

RECORD OF BRIEFING

HUNTER AND CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Tuesday, 6 August 2024
LOCATION	MS Teams Videoconference

BRIEFING MATTERS

PPSHCC-294 – Lake Macquarie– DA/598/2024 – 65 Glendale Drive, Glendale 2285 – Concept Development and first stage of development

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Alison McCabe, Roberta Ryan, Tony McNamara, Christine Buckley
APOLOGIES	Jason Pauling
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Nil

OTHER ATTENDEES

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES	James Belford, Pat Patel, Pranav Rathore, Natalie Prince
COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF:	Glen Mathews, Amy Regado, Steve Masia, Kirra Somerville, Development Planner
DEPARTMENT STAFF	Leanne Harris

COUNCIL BRIEFING

- Crown development for a concept DA (TAHE).
- Overview of the site and context, with surrounding uses including residential development, Cardiff Rail Workshop, Hunter Regional Sports Complex and Glendale shopping centre, bulky goods and commercial premises.
- Site has strategic importance, identified as a future transport interchange.
- Proposal entails subdivision to accommodate a range of future uses including approx. 600 apartments, 117 multi-unit dwellings, local shops, large format retail and mixed use, permitted uses, environmental conservation areas and two parks.
- Development predominantly outside of the conservation areas apart from some drainage.
- APZ impacts on the conservation area will need to be considered.
- The DA is accompanied by a Clause 4.6 variation to deal with the LEP requirement for activated street frontages.
- Development provides for a regional cycleway which is largely consistent with DCP.
- Concept and Stage 1 subdivision works in two phases with associated infrastructure works are proposed.
- Overview of key planning considerations:
 - o Concept DA

- o Crown DA
- Contamination
- o TfNSW referral which has raised concerns about delivery of infrastructure
- Active street frontages 4.6 variation
- \circ $\$ Flooding number of questions with the applicant's flood report
- Biodiversity Conservation Act needs further work to demonstrate the principles of avoid and minimise have been met
- GTAs received from RFS.
- Subsidence Advisory NSW have requested additional info.
- Water and Heritage referrals outstanding.
- Community consultation 11 submissions objecting to the proposal (issues with ecology, flooding, traffic, social impacts, privacy etc)
- Council is in the initial stages of assessment and is working through:
 - $\circ \quad \text{Subdivision design and layout} \\$
 - Flooding, biodiversity
 - o Traffic
 - $\circ \quad \text{Timing for delivery of works} \\$
 - $\circ \quad \text{Location of local park}$
 - o Consistency with planning controls

APPLICANT PRESENTATION AND BRIEFING

- Site background discussed.
- Overview of the application being a concept and first stage of the development and proposed uses.
- Discussion of specialised technical team involved in the project.
- Overview of community consultation and stakeholder engagement prior to lodgement, issues discussed that have and are being worked through.
- Applicant understands that issues for further consideration include:
 - o Traffic
 - Open space
- Government property audit currently underway to identify land suitable to be transferred to housing delivery agencies this property is included in the review and audit.
- At this stage there are no specific provisions for social or affordable housing proposed but this would not be precluded, and the Applicant believes that it can be addressed in the future detailed DAs.

PANEL COMMENTS

- The Panel questioned the status and context of Glendale regional commercial hub?
- The Panel questioned why social / affordable housing wasn't being provided. As this is a Crown application the Panel would expect this to be included.
- The Panel need to understand how ecology has been dealt with in terms of the avoid and minimise requirements under the Biodiversity Conservation Act. There is a potential jurisdictional matter related to the Planners North v Ballina LEC Judgement (para 173 and 174 in particular). Reliance on the use of the C2 zone as an avoidance measure may be problematic. Applicant is requested to address this.
- The Panel understands that Council will be requesting additional information in relation to traffic and flooding matters.
- The Panel questioned the overall approach to the site with the four storey height limits proposed and whether there could be opportunities for further variety in heights across the site (mid-range) and that this could offer possible solutions to biodiversity and social housing. The applicant noted that mine subsidence is dictating the practical limit for 4 story to avoid a grouting exercise.
- The Panel noted the need for good public transport to service the site.
- The applicant should clarify the government audit approach as discussed.
- The Panel will seek further briefings as required