## **RECORD OF PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATION MEETING**

DETAI	1 9	OE ADI	ם וכ	`	UT.							
Name	_	OF APPLICANT egral Financial C/o DEM Pty Ltd						Rudi Valla – DEM				
Phone	88	<del> </del>		Mobile 041058				E-mail	edmond.tang@dem.com.au			
MEETI	NG	DETAI	LS									
Date	Thursday 18 December 2014							Time	3:00pm – 4:00pm			
Place	Gro	ound Floor Meeting Room, Gosford Cit						ty Co	y Council, 49 Mann Street Gosford			
PROP	ER1	Y DET										
Proposal Five (5) Storey Residential Flat Building comprising 75 Apartment Units and Basement Car Parking								Units and				
Owner		Murcielago Group Pty Ltd										
Lot No 100		D	OP 1066540					Zonings F		R1 General Residential		
Address	3	70 Johr	n Whi	itew	ay D	rive Go	sford					
Previous Approvals		DAs		В			BAs				CAs	
ATTEN	IDE	ES										
Development Planner			Robert Eyre									
Development Engineer			Carlo Favetta									
Architect			Mark Wasson									
Waste Management			Ross Spare									
Water & Sewer				Graham Masters - Comments provided								
ISSUE												
seeking t	to ind	crease fro	m 40	Un	its to	75 Units	by chang	ing u	nit mix on	typical	floors add	l valid. New DA is ding one extra g footprint.
floor and one extra basement carpark within the extent Gosford LEP 2014						Car Parking						
Gosford DCP 2013						S94A Contributions						
Height & FSR						Bushfire Prone Land						
Building Setbacks						Current Consent						
View Analysis (including from Gosford Waterfront)						Shadow Impact						
Landslip Risk						SEI	PPs 19 & 6	35				

## **MINUTES**

## **Planning**

- 1 Max height RL 77.0 on AHD
- 2 Zone R1 Residential GLEP 2014
- 3 Max FSR 1.5:1 (incl C/P above ground level) Variations subject to Clause 4.6 GLEP 2014
- 4 S94 Contribution

2% up until end of January 2015 4% of value from 1 February 2015 Chapter 4.1 of Gosford DCP 2013

- 5 Street setback 5m 6m (Landscape setback)
- 6 Setbacks Residential

Up to 12m height Street 5m – 6m

Side 3m /6m (non-habitable/habitable rooms)

Rear 6m

Above 12m height Street 5m – 6m

Side 4.5m /9m (non-habitable/habitable rooms) Rear 6m/9m (non-habitable/habitable rooms)

7 Maximum site coverage 50% Minimum Deep Soil Planting 15%

8 Car Parking 1 bed - 1 space

1 bed - 1 space 2 bed - 1.2 spaces 3 bed > - 1.5 spaces Visitor - 0.2 / unit

10% disability parking spaces

Motorcycle - 1 space / 15 units
Bicycle - 1 space / 3 units
+ 1 visitor / 12 units

## Other Matters to be addressed

- 9 Show tree removal / clearing / Asset Protection Zone.
- 10 Water & Sewer / Services Est. \$320,000.00 (\$6477 ET).
- 11 Street Address required (consider breaking building into different components).
- 12 Geotechnical Report.
- 13 Quantity Survey Report.
- 14 BCA / BASIX.
- 15 Safer By Design.
- 16 Shadow Impact show complying height and proposed height shadows.
- 17 CD disc required for electronic registration / Guide to Submitting Das.

- 18 Height Variation view analysis from surrounding area including waterfront.
- 19 Comparison to previous consent.
- 20 Bushfire Report required.

## **Engineering**

- 1. Engineering requirements will be similar to DA19775/2003. Eg provision of footpath, heavy duty vehicle crossing in Georgiana Terrace, tie-in with fire trail, catch drain at the top of the cliff line to direct stormwater to Georgiana Terrace.
- 2. The following are to be submitted with the DA:
  - a. Water Cycle Management Strategy in accordance with Chapter 6.7 DCP2013. NB: Refer to Section 6.7.6.2 Table 1 and Section 6.7.6.5 of Chapter 6.7.
  - b. Design compliance statement from traffic consultant that the proposed development complies with AS 2890.
  - c. Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by a traffic consultant.
  - d. Preliminary engineering plans covering the proposed road and driveway works.
     The plans are to demonstrate that the development will comply with Council's Design Specification and the AS standards.
     NB:
    - Long-sections are to be plotted along the steeper side edges of accesses to demonstrate that grades and grade changes are AS 2890 compliant.
    - Provide details on tie-in with fire trail.
    - Provide delineation between public roadway and heavy duty vehicle crossing.
    - Grade heavy duty vehicle crossing towards roadway to prevent ingress of stormwater into the development.
- 3. Water and Sewer contributions apply.

