

**JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL
(Sydney East Region)**

JRPP No:	2016SYE045
DA No:	DA16/0223
Local Government Area:	Sutherland Shire
Proposed Development:	Construction of additional bulky goods floor space, introduction of new tenancies, internal upgrading and revitalisation of the existing Caringbah Homemaker Centre, including additional carparking and landscaping enhancement
Street Address:	Lot 101 DP 417983, Lot 21 DP 800924, Lot 22 DP 800924, Lot 23 DP 800924 - 41-49 Willarong Road, 39 Willarong Road, 29 Koonya Circuit, and 31 Koonya Circuit, Caringbah
Applicant/Owner:	Aventus Property
Number of Submissions:	Two
Regional Development Criteria (Schedule 4A of the Act)	General Development over \$20 million
List of All Relevant s79C(1)(a) Matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015 (SSLEP2015) • State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 – Remediation of Land (SEPP 55) • State Environmental Planning Policy 64 – Advertising and Signage (SEPP 64) • State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005 • State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (Infrastructure SEPP) • Greater Metropolitan Regional Environmental Plan No. 2 – Georges River Catchment • Draft Sutherland Shire Development Control Plan 2015 (DSSDCP2015) • Section 94 Contributions Plans: Employment Lands s94ALevy Plan.
Recommendation:	<i>Approval subject to conditions</i>
Report By:	Reid, J Development Assessment Officer Sutherland Shire Council

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Reason for Report

Pursuant to the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005, this application is referred to the Joint Regional Planning Panel (JRPP) as the development has a capital investment of more than \$20,000,000. The application submitted to Council nominates the value of the project as \$33,318,560.00.

1.2 Proposal

The application is for alterations and additions to the existing Caringbah Homemaker Centre involving the extension of bulky goods floor space at ground floor and first floor as well as a new second floor. The proposal includes internal and external upgrades, the introduction of additional tenancies and the provision of additional landscaping and parking.

1.3 The Site

The subject site is located on the eastern side of Taren Point Road, with additional frontages to Koonya Circuit and Willarong Road.

1.4 The Issues

The main issues identified are as follows:

- Non-compliance with the development control for height
- Pedestrian Access
- Vehicle Access
- Landscaping
- Stormwater management
- Signage

1.5 Conclusion

Following detailed assessment of the proposed development the current application is considered worthy of support, subject to minor amendments and conditions including:

- Reduction in the parapet height for the second floor retail level from a maximum RL of RL24.5 to a maximum RL of RL23.5.
- Delete all signage and signage structures, requiring a separate development application and signage strategy.
- Detailed stormwater drainage design
- A covenant to be registered on title requiring the ongoing care and maintenance of the proposed flood system.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

An application has been received for alterations and additions to the existing Caringbah Homemaker Centre involving the extension of bulky goods floor space at ground floor and first floor as well as a new second floor. The proposal includes internal and external upgrades, the introduction of additional tenancies and the provision of additional landscaping and parking.

The proposal consists of 12,573m² of additional gross floor area (GFA). The proposal will result in an additional 59 spaces within the car park, bringing the overall level of parking provisions on the site to 637. The parking area will also provide parking for 26 motor bikes and 42 bicycles.

The main pedestrian entrance into the development is proposed to be from Koonya Circuit however, access can also be obtained from Taren Point Road. There is also access from Willarong Road via the car park.

Vehicular access into the different levels of car park is from Koonya Circuit and the south and the north end of Willarong Road.

The majority of the existing trees surrounding the site are proposed to be retained with additional canopy tree planting proposed.

The applicant proposes approximately 100 sign zones in addition to way finding and parking directional signage.

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCALITY

The subject land is located at 41-49 and 39 Willarong Road and 29 and 31 Koonya Circuit, 31 Koonya Circuit, Caringbah. Currently situated on the site is a two (2) storey bulky goods retail development with parking for 550 cars known as 'Caringbah Homemaker Centre', a swim school with parking for 5 cars at 39 Willarong Road and a commercial building with parking for 8 cars at 31 Koonya Circuit.

The site is irregular in shape and has a total site area of 24,308m². The development area consists of a 134m frontage to Willarong Road to the east, a 79m frontage to Koonya Circuit to the north and a 70m frontage to Taren Point Road to the west. The southern boundary is over 220m long.

