

John Brunton (9710 0474) File Ref: DA10/1253

28 March, 2011

Dr John Roseth Chairman Sydney East Region Joint Regional Planning Panel GPO Box 3415 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir

Sutherland NSW 1499 Australia Tel 02 9710 0333 Fax 02 9710 0265 DX4511 SUTHERLAND

Administration Centre

Please reply to: General Manager,

Locked Bag 17,

4-20 Eton Street, Sutherland NSW 2232 Australia

Email ssc@ssc.nsw.gov.au www.sutherland.nsw.gov.au ABN 52 018 204 808

Office Hours 8.30am to 4.30pm Monday to Friday

Council Submission: JRPP Reference Number 2010SYE106 (DA10/1253) 442-446 Captain Cook Drive, Kurnell Staged development of residential subdivision to create 165 lots [In response, please quote File Ref: DA10/1253]

At its meeting of 21 March, 2011 Council considered a report in relation to this application for residential subdivision of land near Bate Bay which was rezoned for residential use last year. After some discussion Council resolved that the Panel be informed that Council considers that the proposal warrants support, subject to the imposition of a condition of development consent.

Many years ago the Land & Environment Court approved an application for the reshaping of this site which had previously been used for sand extraction. Allied to that consent was an approval for the land to be subdivided to facilitate industrial/business development. Subsequently, the relevant State Environmental Planning Policy has been amended to permit residential development on the site.

Generally, the Council is satisfied that there are no policy issues which arise as a result of this proposal. Satisfactory compliance with all relevant technical standards will be examined in the development assessment report.

However, Council did express its concern about the width of some roads, particularly Road 1 adjacent to the eastern boundary. An explanation has been provided by the applicant that car parking is provided only along the western side of this road. It is argued by the applicant that houses are to be erected on only one side of the street. Consequently, parking should be provided to only serve these residences. Concern has been expressed by the applicant that additional parking will encourage the parking of cars being driven by persons seeking access to the adjoining sandhills and beach. To ensure that the local road network is not used by visitors who are not visiting

residents of the estate, the applicant argues additional parking should not be provided.

Council has not accepted this argument. It is the position of Council that currently all streets in the vicinity of beaches and the ocean are utilised by motorists who wish to park in close proximity to the ocean. Parking is provided to cater for this demand. To not require similar car parking in this location would be inconsistent and discriminatory.

It is the position of Council "that the width of Road 1 along the eastern boundary of the site should be increased in width by 2.5m to enable the provision of an additional lane for the parking of cars due to the anticipated demand for car parking in this vicinity". As the applicant is aware of this decision of Council, it is expected that an amended design will be presented to the Panel at its meeting. If this does not occur Council requests that a suitable condition of consent be inserted.

Council submits that the concept of the proposed subdivision is generally acceptable. However, with the location of the subdivision relative to the beach an unusual set of circumstances arises. Council submits that parking to satisfy this additional demand should be required through a condition of development consent.

Yours faithfully

John Brunton

Director - Environmental Services

for J W Rayner General Manager