

Record of Kick-Off Briefing

Hunter & Central Coast Regional Planning Panel

PANEL REFERENCE, DA NUMBER & ADDRESS	PPSHCC-186 122-124 ERINA STREET AND HENRY PARRY DRIVE EAST GOSFORD CENTRAL COAST DA/46274/2014/H
APPLICANT / OWNER	Mr Joshua Oyeku
APPLICATION TYPE	Modification Application
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT CRITERIA	S4.55(2) Modification Application
KEY SEPP/LEP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts—Regional) 2021 State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021 State Environmental Planning Policy No 65—Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development
CIV	\$29,806,461 (excluding GST)
BRIEFING DATE	14 June 2023

ATTENDEES

APPLICANT	Mr Joshua Oyeku
PANEL CHAIR	Alison McCabe (Chair), Tony McNamara, Roberta Ryan, Greg Flynn and Tony Tuxworth
COUNCIL OFFICER	Alexandra Hafner, Tania Halbert and Emily Goodworth
CASE MANAGER	Leanne Harris
PLANNING PANELS SECRETARIAT	Lisa Foley and Tim Mahoney

DA LODGED: 16/04/2023

TENTATIVE PANEL BRIEFING DATE: August 2023

TENTATIVE PANEL DETERMINATION DATE: December 2023

Council is yet to undertake its full application assessment, so this record is not a final list of the issues they will need to consider in order to draft their recommendation.

The application is yet to be considered by the Hunter & Central Coast Regional Planning Panel and therefore future comment will not be limited to the detail contained within.

KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION

COUNCIL

- DA originally approved in 2015 with a two-year lapse date for 180 units, with an extension for a further 12 months.
- Multiple modifications since then assessed and determined by Council.
- Council questions whether the current modification is substantially the same development to that approved in 2015?
- Most recent modification was approved in 2021.
- Applicant is relying on demolition and a Roads Act approval for physical commencement.
- Overview of changes now proposed provided.
- Council noted that the plans are not adequate and don't necessarily cover all changes proposed.

APPLICANT

- Tower C is where the additional two storeys are proposed, and Tower D is staying relatively the same.
- Previously approved modification had 177 units. New modification has 193 units (16 new units).
- Site context and adjoining development discussed.
- Specialist reports and investigations undertaken.
- Key issues considered to be building height, solar access and visitor parking.
- Solar access has been reduced slightly from the approved modification.
- Applicant advised the deep soil zones do not comply with ADG requirements and the proposed modification improves on this.

PANEL

- A complete set of architectural plans of the proposed modification compared to the 2015 approval is required to be submitted. The degree of change on each level and elevation needs to be clearly documented.
- The Panel advised that a thorough comparison (qualitative and quantitative analysis) between the original approval and the proposed changes needs to be made to justify that it is substantially the same development.
- The Panel will not be supportive of diminishing ADG requirements when increased floor space and height is being requested. Solar access needs to be assessed with eye of sun diagrams required.

- Application needs to be assessed under the controls that apply now. Details and an understanding of the existing approval and controls in place at that time will also be required. It was noted that the building height is substantially higher due to incentives involved with the original approval.
- The Panel would expect the application to exhibit design excellence and appropriate urban design and amenity outcomes to justify any variation to controls.
- The Panel needs to be satisfied that there has been physical commencement in accordance with the relevant conditions of consent to ensure the consent is still valid. The Applicant needs to demonstrate and document this.
- The assessment should consider the urban design philosophy and architectural response when the development was approved, i.e. was there a requirement for a differentiation in tower heights and how did the built form respond to typography?
- The built form relationships to the surrounding context will be an important consideration.
- Impacts of the increased height and FSR will also need to be factually assessed.

The Panel understand that Council will issue an RFI. Much of the information required should have been submitted with the application. A specific timeframe should be identified for the response and the applicant be required to respond in a timely manner. Once the RFI response is received a further briefing with Council will be scheduled.