

MINUTES OF THE SYDNEY EAST REGIONAL PANEL MEETING HELD AT STRATHFIELD COUNCIL ON THURSDAY 14 OCTOBER 2010 AT 6:00 PM

PRESENT:

John Roseth	Chair
Tim Moore	Member
Mary-Lynne Taylor	Member
Bill Carney	Member
Peter Robinson	Member

IN ATTENDANCE

Silvio Falato	Group Manager Planning and Environment
Stuart Gordon	Consultant Planner
Patrick Wong	Director of Technical Services

APOLOGY:

1. The meeting commenced at 6:04pm
2. **Declarations of Interest – none**

Apologies - none

3. **Business Items**

ITEM 1 - 2010SYE035 Strathfield DA No. 2009/260 – Demolition and construction of eight (8) storey residential flat building, three levels of basement parking with Community Centre by VPA, 29 - 33 Burlington Road & 32 The Crescent, Homebush

5. **Public Submission -**

- Marlene Boran spoke in favour of the development, making the point that the site is now used for dumping rubbish and an alternative approved scheme would be worse than the current proposal.
- Allan Chapple spoke on behalf of the RSL, which supports the proposal.
- Patrick Wong spoke on behalf of the elected councillors, who support the proposal.
- Daniel McNamara and Tony Owens spoke on behalf of the applicant.

6. Business Item Recommendations

2010SYE035 Strathfield DA No. 2009/260 – Demolition and construction of eight (8) storey residential flat building, three levels of basement parking with Community Centre by VPA, 29 - 33 Burlington Road & 32 The Crescent, Homebush

1. The Panel resolves unanimously to accept the planning assessment report's recommendation to refuse the application, generally for the reasons listed in the report, except as expanded below.
2. The Panel notes that the applicant has submitted an Objection under SEPP 1; however, in its opinion, the objection is not well founded. Therefore the absence of an SEPP 1 Objection is not a reason for refusal.
3. The Panel notes that Mr Wong has made a submission on behalf of the elected council in support of the application. It notes also that the council has not made a resolution on the matter. Had such a resolution been made, it could have been submitted to the Panel in writing.
4. The Panel notes also that, quite unusually, there were only speakers in support of the application at the public meeting. The Panel understands that the community desires some development on the site; however, the Panel believes that this proposal is so deficient that it is not in the long-term interest of the site, the precinct or the community. The Panel notes also that the vast majority of the written submissions sent to council were against the proposal.
5. In the Panel's opinion, the main deficiencies of the proposal are its non-compliances with the required setbacks, height, landscaped area and FSR. These controls are not onerous so that a complying proposal would still give plenty of scope for development.
6. The Panel is particularly concerned with the proposal's inadequate setbacks from the site's boundaries, as these have an adverse impact on adjoining sites and curtail their development potential.
7. The Panel looks forward to receiving an application for this site that complies with most of the council's controls or, where it departs from them, achieves a better design and environmental outcome.

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting concluded at 7:21pm

Endorsed by

John Roseth
Chair, Sydney East Region Planning Panel
22 October 2010