The existing Homemaker Centre is known as 41-49 Willarong Road and is accessed from Willarong Road as well as Koonya Circuit via 29 Koonya Circuit which is under separate ownership. Pedestrians can enter from Taren Point Road via a ground floor tenancy or the roof top car park off Willarong Road. The swim school (39 Willarong Road) is accessed from Willarong Road while the commercial building at 31 Koonya Circuit is accessed from Koonya Circuit close to the intersection with Willarong Road.

The site has a moderate fall to the east of some 5.4m from Taren Point Road to Willarong Road along its southern boundary and 3.5m along the Koonya Circuit frontage. There is also a slight fall to the north of approximately 1.0m along the Taren Point Road frontage and 2.4m along the Willarong Road frontage.

The site is flood affected with a flood risk category mainly ranging from medium to low. However, the southern section of Koonya Circuit is categorised as a high flood risk. There are several existing trees on and adjacent to the site along Willarong Road and several highly pruned trees within the Taren Point frontage. Most of the trees along the Willarong Road frontage are proposed to be retained while those adjacent to Taren Point Road frontage are proposed to be replaced.

Land to the north and south of the site is also zoned B5 Business Development. Surrounding development in this area includes small industrial units, bulky goods developments including Domain Furniture and Australia Post. Bunnings is located directly opposite the site off the northern side of Koonya Circuit. The recently approved redevelopment of Bunnings will provide both the main pedestrian entry and vehicle access off this section of Koonya Circuit.

Properties off the eastern side of Willarong Road are zoned R2 Low Density Residential and consist primarily of single dwellings. The Endeavour Sports High School is located directly opposite the site off the western side of Taren Point Road.



Figure 3: Location of site



Figure 4: Aerial photograph of site

4.0 BACKGROUND

A history of the development proposal is as follows:

- An extension to the retail space of the Homemaker Centre was approved by the Joint Regional Planning Panel on 1 August 2012. This consent has not commenced.
- The owners of the site (BB Retail Capital) have since purchased two adjoining properties and now seek to incorporate these into the existing centre.
- A proposal for this site was reviewed by the Architectural Review Advisory Panel (ARAP) on 22 May 2014 prior to submission of the current application. An informal meeting was also had with Council staff on 15 December 2014. The concept presented at these meetings proposed a similar form to that submitted, except for minor amendments to the new pedestrian entrance from Koonya Circuit. Concern was raised regarding the clarity and quality of the entry off Koonya Circuit and the proposed the landscape concept.
- At the time of these meetings, Local Environmental Plan 2006 was in force. The proposal did not comply with the development standards for height, landscaped area, or density under this plan.
- The applicant consulted with surrounding residents on 30 March 2015.
- An Information Session was held on 13 April 2016 and 1 person attended.

- Council requested that the following additional information in a letter dated 18 May 2016;
 - Excessive height not supported
 - A lower floor to ceiling height for the second floor.
 - All existing deep soil is to be retained
 - Accuracy of submitted plans
 - Necessity for the submission of an arborist report
 - Requirement for light weight shade structures to rooftop parking area
 - Requirement for additional / improved landscaping at ground floor and rooftop level
 - Additional stormwater and flooding information required
- Amended plans were lodged on 18 July 2016.
- The application was considered by Council's Submissions Review Panel on 10 August 2016.

5.0 ADEQUACY OF APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

In relation to the Statement of Environmental Effects, plans and other documentation submitted with the application or after a request from Council, the applicant has provided adequate information to enable an assessment of this application, including a clause 4.6 Objection requesting a variation to the height standard.

6.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The application was advertised in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 12 of Sutherland Shire Development Control Plan 2006 (SSDCP 2006).

342 adjoining or affected owners were notified of the proposal and 2 submissions were received as a result.

Submissions were received from the following properties:

Address	Date of Letter/s	Issues
74 Willarong Road Caringbah	14 April 2016	Traffic Landscaping
41-49 Willarong Road, 39 Willarong Road, 29 Koonya Circuit and 31 Koonya Circuit Caringbah	21 April 2016	Traffic Height Landscaping Sufficiency of information

The issues raised in these submissions are as follows:

1. Height – The proposal is over the height limit with the majority of the non-compliance associated to the provision of an additional retail level with a ceiling height of approximately 7.6m. This

ceiling height is excessive and unwarranted given the ceiling heights of the existing retail levels are approximately 5.3m. The visual impact of this is not consistent with the surrounding developments or the objectives of the development standard.

Comment: Height is addressed in Section 10.1 of the report.