#### **Architectural**

The proposal is subject to SEPP 65 and the Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC).

A multi unit development is supported in principle but the proposal shown does not comply with the requirements of the DCP or the RFDC and requires amendments to address the following issues:

 The RFDC recommends 20% of the site for sites over 1500m² is allocated to deep soil planting. The narrow setbacks, parking built to the boundary and large cuts reduce options for significant landscaping and deep soil planting, particularly on the street frontages.

The building and parking area should be redesigned to accommodate a minimum of six large (min. 15 metre mature height) trees within the front setback. Fewer but larger trees are more successful in providing visual breaks, softening and shade than large areas of shrubs or groundcover.

Street trees are supported but are an addition to, not a substitute for deep soil planting on site.

2. Units on level 1 facing the street are up to 4 metres below ground level resulting in poor outlook and solar access and should be amended.

- 3. There must be safe internal access to the pool from all blocks without passing through the carpark. This an amenity and particularly a safety issue for children.
- 4. Units and balconies above the carpark ramp and garbage collection area have poor amenity and should be amended.
- 5. The RFDC recommends 18 metres separation for buildings over 12 metres high. The top floor on the north eastern section of the building does not achieve this.

## **Solid Waste Management**

 Submission plans are to indicate fully dimensioned waste storage enclosures located to be readily accessible to residents, caretaker and the Council Domestic Waste Contractor for proposed Residential occupancies. Note: The proposed 75 residential units will require minimum 3 x 1.5m³ mixed waste bulk bins and 3 x 1.5m³ recyclable waste bulk bins for a twice weekly service.

A nominal number of 240 litre green waste MGB's may be proposed subject to available street frontage for kerbside collection for shared use of the residents.

2. A waste truck servicing location, bulk bin roll out area and waste storage enclosures are to be indicated at a maximum 3% gradient.

The waste truck servicing location to be located to not impede other vehicle movements within the development. Alternatively, arrangements including an internal traffic light system designed and certified by the applicants Traffic Engineer to the satisfaction of Councils Assessment Engineer to restrict internal vehicle movements while waste servicing is undertaken will be required to be provided.

- 3. Access for minimum 10.0m long, dual rear axle, rear locating HRV is to be demonstrated by turning template overlays onto submission plans. Turning and manoeuvring for waste vehicle movements to be designed and certified to AS2890.2 by the Applicants Traffic Engineer.
- 4. A minimum 4.0m height clearance is required in all waste vehicle manoeuvring areas.
- 5. Submission of a detailed Waste Management Plan in accordance with the Gosford City Council Development Application Guide and Gosford DCP 2013 for all demolition, construction, use of premises and ongoing management of waste.
- 6. Submission of a detailed Waste Management Strategy to clearly identify responsibilities, processes and procedures for management of waste generated within the completed development from all proposed uses.

## **NOTE**

This is a pre application meeting only. The details are intended to guide the applicant in the preparation and lodgement of a formal development application. The proposal has undergone preliminary assessment only. Further issues may become apparent, and additional information may be required from the applicant during the formal assessment phase. This meeting in no way infers nor implies that development consent will be granted to this proposal. Applications as indicated above may not reflect the full development history of the property. Should a full development history be required a search application and fee will apply.

