

### BRIEFING DETAILS

|                             |                                       |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>BRIEFING DATE / TIME</b> | Wednesday, 20 April 2022, 11am – 12pm |
| <b>LOCATION</b>             | MS Teams videoconference              |

### BRIEFING MATTER

PPSHCC-116 – Maitland – DA/2021/1702 - 20 Heritage Drive, Chisholm - Mixed use development including Commercial Premises with retail premises, supermarket, mini major and liquor shop, Recreational Facility (Indoor) with gym and swimming pool, Food and Drink premises with Pub, Centre based Child Care Facility (112 children), Health Services Facility with Medical Centre, Car Wash and Signage

### PANEL MEMBERS

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>            | Alison McCabe (Chair), Sandra Hutton, Sally Halliday and Aaron Cook |
| <b>APOLOGIES</b>                | Juliet Grant  |
| <b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> | None  |

### OTHER ATTENDEES

|                                 |                            |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF</b> | Brian Gibson, Ben Schaffer |
| <b>DEPARTMENT STAFF</b>         | Leanne Harris              |

### KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED:

- The DA is still under initial stages of assessment and Council is yet to issue a detailed request for information.
- Social Impact Assessment yet to be obtained (dealing with tavern and liquor shop)
- Previous DA approved for this site however this proposed is more in line with the site specific DCP.
- Biodiversity – 3 trees on the site and some further information in relation to microbats is required
- Resilience & Hazards SEPP – contamination information is dated and needs more to satisfy the requirements of the SEPP
- Transport – TfNSW have advised that the East Maitland Study looking at through traffic growth is underway but rather than delay the assessment they have advised that the Council and the Panel should consider local traffic impacts. The Council has identified that there are some minor gaps and errors in the modelling that need to be addressed (minor phasing and timing of lights)
- Signage – details to be provided and adequately addressed
- LEP – minor permissibility issue – zone boundary alignments need to be clearly demonstrated
- There are no height limitations under the LEP and the proposal complies with the FSR restrictions. Council has however raised concerns with the PAD site and the implications of development of this and the need for a future 4.6 variation under a future DA.
- DA has been notified however no submissions received.

- The Childcare component is generally consistent with the Council's DCP requirements
- The proposal is Integrated (RFS) as a result of the Childcare Centre, however GTAs not yet provided.
- Car parking and vehicular access:
  - Council is still assessing pedestrian movements / integrated bus operations through the site.
  - Car parking numbers currently compliant
  - Access to site along southern boundary – separate DA – will hold this DA up
  - Pedestrian access through centre of site to Tigerhawk Drive – does not align with the existing pedestrian crossing (offset). This is a school crossing.
  - No main access to north/east / eastern portions of the shopping centre – driveway may need to be widened on Tigerhawk
  - Walking length from bus stops
  - Minor awning overhand – north west corner – should not be any intrusion into the road reserve
- Minor CEPTED issues need to be addressed with toilet locations

#### **PANEL COMMENTS:**

- Bulk and scale, and interfaces at southern end need to be carefully considered
- The Panel will want to understand the relationship between landscaping and retaining in terms of scale, cross sections etc. There is a need for more detail on cross sections, particularly between interfaces R1 and B1 zones, pedestrian interfaces / landscape outcomes
- Pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity to the west and east – needs to be clarified. Consideration should be given to improved outlook and linkages to the existing park.
- Public (dedicated) Road access will be essential – may be permissibility issues if the road does not form part of the application.
- PAD site – application needs to be clear about what they are seeking consent for. The PAD site can be the subject of a subdivision. If it is to be considered for use then all relevant details need to be provided – e.g., access, manoeuvring, FSR etc.
- External pedestrian and traffic access arrangements need to be resolved now as part of this application and Council's Traffic Committee should be involved. The Panel want a clear understanding of the relationship between the school, the proposed centre and bus stops, crossing etc.
- Contamination is a threshold matter and the application needs to be clear and specific if remediation is required. There needs to be sufficient current documentation to satisfy the provisions of the SEPP.
- Given this is a greenfield development there should be no encroachments into the road reserve or zone boundaries. It is noted that Council's LEP clause 5.3 provides a mechanism for minor flexibility near zone boundaries.

The Panel understands Council will issue a detailed RFI and consideration will be given for a further update briefing once a response has been received from the applicant. The Panel expects the applicant to respond in a timely manner to enable the application to continue to progress.

**TENTATIVE DETERMINATION DATE SCHEDULED FOR: 11 August 2022**

#### **Planning Panels Secretariat**

4PSQ 12 Darcy Street, Parramatta NSW 2150 | Locked Bag 5022, Parramatta NSW 2124 | T 02 8217 2060 | [www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/planningpanels](http://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/planningpanels)