2. Traffic and parking – The proposal is deficient with Council's controls for car parking by 144 cars. Justification for this is based on parking surveys for the existing centre. This does not accurately consider future parking needs once the centre is expanded and upgraded.

Comment: Car parking is addressed in Section 10.4 of the report.

3. Landscaped Area – The proposal does not comply with landscaped area requirements and proposes to remove several trees without adequate compensatory tree replacement.

Comment: Landscaping area is addressed in Section 10.2 of the report.

4. Insufficient information – The elevations and photomontages does not adequately show the second floor retail and therefore the visual impact of this.

Comment: The information adequately depicts the proposal for the purposes of the assessment.

Submission Review Panel (SRP)

The 2 submissions received by Council during public exhibition were considered by Council's SRP on 10 August 2016. The SRP concluded that all matters raised within the submissions are either not substantive or can be dealt with via condition of consent.

Information Session

An information session was held on 13 April 2016 where one resident attended. The issues discussed related to the impact of the development on the streetscape and the impact on traffic movement on the intersection on Willarong Road and Captain Cook Drive.

Revised Plans

The applicant lodged revised architectural plans on 12 July 2016. The amendments made to the original proposal included the following:

- Reduction of floor to floor heights of the additional level
- The submission of a detailed landscape plan
- Updated plans confirming deep soil and existing trees to be retained
- Updated rooftop plans to remove pergolas and replace with light weight structures
- The introduction of 3 new trees in the south west corner of the rooftop adjacent to the staff seating area.

- Car parking numbers and layout revised to reflect revised unit number.
- Amendment to the ground floor plan to re-align the arcade to improve way finding for pedestrian access into the centre and to the central vertical access to other levels.

It was deemed unnecessary to renotify the amended proposal on the basis that all amendments were either minor in the context of the overall development or significantly reduced the impact on adjoining properties.

7.0 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

The subject land is located within Zone B5 Business Development pursuant to the provisions of Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015. The proposed development, being a bulky good premise, is a permissible land use within the zone with development consent from Council.

The following Environmental Planning Instruments (EPI's), Development Control Plan (DCP), Codes or Policies are relevant to this application:

The provisions of the following environmental planning instruments and development control plans are of particular relevance to the assessment of the application:

- Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015 (SSLEP2015)
- State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 – Remediation of Land (SEPP 55)
- State Environmental Planning Policy 64 – Advertising and Signage (SEPP 64)
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (Infrastructure SEPP)
- Greater Metropolitan Regional Environmental Plan No. 2 – Georges River Catchment
- Draft Sutherland Shire Development Control Plan 2015 (DSSDCP2015)
- Section 94 Developer Contributions Plan - Employment Lands s94ALevy Plan.

8.0 STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The statement of compliance below contains a summary of applicable development standards and controls and a compliance checklist relative to these:

Standard/Control	Required	Proposed	Complies
Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015			
Clause 4.3 Height of buildings	Max 16m	17.45m to 18.5m	No
Clause 4.4 Floor Space Ratio (FSR)	Max 1.5:1 (36,462m ²)	1.45:1 (35,157m ²)	Yes
Clause 6.14 Landscaped Area	Min 10% (2430.8m ²)	6.75% (1,640m ²)	No

Standard/Control	Required	Proposed	Complies
Draft Sutherland Shire Development Control Plan 2015			
Car Parking (DSSDCP 2015)	1 per 45m ² (781 spaces required)	637 – based on anticipated demand demonstrated by parking surveys.	Acceptable
Setbacks - front	9m - primary	Over 9m Taren Point	Yes
Side	3m secondary	Over 3m Koonya	Yes
Rear	3m secondary	Over 9m Willarong	Yes

9.0 SPECIALIST COMMENTS AND EXTERNAL REFERRALS

The application was referred to the following internal and external specialists for assessment and the following comments were received:

9.1. Roads and Maritime Services (RMS)

The application was referred to Roads Maritime Services, no objection to the proposal was made.

9.2. NSW Police

The application was referred to the NSW Police Local Area Command. No objection to the proposal was made.