Signed: Robert Eyre

Date: 5 January 2015

# Response to matters raised in Pre - DA meeting of 18 December 2014

Issues Raised by Council	Applicant Responses to Issues raised
Gosford LEP 2014	The proposal complies with all relevant LEP provisions and objectives for the site except for height. Refer to Relevant Sections in submitted SOEE & DA documentation.
Gosford DCP 2013	The proposal complies with all relevant DCP provisions and objectives for the site except for height. Refer to Appendix H DCP Compliance Table by DEM Architects for details and relevant sections in submitted SOEE and DA documentation.
Height & FSR	The additional height sought is justified on the basis of detailed Urban Design analysis including detailed shadow studies and visual impact analysis. FSR complies with density provisions for the site. Refer to Appendix C SEPP 65 Design Verification Statement by DEM Architects for details.
Building Setbacks	The proposal fully complies with all setback requirements stipulated in Council's codes. Refer to Appendix C SEPP 65 Design Verification Statement by DEM Architects and Appendix H DCP Compliance Table by DEM Architects for details.
View Analysis (including from Gosford Waterfront)	A detailed visual impact analysis has been undertaken as part of the design process and submitted as part of the DA which demonstrates minimal visual impacts stemming from the proposal. Refer to Appendix E Visual Impact Assessment by DEM Architects for details.
Car Parking	The proposal fully complies with all parking requirements stipulated in Council's codes. Refer to Appendix O Assessment of Traffic and Parking Implications by Transport & Traffic Planning Associates for details.
S94A Contributions	Council confirmed that 2% reduction of S94a contribution would apply if the DA will be lodged by 31st of January 2015.
Bushfire Prone Land	A detailed Bushfire Report has been undertaken as part of the design process and submitted as part of the DA which identifies suitable bushfire mitigation measures which can be incorporated into the proposal. The proposal includes an important upgrade to the emergency vehicle acess to the Rumbalara Reserve from the proposed new extension to Georgiana Terrace. Refer to Appendix I Bushfire Protection Assessment by Eco Logical Australia and the submitted DA documentation for details.
Current Consent	Substantial commencement has occurred with current DA consent DA 19775/2003 till valid.
Shadow Impact	A detailed shadow impact analysis has been undertaken as part of the design process and submitted as part of the DA which demonstrates minimal overshadowing impacts stemming from the proposal. Refer to Shadow Diagrams for details
SEPPs 19 & 65	Refer to Appendix C, D and SEE for details.

Planning	
1. Max height RL 77.0 on AHD	The proposal seeks a maximum height or RL 81.2 The additional height sought is justified on the basis of detailed Urban Design analysis including detailed shadow studies and visual impact analysis Refer to Appendix F - Exceed height control under Clause 4.6 of the LEP by Ingham Planning for details
2. Zone R1 Residential GLEP 2014	The proposed development is consistent with th objectives of the R1 Residential zoning.
3. Max FSR 1.5:1 (incl C/P above grou Variations subject to Clause 4.6 GLE	
4. S94 Contribution	Noted.
2% up until end of January 2015 value from 1 February 2015 Chapter 4.1 of Gosford DCP 2013	1% of
5. Street setback 5m – 6m (Landscape se 6. Setbacks Residential	requirements stipulated in Council's codes. Refer to drawings and compliance Table for details.
Up to 12m height Street 5m – 6n Side 3m /6n habitable/habi rooms) Rear 6m	m (non- drawings and compliance
habitable/habi rooms)	om (non- table m (non- table
7. Maximum site coverage 50% Minimu Soil Planting 15%	The proposal complies with maximum site coverage requirements stipulated in Council's codes as follows:  Proposed site coverage = 37% of site area.  Proposed deep soil zone = 30% of site area.
8. Car Parking  1 bed - 1 space 2 bed - 1.2 spaces 3 bed - 1.5 spaces Visitor - 0.2/unit	The proposal fully complies with all parkin requirements stipulated in Council's codes a follows:  The proposed car park is split over one and ha level. A total of 106 car parking spaces ar
10% disability parkir Motorcycle – 1 units Bicycle – 1 space/3 u	provided for residents and visitors.  Designated bicycle store and motorcycle parkin spaces are provided in accordance with relevant codes requirements as follow.
+ 1 visitor/12d Motorcycle – 1 units	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Motorcycle = 5 space
9. Show tree removal / clearing / Asset P	Bicycle = 25 resident's spaces + 7 visitor spaces

