SYDNEY EAST JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL

Panel Members: John Roseth (chair), Sue Francis, David Furlong and George Glinatsis Apologies: Ben Keneally - Declarations of Interest: Nil Determination and Statement of Reasons 2014SYE019 - Botany Bay - DA13/279 - Integrated Development - 47 Rhodes Street, Hillsdale (also known as Hillsdale Gowling Club) as described in Schedule 1. Date of determination: 27 August 2014 Decision: The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel determined to refuse the development splication as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at sile inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is	Masting hold at Christian Conference Contra on Made addey 27 Avenuet 2014 at 40 20 m		
Apologies: Ben Keneally - Declarations of Interest: Nil Determination and Statement of Reasons 2014SYE019 - Botany Bay - DA13/279 - Integrated Development - 47 Rhodes Street, Hillsdale (also known as Hillsdale Bowling Club) as described in Schedule 1. Date of determination: 27 August 2014 Decision: The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment o	Meeting held at Christies Conference Centre on Wednesday 27 August 2014 at 10.30am		
Determination and Statement of Reasons 2014SYE019 – Botany Bay – DA13/279 – Integrated Development – 47 Rhodes Street, Hillsdale (also known as Hillsdale Bowling Club) as described in Schedule 1. Date of determination: 27 August 2014 Decision: The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> . Panel consideration: The panel decision: The Panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The panel secolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The panel decision: 1. The panel decision: 1. <td col<="" td=""><td></td></td>	<td></td>		
2014SYE019 - Botany Bay - DA13/279 - Integrated Development - 47 Rhodes Street, Hillsdale (also known as Hillsdale Bowling Club) as described in Schedule 1. Date of determination: 27 August 2014 Decision: The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development			
Hillsdate Bowling Club) as described in Schedule 1. Date of determination: 27 August 2014 Decision: The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the application however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justifi			
Decision: The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong Sue Francis	Hillsdale Bowling Club) as described in Schedule 1.		
The panel determined to refuse the development application as described in Schedule A pursuant to section 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong David Furlong	Date of determination: 27 August 2014		
 80 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Panel consideration: The panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis			
Panel consideration: The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members:			
The panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong Sue Francis			
 meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1. Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair)			
Reasons for the panel decision: The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: 1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong John Roseth (chair) David Furlong David Furlong Sue Francis			
 The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: 	meetings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1.		
 The Panel resolves unanimously not to accept the recommendation in the council assessment report to approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: 	Reasons for the panel decision:		
 approve the application. The Panel resolves to refuse the application for the following reason: The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong 			
 The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having regard to the objectives of those standards. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) 			
regard to the objectives of those standards. 2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong David Furlong David Furlong			
 The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those variations. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) 	1. The proposed clause 4.6 variations for FSR and height of building have not been justified having		
 variations. 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) 	regard to the objectives of those standards.		
 3. The proposal fails to satisfy a number of the criteria contained in SEPP 65 and the associated RFDC for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) 	2. The council assessment report has not demonstrated a better planning outcome from those		
for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: David Furlong Sue Francis	variations.		
Note 1: The Panel notes there is an offer of community benefit from the applicant however there is no comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis			
comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis	for example building separation, building depth, number of units off a corridor and solar access		
comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision. Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis			
Note 2: The Panel notes that this is the first development application in this precinct since the gazettal of Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis			
Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis	comment of acceptability from the Council and this in any case has no bearing on the Panel's decision.		
Botany Bay LEP 2013; therefore any variations to development standards should be fully justified. Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis	Note 2: The Depel potes that this is the first development explication is this president sinds the constant of		
Panel members: John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis			
John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis			
Clif.	Failer members.		
alt.	Joh Roseth March		
George Glinatsis	John Roseth (chair) David Furlong Sue Francis		
George Glinatsis			
George Glinatsis			
	George Glinatsis Muns		

SYDNEY EAST JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL

	SCHEDULE 1
1	JRPP Reference – LGA- Council Reference: 2014SYE019 – Botany Bay – DA13/279
2	Proposed development: Integrated Development
3	Street address: 47 Rhodes Street, Hillsdale (also known as Hillsdale Bowling Club)
4	Applicant/Owner: Krikis Taylor Architects Pty Ltd
5	Type of Regional development: Capital Investment Value > \$20M and Integrated Development
6	Relevant mandatory considerations
	 Environmental planning instruments: Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 – Integrated Development SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP 65 – Deisgn Quailty of Residential Flat Buildings Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 Botany Bay LEP 2013 Draft environmental planning instruments: Nil Development control plans: Botany Bay DCP 2013 Planning agreements: Nil Regulations: Nil The likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on the natural and built environment and social and economic impacts in the locality. The suitability of the site for the development. Any submissions made in accordance with the EPA Act or EPA Regulation.
7	Material considered by the panel: Council Assessment Report Dated: 15 August 2014 Written submissions during public exhibition: 15 Verbal submissions at the panel meeting: Support- Nil; Against- John Aerlic; On behalf of the applicant- Nick Krikis and Larissa Brennan
8	Meetings and site inspections by the panel: Briefing Meeting 16 April 2014
9	Council recommendation: Approval
10	Draft conditions: Attached to council assessment report