

**MEETING DETAILS**

<b>MEETING DATE / TIME</b>	Monday, 22 October 2018 1.00pm to 1.30pm
<b>LOCATION</b>	Camden Council

**BRIEFING MATTER:**

Panel Ref – 2018SSW019 - DA/2018/694/1

Address – 297 Bringelly Road, Leppington

Description - Demolition of existing structures, tree removal and the construction of a staged mixed use development containing commercial/retail space, 360 residential apartments, basement and at-grade car parking, road construction, subdivision and associated site.

**ATTENDEES**

<b>PANEL MEMBERS</b>	Justin Doyle – Chair Bruce McDonald Nicole Gurran Peter Sidgreaves
<b>COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF</b>	Adam Sampson Jordan Davies Jessica Mesiti
<b>OTHER</b>	Planning Panels Secretariat: Suzie Jattan

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Nil

**APPOLOGY:** Lara Symkowiak

**KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED**

The Panel questions the justification for a breach of the height standard for this Greenfield site, noting that the height limit would seem to suggest a maximum 6 storey building was anticipated for this site.

This Greenfield site would also seem to allow for common open space to be located at ground level designed for reasonable solar access. Minimum ADG building separations and compliant height might assist in achieving the goal of providing more usable open space.

The proposed unit mix including 41 single bedroom units in this location is not obviously suitable, and would require some analysis to justify.

The Panel questions the logic of locating the dense residential development on the part of the site furthest away from the station. Configuration of a development which encourages take up of the commercial part of the development would be an advantage.

The DCP anticipates a sequencing of development in the locality, with this site envisaged as a more long term part of the development of the locality. If additional density is to be justified, a development scheme which rationally fits within the desired development of the area would be desirable.

The Panel notes the RMS comments which will need to be addressed, given the requirement for RMS concurrence, but the Panel expects that dedication of land would only be demanded by the RMA where the need for dedication arises from the proposed development.