

Memo

Strategic and Development Services

To: Panel Members – Joint Regional Planning Panel

From: David Kerr, Acting Deputy General Manager, Strategic and Development Services

Date: 16 November 2011

Subject: **2011SYE042** - Demolition works, construction of an infill affordable housing development under SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 and strata and stratum subdivision at Lots 25 & 26 in DP 398815, Nos. 2 & 4 Riverhill Avenue Forestville; Lots 4A in DP 358192, No. 751 Warringah Road Forestville and Lots B, A & C in DP 368072, Nos. 753, 755 & 757 Warringah Road, Forestville

Dear Panel Members,

Council is in receipt of an email from the applicant of the above Development Application which questions the accuracy of three points within the Supplementary Report as referred to the Joint Regional Planning Panel on 9 November 2011. A copy of the email is attached.

Council's response to the questions raised are as follows (comments made by the applicant are in *italic*):

1. *We note that on page 6 Council states that:*

"Although not listed by CKDS Architecture, it is also noted that the western side setback to Building A has been reduced at the ground level from 8.8m to 3.0m and at the upper levels from 3.71m to 3.0m."

The original plans submitted to Council on 25 March 2011 proposed building A to have a western side setback of 8.8m at the ground level. The plans submitted to Council on 22 September 2011 propose a 3.18m setback of building A to the western boundary at ground level, not 3m. Similarly, the upper level side setback is 3.18m, not 3.0m as stated in Council's report. We acknowledge that the setback of Building A has been reduced by 53mm."

Comment:

The applicant is correct on this point. The western side setback to proposed Building A at the ground and upper levels were reported to be reduced to 3.0m. It is concurred that this side setback to both the ground and upper levels are actually reduced to 3.18m.

2. *"Can you please confirm whether the development engineer's comments on page 9 of the report respond to the stormwater and drainage plans submitted with the original DA on 25 March 2011 or the amended stormwater and drainage plans submitted to Council on 8 June 2011?"*

The amended design submitted on 8 June 2011 addresses points 1-13 of the development engineer's initial report and it appears these plans have not been considered."

Comment:

The comments made by Council's Development Engineer refer to the original drainage and stormwater plans submitted with the Development Application on 25 March 2011 and the amended architectural plans submitted on 22 September 2011. The applicant had submitted amended architectural and engineering plans on 8 June 2011 which weren't accepted in their entirety (in accordance with Council's 'Applications for Development Handling of Unclear, Non-Conforming, Insufficient and Amended Applications Policy') and were not referred to the Development Engineer as there were fundamental planning issues with the Development Application. The recently submitted amended architectural plans, the subject of the Supplementary Report, have changed the above and below ground layout and, subsequently, made the previous sets of engineering plans redundant. Amended drainage and stormwater plans did not accompany the recently amended architectural plans and Council's Development Engineer has addressed this accordingly.

3. *"We seek confirmation that Council has made an error in paragraph 3 under the heading 'Conclusion.' Throughout the amended application process (including discussions with the RTA) Council has made it clear that it would not support ingress and egress from Riverhill Avenue and wanted the least amount of traffic flow possible on Riverhill Avenue. The outcome suggested in paragraph 3 of the conclusion contradicts all previous advice from the Council. The traffic and parking proposal submitted by the applicant provides a much better outcome which responds to the residents of Riverhill Avenue and the surrounding streets expressed concerns. Please confirm Council's position is that if approved it will seek and egress only to Riverhill Avenue."*

Comment:

Paragraph 3 states "Council's Development Engineer and Landscape Officer each raised fundamental concerns. Council's Traffic Engineer identified that, given the prohibition for access/egress onto Warringah Road, all traffic access/egress would be directed onto Riverhill Avenue and that a revised traffic report would be required to be submitted to appropriately address this."

As the comments provided by the respective Development Engineer, Landscape Officer and Traffic Engineer are included within the body of the Supplementary Report this paragraph is revised to state Council's Development Engineer, Landscape Officer and Traffic Engineer each raised concerns which are addressed under 'Internal Referrals' in this report.

Conclusion

The above review of the submission from the applicant identifies two minor amendments to the Supplementary Report (Points 1 and 3) which do not have an impact on the recommendation.



David Kerr
Acting Deputy General Manager, Strategic and Development Services