9.3. Architectural Review Advisory Panel

The application was referred to the Architectural Review Advisory Panel (ARAP) who raised the following points to be addressed:

- *Way finding, natural lighting and spatial modulation of the proposed arcade structure connecting Koonya Circuit to Taren Point Road should be improved.*
- *A more expansive and welcoming double height entry with active uses on both sides at Koonya Circuit is suggested*
- *Reduction in the number of vehicular access points around the Koonya/Willarong corner would improve safety, activation and create an improved sense of address and identify for the centre.*
- *The Willarong Street landscape treatment must be consistent to balance the street section and address the amenity of residents opposite by providing a visual screen to the Centre. This will require retention of all mature trees and provision of new ones where required. Drawings should be provided to demonstrate this.*
- *Power lines should be undergrounded and additional deep soil landscape provided along Koonya Circuit.*

9.4. Engineering

Council's development engineer has undertaken an assessment of the application and advised that the application is supportable subject to suitable conditions of development consent.

9.5. Architect

Council's architect has undertaken an assessment of the application and advised that generally the development is acceptable and comments have been incorporated into conditions of consent.

9.6. Landscape Architect

Council's landscape architect reviewed the initial proposal and provided suggestions to improve the submitted landscape design. A revised landscape plan has been supplied by the applicant, outstanding matters cornering the detail of existing and proposed landscaping can be addressed as a condition of consent.

9.7. Traffic and Transport

Council's traffic engineer has advised that the provision of 637 parking spaces is sufficient to meet the anticipated parking demand. This assessment was based on a submitted traffic study which found that a peak demand on Saturday afternoons of 280 parking spaces (or 1.4 spaces per 100sqm). An increase in GFA would therefore require 492 parking spaces which can be easily accommodated within the 637 spaces proposed.

As part of redevelopment of the nearby Bunnings store, VISSIM traffic modelling was developed by GTA consultant to assess the cumulative traffic impacts of the adjoining Bunnings site and the expanded Homemaker Centre site. Based on the modelling results, it is anticipated that the traffic generated from both developments can be satisfactorily accommodated by the surrounding road network.

9.8. Stormwater

Council's stormwater and waterways engineer advised that the subject property is identified as flood affected in 5% AEP, 1% AEP and PMF events and the flood risk categories of medium and low.

The flood consultant's report recommends a crest should be constructed on the basement access ways 200mm above the 1% AEP flood level. At or close to the proposed access-ways off Koonya Circuit and Willarong Road the depth of flood waters (1% AEP event) is up to 300mm.

The applicant's architect has recommended the installation of flood gates rather than raising the crest. This system has been reviewed by Council's flood engineer who has not raised any objection to the "gate" but is concerned with ongoing maintenance.

9.9. Communities Unit

Council's Communities Unit has undertaken an assessment of the application and have not raised any concerns with the proposal.

9.10. Building

Council's building surveyor has undertaken an assessment of the application and advised that a number of non-compliance with the BCA have been identified. Details of the proposed alternative solutions will be required prior to the issue of a construction certificate.

10.0 ASSESSMENT

Following a detailed assessment of the application having regard to the Heads of Consideration under Section 79C(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the provisions of relevant environmental planning instruments, development control plans, codes and policies, the following matters are considered important to this application.

10.1 Height of Buildings

A maximum building height of 16m applies to the site pursuant to Clause 4.3 and the Height of Buildings Map of SSLEP 2015. The proposal initially sought a 7m high ceiling for the new level of retail which would have resulted in a maximum height of 20.9m.

At the request of Council Offices the top floor has been lowered in part. The amended proposal has a maximum height of 18.5m which exceeds the 16m height limit. This is attributable to the additional retail level on top having a parapet of approximately 3.2m above the ceiling height of the tenancy. The proposal therefore involves a variation of up to 15.5% and fails to comply with the height of buildings development standard of SSLEP 2015.

It is recommended as a condition of consent that the parapet be lowered whilst still maintaining the required floor to ceiling height and adequate space for services.

The relevant objectives of the height of buildings development standard set out in Clause 4.3 (1) of SSLEP 2015 are as follows:

- (a) *to ensure that the scale of buildings:*
 - (i) *is compatible with adjoining development, and*
 - (ii) *is consistent with the desired scale and character of the street and locality in which the buildings are located or the desired future scale and character, and*
 - (iii) *complements any natural landscape setting of the buildings,*
- (b) *to allow reasonable daylight access to all buildings and the public domain,*
- (c) *to minimise the impacts of new buildings on adjoining or nearby properties from loss of views, loss of privacy, overshadowing or visual intrusion,*

- (d) *to ensure that the visual impact of buildings is minimised when viewed from adjoining properties, the street, waterways and public reserves.*

The majority of the building complies with the maximum height limit, with the eastern end of the building well below the maximum (between 12 and 14m). The reduced building height at the eastern end is a response to the site context and the need to achieve a transition in built form with the adjacent residential development on the eastern side of Willarong Road.

