This is clearly a 2-bedroom unit and will require amendment to car parking calculations.

Detailed considerations having regard to SEPP 65, the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) and the Gosford City Centre DCP (GCCDCP) is provided below:

Context	Regarding the mentioned non-compliance:
The site is zoned for medium density with a maximum FSR of 2:1 and an 18 metre maximum height. It is likely the adjoining sites to the south will be redeveloped. A medium density development is appropriate in this location and is supported in principle however the significant non-compliance with height, setbacks, site coverage and parking indicate the application is an overdevelopment of the site. It does not exhibit design excellence as required by the Gosford City Centre SEPP and is inconsistent with the existing and likely future context.	<ul> <li>Height: Clarified in the Planning section above.</li> <li>Setbacks: General layouts have been amended to achieve all setback requirements.</li> <li>Site coverage: Clarified in the Planning section above.</li> <li>Parking: The total number of car parking just meets the minimum requirement and is not overdesigned.</li> </ul>
Built Form and Scale	These mentioned issues have been clarified in the
The proposed development significantly breaches	Context section and Planning section above.
The proposed development significantly breaches	
the applicable height control. It is understood	
that this is a sloping site however this is a site	

constraint, not a justification for non-compliance. Some height non-compliance could be considered it site coverage, setbacks and all other issues are resolved to Council's satisfaction. The ADG requires a 9 metre setback above 4 storeys including to balconies. The design proposes only 6 metres or 33% non-compliance on parts of the north, west and south. Noncomplying setbacks result in visual and acoustic privacy impacts. It is acknowledged that the bedroom windows do not face the boundary, but they increase visual bulk and overshadowing and balconies are also non-complying resulting in privacy impacts to adjoining sites. This is a particular concern on the north and south where there is little significant planting to provide screening or outlook to and from adjoining sites.

Some minor non-compliance may be considered on the north if this is screened with significant landscaping as this does not result in overshadowing.

The application does not include a full southern elevation however the top of the ramp wall is at approximately 40.3m or up to 3.5m above the southern boundary. This is located approximately 1.4m from the boundary and is unscreened by landscaping.

The Gosford GCCDCP requires a ground floor setback for this site of 3m to 4m. Existing setbacks on this side of Gertrude Street are approximately 5m to the south of the site and 3.5m to 5m on the multi unit development to the north. This application proposes from 1.6m to 3m at the ground floor. This is inconsistent with the existing and likely future context, particularly because this section of Gertrude Street is so narrow.

It is considered the ground floor setbacks must fully comply with the GCCDCP.

The application proposes 65% site cover or 15%	
non-compliance. This increases the visual bulk	
and reduces the area available for landscaping	
necessary to disguise the non-complying height	
and setbacks	
Density	The general design has been amended to
The ESP complies with numerical controls but the	heights evershadowing and privacy
number and extent of non-compliances indicate	lieights, oversnauowing and privacy.
the application is an over development of the	
Site.	The development has received the Desire
Sustainability	The development has passed the Basix
DACIN contificate compliant indicating compliance	assessment with updated Certificate.
BASIX certificate supplied indicating compliance	Dataile refer to the Desiry Contificate
with mandatory energy efficiency standards. The	Details refer to the Basix Certificate.
use of solar not water and photovoltaic cells or	
other energy saving options should also be	
Landscape	the updated deep soil diagram has excluded
The ADC requires the deep cell is encryption to be	stormwater items, and the area still complies
The ADG requires the deep soil is approximately	with the requirement.
Zones to have a minimum of 7% of the site area.	The landscape plan has been undated
standard but locatos almost all landscaning in	The landscape plan has been updated.
standard but locates almost all landscaping in	Datails refer to the landscape plan
that subject to the provision of OSD and a re-	Details refer to the landscape plan.
routed server main this landscaping may be	
further reduced	
There is particular concern at the provision of	
only one significant capony tree in the design and	
the lack of landscaning on the southern boundary	
to screen the high driveway wall	
Amenity	Sun eve diagram has been undated to show the
,	solar access of G04 more clearly.
The majority of units achieve acceptable levels of	
solar access though unit G04 is questionable.	The ground floor units are well screened by
	fences and won't have privacy issues.
Units are generally well planned with usable	,,
balconies. The communal open space on the roof	Detail refers to Architectural drawings NO.:
top is considered to be acceptable. Access to the	014
rear communal space via the fire stairs is	103
circuitous and has privacy impacts on adjoining	
units.	

