Sydney East Joint Regional Planning Panel meeting of 17 May 2012

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

This supplementary report should be read in conjunction with the original development application assessment report.

Property: 7, 7A, 9, 9A, 11, 11A, 11B & 13 Centennial Avenue, 92, 94, &

96 Gordon Crescent, Lane Cove

DA No: 2012SYE008, DA 11/233

Applicant: Hyecorp Property Group

PROPOSAL

The proposed development involves demolition of 11 dwelling houses and construction of a residential flat building complex comprising three buildings with 186 dwellings, a shop and basement car park for 295 cars.

REASONS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

The development application was lodged with Lane Cove Council in December 2011. During the development assessment process, the applicant submitted amended plans to address the requirements of the Lane Cove Development Control Plans and State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 - Design Quality of Residential Flat Development (SEPP 65). At the completion of the assessment report, two of the outstanding issues were as the follows:

- The NSW Rural Fire Service (RFS) did not endorse the application because Block A did not meet with the Asset Protection Zone (APZ) requirements of Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006.
- The response from the Roads and Maritime Service (RMS) was not received by Council because the matter was scheduled for consideration in their regional traffic committee on 9 May 2012.

Further information relating to the above outstanding issues has been received after the completion of the assessment report. This report includes supplementary information received after the report was submitted to the JRPP.

NSW Rural Fire Service

The applicant has agreed to increase the front setback of Block A to meet the RFS's APZ requirements and submitted amended plans to Council on 14 May 2012. The RFS has advised Council on 16 May 2012 that the amended plans now meet the APZ requirements and endorsed the application. Refer to **Attachment 1**.

Roads and Maritime Service (RMS)

The development was scheduled in the regional traffic committee on 9 May 2012. The traffic engineers of RMS, Council assessment officer and the applicant attended the meeting. The committee did not raise any significant issues relating to the traffic management of the proposal and has endorsed the application.

CONCLUSION

Two of the outstanding issues in the assessment report have been resolved.

Attachment 1 - Advice from the Rural Fire Service dated