The proposed new building is set well back from all four street frontages, in excess of the 9m and 3m secondary street frontage requirements. This ensures that the scale and visual impact of the increased height is reduced, with large landscaped buffers and the retention of most established trees fringing the site.

The amended scheme submitted by the applicant would still be visually prominent, however this impact could be reduced by lowering the parapet height by 1m. A reduced parapet height will not result in any reduction of views, loss of privacy or overshadowing impacts.

The proposed development is located within zone B5 – Business Development. The objectives of this zone are as follows:

- *To enable a mix of business and warehouse uses, and bulky goods premises that require a large floor area, in locations that are close to, and that support the viability of, centres.*
- *To promote uses that do not detract from the role and function of existing centres in the retail hierarchy of Sutherland Shire.*
- *To enhance the visual appearance of the area by ensuring new development achieves high architectural and landscape standards.*
- *To ensure that development does not have an adverse impact on the effective operation and safety of main roads.*

The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the zone to the extent that it represents a redevelopment of an existing Homemaker Centre site. The Homemaker Centre use is appropriate in this location as it supports the viability of other nearby centres without detracting from their role or function. Council's engineers have assessed the traffic impact of the additional floor space and vehicle movements of the new building and the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.

Concern is raised that the parapet is set unnecessarily high and will increase the bulky appearance of the new addition. The volume of proposed signage is also unnecessary. It is considered that conditions of consent can address these shortfalls. Subject to these elements the proposal is consistent with the B5 zone objectives.

The applicant has lodged a written request in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.6 of SSLEP 2015 with respect to the height standard.

A full copy of this request is held at **Appendix “B”** and the most relevant points are summarised below:

- *The design approach has been to limit building height and scale around the street frontages and to provide additional height and massing to the centralised part of the site where the built form can be further setback and be more visually subservient from the street.*
- *The proposal has sought to transition building height across the very large site in a manner which reduces the building height and scale adjacent to the surrounding residential properties on Willarong Road.*
- *The application has been amended to provide the applicants ‘absolute minimum’ acceptable height below the lowest point of any structural element to allow for 4.0m floor to ceiling height and an additional 500mm above ceiling for building services.*

The applicant’s written submission demonstrates that compliance with the height development standard is unnecessary in the circumstances and satisfies the Clause 4.6 criteria. It also demonstrates that the parapet can be lowered by a condition of consent without impacting on the ‘minimum’ acceptable floor to ceiling height. Sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify varying this development standard have therefore been provided subject a reduction in the height of the parapet. The proposed variation does not raise any matters of State or regional environmental planning significance.

In conclusion, the variation to the height development standard satisfies all relevant parts of Clause 4.6 and therefore can be supported, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions of consent.

10.2 Landscaped Area

The proposed development fails to comply with the development standard for landscaped area. A minimum landscaped area of 10% applies to the site pursuant to Clause 6.14 and the Landscaped Area Map of SSLEP 2015.

The development proposes a landscaped area of 6.75% (1,640m²), which fails to provide the minimum requirement.

The objectives of the landscaped area development standard set out in Clause 6.14 of SSLEP 2015 are as follows:

- (a) to ensure adequate opportunities exist for the retention or provision of vegetation that contributes to biodiversity and, in the case of trees, enhances the tree canopy of Sutherland Shire,*
- (b) to minimise urban run-off by maximising permeable areas on the sites of development,*
- (c) to ensure that the visual impact of development is minimised by appropriate landscaping and that the landscaping is maintained,*
- (d) to ensure that landscaping carried out in connection with development is sufficient to complement the scale of buildings, provide shade, screen parking areas and enhance*

workforce amenities.

The development proposes to retain the existing deep soil area of 3.78% of the site. Additional non-deep soil planting areas are proposed that will bring the total landscape area up to 6.75%.

The proposed development is located within zone B5 – Business Development. The objectives of this zone are as follows:

- *To enable a mix of business and warehouse uses, and bulky goods premises that require a large floor area, in locations that are close to, and that support the viability of, centres.*
- *To promote uses that do not detract from the role and function of existing centres in the retail hierarchy of Sutherland Shire.*
- *To enhance the visual appearance of the area by ensuring new development achieves high architectural and landscape standards.*
- *To ensure that development does not have an adverse impact on the effective operation and safety of main roads.*

The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the zone to the extent that it represents a redevelopment of an existing Homemaker Centre site. The Homemaker Centre use is appropriate in this location as it supports the viability of other nearby centres without detracting from their role or function. Council's engineers have assessed the traffic impact of the additional floorspace and vehicle movements of the new building and the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.