Zone.	submitted landscape drawings and Arborist Report Refer to landscape drawings and Bush Fire report.
10. Water & Sewer / Services Est. \$320,000.00 (\$6477 ET).	Noted.
11. Street Address required (consider breaking building into different components).	The proposal has been broken down to provide 3 residential appartment clusters all with their own individual street address and lobby. This assists in breaking down and humanizing the overall mass on the building and greatly enhances street activation along the John Whiteway Drive streetscape. Refer submitted DA plans and 3D images.
12. Geotechnical Report.	The site is subject to a current approval which is very similar in footprint and size to the current proposal. The current Consent has already considered and addressed geotechnical constraints and issues. It was confirmed in the Pre-DA meeting that it would be appropriate to condition an updated Geotech investigation for the site to be provided prior to Construction Certificate approval.
13. Quantity Survey Report.	The applicant has received advice from their Quantity Surveyor that the estimated cost of the development is \$24,600,400.00
14. BCA / BASIX.	A detailed BASIX report and preliminary BCA review of the proposed design have been undertaken. Refer to Basix report for details
15. Safer By Design.	A detailed Safety in Design Report has been prepared. Refer to Appendix L Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Statement by DEM Architects for details
16. Shadow Impact – show complying height and proposed height shadows.	A detailed shadow impact analysis has been undertaken as part of the design process and submitted as part of the DA which demonstrates minimal overshadowing impacts stemming from the proposal. Refer to Shadow Diagrams for details.
<ol><li>17. CD disc required for electronic registration / Guide to Submitting Das.</li></ol>	Noted and provided as part of the DA.
18. Height Variation – view analysis from surrounding area including waterfront.	The additional height sought is justified on the basis of detailed Urban Design analysis including detailed shadow studies and visual impact analysis. Refer to Appendix F - Exceed height control under Clause 4.6 of the LEP by Ingham Planning for details.
19. Comparison to previous consent.	A detailed compliance comparison between the existing Consent and the proposed DA has been provided. Refer to Appendix H DCP Compliance Table by DEM Architects for details
20. Bushfire Report required.	A detailed Bushfire Report has been undertaken as part of the design process and submitted as part of the DA which identifies suitable bushfire mitigation measures which can be incorporated into the proposal. Refer to Appendix I Bushfire Protection Assessment by Eco Logical Australia for details
Engineering	
<ol> <li>Engineering requirements will be similar to DA19775/2003. Eg provision of footpath, heavy duty vehicle crossing in Georgiana Terrace, tie-in with fire trail, catch drain at the top of the cliff line to direct stormwater to</li> </ol>	Engineering requirements have been addressed in the submitted Civil and Stormwater DA drawings. Refer to submitted civil and stormwater design DA package.

Georgiana Terrace. 2. The following are to be submitted with the DA: Water Management requirements have been Water Cycle Management Strategy in addressed in the submitted Civil and Stormwater accordance with Chapter 6.7 DCP2013. DA drawings and BASIX Report. Refer to NB: Refer to Section 6.7.6.2 Table 1 and stormwater management report and basix report for Section 6.7.6.5 of Chapter 6.7. details. A detailed Traffic Report has been formulated and b. Design compliance statement from traffic consultant that submitted as part of the DA package which the proposed development complies with AS 2890. confirms compliance with AS 2890. Refer to traffic and parking assessment report for details c. Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by a traffic A detailed traffic impact assessment has been consultant. formulated as part of the design process and included in the Traffic Report submitted as part of the DA package. Refer to traffic and parking assessment report for details d. Preliminary engineering plans covering the Civil and Structural Engineering requirements proposed road and driveway works. The plans related to the proposed road and driveway works are to demonstrate that the development will have been addressed in the submitted Civil DA comply with Council's Design Specification and drawings. Refer to civil works package for details. the AS standards. NB: Long-sections are to be plotted along the steeper side edges of accesses demonstrate that grades and grade changes are AS 2890 compliant. Provide details on tie-in with fire trail. Provide delineation between public roadway and heavy duty vehicle crossing. Grade heavy duty vehicle crossing towards roadway to prevent ingress of stormwater into the development. 3. Water and Sewer contributions apply. Noted. Architectural The proposal is subject to SEPP 65 and the The proposed development has been designed in Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC). full compliance with the provisions of SEPP 65. A multi unit development is supported in principle but the proposal shown does not comply with the requirements of the DCP or the RFDC and requires amendments to address the following issues: 1. The RFDC recommends 20% of the site for Approx. 30% of site area is deep soil area. sites over 1500m<sup>2</sup> is allocated to deep soil The building and parking design adopts the same building footprint as the previous consent approval planting. The narrow setbacks, parking built to maximise solar access and cross ventilation to the boundary and large cuts reduce compliance. options for significant landscaping and deep Refer to SEPP 65 and DCP compliance table and soil planting, particularly on the Design Verification statement for details. frontages. The proposal accommodates 21 Street Trees within The building and parking area should be the deep soil road reserve and allows for 6 redesigned to accommodate a minimum of six substantial trees to be planted above the carpark large (min. 15 metre mature height) trees within podium. Given the level of the basement and the the front setback. Fewer but larger trees are height and size of the podium tree planters these more successful in providing visual breaks, trees can grow to a height of 12 - 15m. Refer to softening and shade than large areas of shrubs landscape drawings and indicative 3D images for or groundcover. proposed large trees location and landscape treatment within street set back area. Street trees are supported but are an addition

to, not a substitute for deep soil planting on

site.