Safety	Complies.
The application provides balconies and windows overlook the street and common areas to provide surveillance.	
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	Complies.
The application provides 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom units and adaptable units to cater for a variety of occupants.	
Aesthetics	The issues mentioned have been clarified in the
The upper floors step back and the building is articulated, however this is inadequate to disguise the bulk and scale resulting from the non-comply height, setbacks and site coverage.	
WATER & SEWER	
The location of the current sewer through the properties, appears to conflict with the proposed development (refer to Figure 3 below).	A proposed sewer plan is prepared with an advice letter from a sewer expert for clarification of the sewer work.
The application in its current form is not supportable as no details accompany the application pertaining to how the site and adjoining properties will be serviced.	Detail refers to Advice letter of sewer issues and Proposed Sewer Plan.
The following advice is provided, noting the proponent was given similar advice previously following a Pre-Development Meeting with Council:	
• Water and sewer is available to the land. The site is located within the Water & Sewer Redevelopment Services Plan (DSP) Area. The developer shall be required to obtain a Section 307 certificate for development of the land. Water and sewer developer (S307) contributions apply for the number of units. Water & Sewer S307 contributions are utilised to ensure suitable capacity is available within the system to accommodate development within the area.	

<b>F</b>	
• A Council sewer main (150mm VC SE Line) is	
located across the development site and it's	
dead-end junction servicing the northern	
adjoining neighbouring property 188-198	
Gertrude Street only.	
The proponent was advised to communicate with	
the owners or the strata manager of the northern	
neighbouring property and reroute the internal	
sewer to the council main ML line located along	
the western boundary, if any sewer connection	
exists to SE01.	
If this rerouting is proposed, landowners consent	
is required from the owners or the strata	
manager of the northern neighbouring property	
88-198 Gertrude Street to delete the existing	
sewer junction from sewer manhole SE01, so that	
the existing sewer main SE line can be truncated	
at the southern boundary of the development	
site so as to avoid a sewer clash with the	
proposed basement.	
<ul> <li>Alternatively, the sewer can be relocated</li> </ul>	
outside the footprint of the basement, if the	
existing depth of the sewer main and the sewer	
junction servicing the northern neighbouring	
property 88-198 Gertrude Street permits.	
In this instance, Council may consider to retain	
the sewer main within channel in the basement	
slab, if all of the above solutions can't be	
achieved. It is to be noted, this will impact the	
levels of the basement slab and vehicular access	
ramps etc.	
<ul> <li>It was also recommended the proponent</li> </ul>	
engage an external hydraulic consultant for the	
water service size and if required a fire service for	
the proposed development. This information is	
also lacking from the application.	
ENGINEERING	
The proposal in its current form is not supported in	terms of engineering for the following reasons:
• The proposed onsite garbage collection and	The issues mentioned have been addressed and
removal off site by a Small Rigid Vehicle (SRV) is	clarified in the Waste management section
not supported by Council. The use of a Heavy	above.