The applicant has lodged a written request in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.6 of SSLEP 2015 with respect to the height standard.

A full copy of this request is held at Appendix "B" and the most relevant points are summarised below:

- *There are limited opportunities for the proposal to provide a significant quantum of additional deep soil landscaping on the site, given the large footprint of the existing centre.*
- *The current 10% standard was put in place after the Homemaker Centre was developed. Previously there was no numerical requirement for landscaped area.*
- *The application provides for a significant increase in non-deep soil landscaping.*
- *Additional rainwater storage capacity will be installed to harvest roof water. Overflow of the rainwater tank will discharge into the existing stormwater system to ensure no additional discharge.*

- *Additional landscaping in the car park area will provide more effective screening of the car park and built form.*

The applicant's written submission demonstrates that compliance with the landscape development standard is unnecessary in the circumstances and satisfies the Clause 4.6 criteria. Sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify varying this development standard have therefore been

provided. The proposed variation does not raise any matters of State or regional environmental planning significance.

In conclusion, the variation to the landscape development standard satisfies all relevant parts of Clause 4.6 and therefore can be supported, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions of consent.

10.3 Signage

SEPP 64 applies to the proposed signage and the application has been assessed in accordance with the relevant provisions of this SEPP.

Pursuant to definitions contained within SEPP 64 the proposed signage is considered to be business identification signage and freestanding signage.

In considering an application for signage the consent authority must be satisfied that the signage is consistent with the objectives of SEPP 64 and the assessment criteria specified in Schedule 1 of the SEPP. Schedule 1 requires consideration of the following:

Heading	Consideration	Complies
Character of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is the proposal compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is proposed to be located?</i> • <i>Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality?</i> 	No specific Draft Sutherland Shire DCP2015 controls apply to the site however the signage is considered excess and will add to the existing visual clutter on the building.
Special areas	<i>Does the proposal detract from the amenity or visual quality of any environmentally sensitive areas, heritage areas, natural or other conservation areas, open space areas, waterways, rural landscapes or residential areas?</i>	The proposed signage is considered excess and will add to the existing visual clutter on the building.
Views and vistas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?</i> • <i>Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?</i> • <i>Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?</i> 	No views obscured by signage No signage dominates the skyline or reduces vista quality No other advertisers relevant to the site

<p>Streetscape, setting or landscape</p>	<p><i>Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i> • <i>Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?</i> • <i>Does the proposal screen unsightliness?</i> • <i>Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?</i> • <i>Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?</i> 	<p>The proposed signage is considered excess and will add to the existing visual clutter on the building.</p>
<p>Site and building</p>	<p><i>Is the proposal compatible with the scale, proportion and other characteristics of the site or building, or both, on which the proposed signage is to be located?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?</i> • <i>Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both?</i> 	<p>The proposed signage is considered excess and will add to the existing visual clutter on the building.</p>
<p>Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures</p>	<p><i>Have any safety devices, platforms, lighting devices or logos been designed as an integral part of the signage or structure on which it is to be displayed?</i></p>	<p>The signage includes building identification signage for the base building and an unlimited number of tenants.</p>
<p>Illumination</p>	<p><i>Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?</i> • <i>Would illumination detract from the</i> 	<p>All signage elements are lightboxes.</p>

	<p><i>amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation?</i></p> <p><i>Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Is the illumination subject to a curfew?</i> 	
Safety	<p><i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?</i> <i>• Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas?</i> 	The proposed signage will be fully contained within the boundaries of the site and represents no traffic or pedestrian safety hazards.

The proposal seeks consent for a total of approximately 876 sqm of signage excluding way finding and parking signs. The volume of signage is considered excessive with almost 100 signs over each frontage and an unlimited number of tenants to be advertising within the proposed zones.

It is recommended as a condition of consent that all signage be deleted and a separate development application is lodged with a detailed signage strategy.

10.4 Parking and Traffic

The proposed development was referred to the RMS as it is classified as Traffic Generating Development pursuant to the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007.

