

Sebastian Tauni

From: Kevin Kuo <KKuo@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 5 February 2018 4:29 PM
To: Sebastian Tauni
Cc: Christine Gough; Darren Caballero
Subject: HPE CM: RE: 34-42 East Street Granville (PP_2017_COPAR_014_00)

Record Number: DOC2018/0068527

Hi Sebastian,

Apologies the delayed response.

See below responses to the questions raised in your email below in red:

Regards

Kevin Kuo | Team Leader – Strategic Land Use Planning

City of Parramatta

PO Box 32, Parramatta NSW 2124

☎ (02) 9806 5834

✉ kkuo@parracity.nsw.gov.au

Links | www.parracity.nsw.gov.au



**CITY OF
PARRAMATTA**

From: Sebastian Tauni [<mailto:Sebastian.Tauni@planning.nsw.gov.au>]

Sent: Thursday, 21 December 2017 2:01 PM

To: Kevin Kuo <KKuo@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au>

Cc: Christine Gough <Christine.Gough@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: 34-42 East Street Granville (PP_2017_COPAR_014_00)

Dear Kevin,

Further to our conversation earlier today regarding the above planning proposal, I'm seeking further information and/or clarification on the following:

1) Precedent

Further to our discussions, increasing the FSR for the site and permitting a departure from the sliding scale has the potential to set a precedent for other proposals in the area. Accordingly, can you advise on:

- a) The location of discussion within the planning proposal documentation which examines the risks of setting undesirable precedents.

Response: Within the planning proposal documentation regarding the risks of setting undesirable precedents, according to the IHAP Report (17/10/2017):

42. The circumstances of this particular Planning Proposal will prevent a precedent being set for other sites within 'Area 1', which do not have a land size large enough to achieve the maximum FSR of 6:1 within the B4 Mixed Use Zone, lodging a Planning Proposal to seek removal from 'Area 1' to obtain 6:1. The fact that the land was consolidated within a larger site (i.e. 6,855m²) and has an existing DA consent for its redevelopment make this a unique set of circumstances. Council Officers' assessment concludes that the Planning Proposal will result in a better built form outcome on the subject site than what would be delivered under the existing DA approval. This warrants the Planning Proposal's consideration and progression.

43. It would be unlikely for Council Officers in the future to consider a Planning Proposal for an increase in height for a site that:

- a. Does not achieve the land size that permits an FSR of 6:1; and*
- b. Has not already been subject to a site consolidation and DA assessment process, resulting in an existing DA consent.*

44. Therefore enabling the Planning Proposal at 34-42 East Street to progress with an increase in height to enable the previously considered FSR of 6:1 to be achieved will not set a precedent for Granville.

45. Furthermore, the Planning Proposal seeks to introduce a Site Specific Clause to exclude wintergardens (enclosed balconies) from the calculation of the future development's gross floor area calculation. This is considered acceptable given the site's location adjacent to the railway line and the need to manage the amenity constraints. Council has previously endorsed a similar clause for another Planning Proposal for land located on a major arterial road which was constrained by noise from heavy traffic. The context and location of the site at East Street warrant a similar clause to manage amenity for its future residents.

Detailed discussion relating to gross floor area and FSR is discussed below.

- b) Provide clarification as to why a planning proposal has not been pursued for the site area the subject of the approved consent (10-42 East Street) given that the 6:1 FSR of the sliding scale applies to sites over 3,200sqm only.

Response: The reason why the PP has not been pursued for the entire consolidated site (subject of the previous consent) is that the majority of the site is currently under construction. The PP therefore applies to the that portion of the site that has not yet been developed (34-42 East Street).

2) Gross Floor Area

As the calculation of GFA is a key factor for assessing the suitability of the proposed FSR control and adequacy of the existing FSR control, can you please provide:

- a) Figures confirming the total GFA for the approved consent including the total GFA for Blocks A, B and C on both an individual and collective basis.

Response: There is an existing inconsistency between FSR controls and building height controls contained within the Parramatta LEP relating to the Granville Town Centre which has been evident from a number of DA approvals within the B4 zones on sites bound by Parramatta Rd and the Rail way line. In particular, a number of DA approvals within this precinct have been granted where the existing permitted FSR of 6:1 could not be delivered under the existing permitted height of 52m. The previous approvals have relied on a Clause 4.6 variation to the permitted height to achieve an FSR that is closer to 6:1, with many not achieving an FSR of 6:1 even with the variation under Clause 4.6.

The land at 34-42 East Street, Granville, which this Planning Proposal relates to, formed part of a larger site that was approved for a mixed use development as part of DA/738/2014. This DA was one of the DAs within the precinct that was unable to achieve the permitted FSR of 6:1 under the PLEP 2011 due to the height control (even with a Clause 4.6 variation). The Planning Proposal seeks to rectify this and align closely with the controls within the PRCUTS. The previous DA sought approval for three towers (Block A, B and C) across a consolidated site of 6,855m². Under the PLEP 2011, a site of this size is permitted to achieve a maximum FSR of 6:1. However due to the height control, the DA was approved for a three tower development with a total FSR of 5.54:1 – 0.46:1 less than permitted under the PLEP 2011.

The site subject to the Planning Proposal at 34-42 East Street relates to Block C of the previous development consent. Whilst the Planning Proposal will result in more floor space being achieved on the subject site, this additional floor space will not result in the development site considered under DA/738/2014 (i.e. Block A, B and C which has an area of 6,855m²) exceeding the maximum permitted FSR of 6:1. The Planning Proposal will potentially increase the total FSR generated on the broader site considered under DA/738/2014 from **5.54:1 to 5:8:1**.

b) Figures confirming the proposed GFA for Block C with and without the proposed wintergarden clause.

Proposed GFA for Block C with Wintergarden (current proposal): 9,460m² (FSR 6:1)

GFA for Block C without Wintergarden GFA exclusion clause: 9,846m² (FSR 6.25:1, 4% higher)

As detailed in the October 2017 IHAP report, the PP seeks to introduce a Site Specific Clause to exclude wintergardens (enclosed balconies) from the calculation of the future development's GFA calculation. This is considered acceptable given the site's location adjacent to the railway line and the need to manage subsequent noise issues. Council has previously endorsed a similar clause for another Planning Proposal in Granville (The Barn Site which has since been forwarded to the DPE for finalisation) for the purposes of managing noise issues arising from its close proximity to Parramatta Road.

If you have any questions or queries please don't hesitate in giving me a call.

Sebastian Tauni

Senior Planning Officer

Sydney Region West | Planning Services

Level 1, 10 Valentine Avenue Parramatta | GPO Box 39 | Sydney NSW 2001

T 02 8217 2018 E sebastian.tauni@planning.nsw.gov.au



Planning &
Environment



Subscribe to our [newsletter](#)