Rigid Vehicle (HRV) will require increased/larger	
onsite access and collection areas.	1
<ul> <li>The proposal presents traffic safety concerns as a result of vehicle traffic conflicts between residential, service and garbage vehicles entering the site with vehicles exiting the site at the same time.</li> <li>Notes: Residential, service and garbage vehicles entering and exiting the site travel into/over the path of oncoming vehicles exiting/entering the site and also into vehicles waiting at the waiting bay on Level 02 Gertrude Street as shown by turning paths in the Traffic Impact Assessment supporting the application.</li> </ul>	In the latest proposal, the waste will be collected on the kerbside and garbage vehicles will not enter the site. Therefore, the conflict will be passively addressed.
<ul> <li>The internal circulation roadway and two-way</li> </ul>	The traffic issues have been solved with redesign.
ramps do not comply with AS 2890.1 Section 2.5 Design of Circulation Roadways and Ramps which requires a minimum 5.5m width + clearances.	Detail refers to the updated architectural plans and Traffic Assessment.
The proposed driveway access cross over within Gertrude Street does not comply with AS 2890.1 Section 3.3 Gradients of Access Driveways which states a maximum longitudinal grade of + 5%. The proposed driveway grade from back of layback to front site boundary is too steep.	
Notes: PDC Consultants Traffic Impact Assessment (Ref 0541r01v03 10/3/23 P Corbett) states in part:	
'7. Conclusions. The proposed access and internal parking arrangements generally comply with the relevant requirements of AS 2890.1, AS 2890.2, AS 2890.3 and AS 2890.6. Any minor amendments considered necessary (if any) can be dealt with prior to the release of a Construction Certificate. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development is supportable on traffic planning grounds.' Construction of the following works in accordance with Council's standards and AS 2890 will be required (and detailed in preliminary civil engineering plans):	

a Replace redundant access cross overs with kerb and guttering across the full frontage of the site in Gertrude St.

b 1.5m wide reinforced (SL72 steel fabric) concrete footpath in an approved location across the full frontage of the site in Gertrude Street. c Construction of an industrial/commercial vehicle access crossing that has a minimum width to accommodate largest vehicles to enter/exit site including construction of a heavy-duty gutter crossing and road pavement adjacent to the gutter crossing.

d Footway formation graded at +2.5% from the top of the kerb to the property boundary across the full frontage of the site in Gertrude Street.

e All proposed internal works on the site including access driveways, structures at /near the property boundaries including retaining walls, fences, gates and steps must be at a suitable level to allow the above roadworks, footway and accesses to be constructed in accordance with the Council and Australian Standards.

f Vehicle access driveway centreline and both edges long sections and cross sections design from the centreline of the road to the proposed car parking spaces in accordance with Australian Standard 2890 and Council's Design Specification are to include reduced levels (RL), chainages / distances along the driveway/car parking spaces and grades expressed as percentages. Notes: The design RL level at the back of the layback is 50mm below the top of kerb RL; the driveway cross fall at the site boundary is to parallel the gutter/layback slope. The longitudinal access profiles are to include the required layback at the kerb line, 2.5% footway formation in the road reserve, and the maximum 3% grade within the site associated with any area related to waste servicing.

• Details are required (however not provided)	Details of vehicle access driveway have been
showing the vehicle access driveway centreline	updated.
and both edges long sections and cross sections	
from the centreline of Gertrude Street to the	Details refers to Drawing 104, 105 and 502 of
proposed car parking spaces in accordance with	architectural plans.
Australian Standard 2890 and Council's Design	
Specification. These details are to include	
reduced levels (RL), chainages /distances along	
the driveway/car parking spaces and grades	
expressed as percentages.	
Notes: The design RL level at the back of the	
layback is 50mm below the top of kerb RL, where	
the driveway cross fall at the site boundary is to	
parallel the gutter slope. The longitudinal access	
profiles required are to include the required	
layback at the kerb line and 2.5% footway	
formation in the road reserve.	
<ul> <li>Details are required showing future concrete</li> </ul>	Details of future concrete footpath have been
footpath levels at/along front site boundary being	updated.
at +2.5% rise from existing/reinstated top of kerb	
in Gertrude Street to the site boundary,	Details refers to Drawing 104, 105 and 502 of
compatible with proposed internal site works and	architectural plans.
levels.	
All proposed internal works on the site including	
access driveways, structures at /near the	
property boundaries including retaining walls.	
fences, gates and steps must be at a suitable level	
to allow roadworks, footway and accesses to be	
constructed in accordance with the Council and	
Australian Standards.	
• No details of the stormwater drainage from the	Details of the stormwater have been updated.
proposed stormwater connection point within	
the site to Council's stormwater drainage system	Details refers to Stormwater Concept Design.
in Hills Street has been provided. A stormwater	
drainage report is required to assess the capacity,	
location and suitability of the stormwater	
drainage system from the proposed connection	
point within site to Council's stormwater	
drainage system in Hills Street. Landowners	
consent from affected properties may also be	
required.	