Units on level 1 facing the street are up to 4 metres below ground level resulting in poor outlook and solar access and should be amended. All apartments have been carefully designed to maximise solar acess during the mid winter period. Due to the site's steep topography and the existing grade along John Whiteway Drive some benching of the site and terracing of the design is unavoidable. The majority of apartments which have been positioned below the road reserve have been structured as dual aspect apartments so that ample light and ventilation is provided from the more elevated eastern side of the development. In addition to this the proposal provides substantial landscape setbacks and treatments along the John Whiteway street frontage setback. This provides excellent privacy, a good landscaped outlook and ample feeling of space from the recessed courtyards and from inside of the apartments.

3. There must be safe internal access to the pool from all blocks without passing through the carpark. This an amenity and particularly a safety issue for children.

A series of safe and secure corridors has been provided to give direct access from all residential lobbies to the communal recreation terrace and pool area.

4. Units and balconies above the carpark ramp and garbage collection area have poor amenity and should be amended.

The bedroom immediately above the car park/garbage pickup area has been deleted. Adequate screening and architectural features have been incorporated to balconies and windows overlooking the driveway.

5. The RFDC recommends 18 metres separation for buildings over 12 metres high. The top floor on the north eastern section of the building does not achieve this.

The top floor/penthouse levels of the adjoining towers are setback from its typical floor footprint which provides setbacks of 18.6m to 28.9 m from habitable space to habitable space. This provides sufficient building separation to the proposed development.

Refer to drawings for details.

## Solid Waste Management

1. Submission plans are to indicate fully dimensioned waste storage enclosures located to be readily accessible to residents, caretaker and the Council Domestic Waste Contractor for proposed Residential occupancies. Note: The proposed 75 residential units will require minimum 3 x 1.5m $^3$  mixed waste bulk bins and 3 x 1.5m<sup>3</sup> recyclable waste bulk bins for a twice weekly service.

A detailed Waste Management Plan has been submitted with the DA. Refer to waste management plan for details.

street frontage for kerbside collection for shared use of the residents.

A nominal number of 240 litre green waste MGB's may be proposed subject to available

The proposed design allows for this requirement to be accommodated. Refer to submitted plans, waste management plan and traffic report for details.

2. A waste truck servicing location, bulk bin roll out area and waste storage enclosures are to be indicated at a maximum 3% gradient.

The waste truck servicing location to be located to not impede other vehicle movements within the development. Alternatively, arrangements including an

internal traffic light system designed and certified by the applicants Traffic Engineer to the satisfaction of Councils Assessment Engineer to restrict internal vehicle movements while waste servicing is undertaken will be required to be provided.  3. Access for minimum 10.0m long, dual rear axle, rear locating HRV is to be demonstrated by turning template overlays onto submission plans. Turning and manoeuvring for waste vehicle movements to be designed and certified to AS2890.2 by the Applicants Traffic Engineer.	The proposed design allows for this requirement to be accommodated. Refer to submitted plans, waste management plan and traffic report for details.
A. A minimum 4.0m height clearance is required in all waste vehicle manoeuvring areas.	The proposed design allows for this requirement to be accommodated. The bedroom immediately above the car park/garbage pickup area has been deleted.  More than 4.0m clearance is provided
5. Submission of a detailed Waste Management Plan in accordance with the Gosford City Council Development Application Guide and Gosford DCP 2013 for all demolition, construction, use of premises and ongoing management of waste.	A detailed Waste Management Plan has been submitted with the DA. Refer to waste management plan for details.
6. Submission of a detailed Waste Management Strategy to clearly identify responsibilities, processes and procedures for management of waste generated within the completed development from all proposed uses.	A detailed Waste Management Plan has been submitted with the DA. Refer to waste management plan for details.
NOTE This is a pre application meeting only. The details are intended to guide the applicant in the preparation and lodgement of a formal development application. The proposal has undergone preliminary assessment only. Further issues may become apparent, and additional information may be required from the applicant during the formal assessment phase. This meeting in no way infers nor implies that development consent will be granted to this proposal. Applications as indicated above may not reflect the full development history of the property. Should a full development history be required a search application and fee will apply.	Noted.