SSDCP 2006 states that where development is identified as Traffic Generating Development then the parking requirement specified in the RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Development should apply. The RTA guide to Traffic Generating Development states that as there is a significant variation in car parking demands for bulky goods premises, car parking requirements should be based on like existing facilities.

The applicant submitted an assessment of traffic and parking studies and modelling. The report assessed the traffic implications of the proposed development in relation to the existing conditions and the transport implications of the proposed development.

In relation to traffic and parking, this report concluded that the proposed parking provision is considered appropriate and the road network will be able to accommodate the additional traffic from the proposed development. The proposed development will provide a total of 637 car spaces and this is considered to be acceptable.

10.5 Stormwater Management

Clause 6.4 of the Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015 requires Council to be satisfied of certain matters in relation to stormwater management prior to development consent being granted. The proposed stormwater management system was reviewed by Council's stormwater and waterways engineer requires a CDS Unit as suitable for a water quality improvement device instead of the proposed ECOSOL.

A suitable condition of consent has been recommended incorporating the above requirements.

10.6 Greenweb

The subject site directly adjoins Council's Greenweb strategy zone. The Greenweb is a strategy to conserve and enhance Sutherland Shire's bushland and biodiversity by identifying and appropriately managing key areas of bushland habitat and establishing and maintaining interconnecting linkages and corridors.

The submitted landscape plans have been reviewed by Council's landscape architect and found to be acceptable given the limited opportunities for additional deep soil landscaping.

10.8 Hours of Operation

The applicant intends to continue the current trading hours of 9.00am to 5.30pm Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday, 9.00am to 9.00pm on Thursdays, 9.00am to 5.00pm on Saturdays and 10.00am to 5.00pm on Sundays.

11.0 SECTION 94 CONTRIBUTIONS

The proposed development is likely to increase employment growth in the precinct and will require the provision of additional public facilities to meet additional demand. In order to provide high quality and diverse public facilities, the proposed development will attract Section 94A Contributions in accordance with Council's adopted contribution plan for Employment Lands.

This contribution is based upon the proposed cost of the development and has been calculated at 1% of \$33,318,560 (the estimated cost of development identified on the development application form). Therefore, Section 94A Levy contributions for the proposed development would be \$333,185.60.

12.0 DECLARATION OF AFFILIATION

Section 147 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 requires the declaration of donations/gifts in excess of \$1000. In addition Council's development application form requires a general declaration of affiliation. In relation to this development application a declaration has been made that there is no affiliation.

13.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed development is for alterations and additions to the Caringbah Homemaker Centre at 41-49 Willarong Road and 29 Koonya Circuit, Caringbah. The development seeks extensive refurbishment including the construction of an additional portion of bulky goods floor space at the first floor level fronting Willarong Road and the provision of additional parking spaces.

The subject land is located within Zone 11 – Employment pursuant to the provisions of Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2006. The proposed development, being a ‘bulky goods premises’ is permissible within the zone with development consent.

In response to public exhibition two (2) submissions were received. The matters raised in these submissions have been discussed in this report and mostly relate to impact on traffic and parking and the non compliance with development standards and landscaping.

The proposal includes a written 4.6 request for variations to the maximum height development standard and the landscape standard. The written 4.6 request is considered reasonable and is supported for the reasons detailed in the report subject to the parapets and portions of the roof forms being lowered were appropriate. Although the proposal exceeds the standard, it does not result in unacceptable impacts upon neighbouring properties, the road network or the streetscape character.

The substantive issues raised as a result of the ARAP review have been satisfactorily addressed through design changes and the submission of additional information. The design and scale of the building are considered acceptable subject to conditions. It has been demonstrated that the proposal has now adequately met the urban design controls and objectives of SSLEP 2006 and the relevant design principles in SSDCP 2006.

The application has been assessed having regard to the Heads of Consideration under Section 79C (1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the provisions of Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan and all relevant Council DCPs, Codes and Policies. Following detailed assessment it is considered that Development Application No. DA16/0223 may be supported for the reasons outlined in this report.

14.0 RECOMMENDATION

14.1 That pursuant to the provisions of Clause 4.6 of the Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015, the requested variation of the 15.6% Height of Buildings development standard under Clause 4.3 of Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015 and the requested variation of the 3.25% landscape development standard under Clause 6.14 of Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015 is considered to be well founded and is therefore

supported. Accordingly, the provisions of Clause 4.6 are invoked and the development standards are varied to 15.6% (height) and 3.25% (landscaping) in respect to this development application.