The design, analysis and report shall be prepared	
and certified by a suitably qualified and	
experienced civil engineer and be carried out in	
accordance with the procedures recommended in	
'Australian Rainfall and Runoff – A Guide to Flood	
Estimation' by The Institution of Engineers	
Australia and be based on survey details & levels.	
Notes:	
The site receives stormwater from the upstream	
areas.	
Provision is to be made for the interception,	
collection and suitable disposal of all overland	
surface stormwater flows from all upstream	
areas.	
All works required to accommodate the above	
stormwater flows are to be located wholly within	
the subject site.	
All structures and obstructions including retaining	
walls shall be setback sufficient distance from the	
property boundary to accommodate the	
collection and disposal of all overland surface	
stormwater flows wholly within the subject site	
• A Water Cycle Management Plan consisting of a	A Water Cycle Management Plan has been
written report and plans in accordance with	prepared.
Central Coast DCP 2022 Chapter 3.1 Water Cycle	Detail as fam to the Mister Curle Management
Management must be submitted to address the	Detail refers to the Water Cycle Management
Onowing criteria: a. Retention. D. Stormwater	Plan.
Quality. C. Offsite Detention Requirements. d.	
Conservation is required	
FLOODING	
• The site is identified as being affected by	Agreed
Gosford Overland Flood Study.	1,5,000
Based off its Flood Impact Assessment, there	Agreed
are no issues in terms of emergency evacuation	
as the flows are shallow and short duration.	
TREES	
• The proposal is supported by an Arboricultural	Agreed.
Impact Assessment D15475850 (Russell	
	Details refer to Arborist report.

Kingdom, October 2022) that nominates removal	
of all but one tree from the footprint of	
the works site. The only tree to be retained in the	
immediate vicinity of the works footprint	
is a native Cheese tree (Glochidion ferdinandi),	
located near the rear boundary of the site,	
which was considered by Councils Arborist to be	
an acceptable distance from the proposed	
works.	
<ul> <li>Trees to be removed are primarily planted</li> </ul>	Agreed.
ornamental and exotic species (as listed in detail	
in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment), with	Details refer to Arborist report.
the more visually prominent specimens being	
Liquidambar (Liquidambar styraciflua) and	
Jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), however	
several native species, including clusters of	
eleven (11) Bangalow Palms (Archontophoenix	
cunninghamiana) and Weeping Bottlebrush	
(Callistemon viminalis) have been identified for	
removal as they are directly situated in the works	
envelope and are in declining health.	
<ul> <li>Neighbour's trees along the northern side</li> </ul>	Agreed.
boundary have been addressed and considered	
by the Arboricultural Impact Statement, noting	Details refer to Arborist report.
that new retaining walls will be replacing an	
existing retaining wall.	
<ul> <li>The assessing Arborist has provided a tree</li> </ul>	Agreed.
protection plan in the submitted Arboricultural	
Impact Statement (Russell Kingdom October	
2022) that has been linked to recommended	
conditions of consent. The recommendations	
provided in the submitted Arboricultural Impact	
Statement (Council Ref: D15475850) are to be	
adhered to as a condition of consent.	