

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Wednesday, 9 April 2025
LOCATION	MS Teams Videoconference

PPSHCC-353 – Maitland – DA /2025/52 – Concept DA and Stage 1 – Anambah Manufactured Home Estate – 559 Anambah Road, Gosforth 2320

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Stephen O'Connor (Acting Chair), Susan Budd, Sally Halliday, Ashley Kavanagh
APOLOGIES	Tony McNamara
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Alison McCabe declared a COI due to her consultancy SJB Planning carrying out work with the applicant (Third.i) not related to this project. Roberta Ryan declared a COI due to previous work with the applicant (Third.i) not related to this project.

OTHER ATTENDEES

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES	Stephen Barr, Samuel Liu, Daniel Collings, Brian Swaine, Andrew Brown
COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF:	Emmilia Marshall, Georgie Williams and Cameron Evans
DEPARTMENT STAFF	Leanne Harris, Holly McCann

COUNCIL BRIEFING

- This DA is for a concept DA for 332 manufactured homes with Stage 1 being for 291 manufactured homes.
- Overview of site context, relationship to the Anambah URA and surrounding uses.
- Adjoins site zoned as an URA for 10 years but needs lead in infrastructure.
- Access, flooding and servicing constraints discussed (unmade emergency access road, bushfire, biodiversity).
- History and status of a recent LEP amendment which prohibits caravan parks in RU2 zone discussed noting the draft LEP was imminent at lodgement and is now in force. DA benefits from savings provisions under that LEP amendment.
- Concurrent subdivision proposal by same applicant and relationship between the two sites discussed.
- Overview of access arrangements discussed.
- Public exhibition – 16 submissions received with key concerns around traffic, lack of infrastructure, sequencing and orderly development, proximity to existing quarry, flooding and bushfire risks,

incompatibility with rural zoning, permissibility and recent LEP amendment and unplanned high-density development and access to social infrastructure for future residents.

- Council has issued an initial RFI for key details including water and sewer servicing, CPTED and Social Impact analysis, compliance with SEPP Housing etc. Applicant has requested a 3-month extension to respond to this.
- External referrals still being sought. TfNSW have raised several concerns and don't accept the traffic assessment as submitted.
- Internal referrals underway.
- Key issues:
 - Inconsistent with various Council strategies and policies
 - Sequencing and orderly development of land
 - Provision of utility services
 - River Rd emergency access, land ownership, emergency evacuation and ongoing use
 - Highly isolated community with a lack of public transport and limited access to facilities and services
 - DA has been lodged prematurely.
- There was no pre-DA consultation with Council for this proposal.
- DCP in preparation for the broader URA to guide the staging and delivery of the URA in an orderly fashion. Should go to Council in May for exhibition.

APPLICANT BRIEFING

- Overview of the concept proposal and background from the applicant's perspective.
- Description of site and strategic context with consistent intent for residential development in this area since 2006.
- Overview of recent LEP amendment which prohibits caravan parks / MHEs but transitional arrangements in place. Applicant considers proposal is still consistent with draft LEP.
- Relationship with and status of the adjoining concept subdivision DA with overlapping infrastructure – both can stand alone.
- Overview and explanation of the proposed development.
- Matters for consideration in preparation and lodgement of the application including supporting specialist studies.
- Initial RFI being considered and will be responded to.

PANEL COMMENTS

- Similarly to the adjacent subdivision DA the Panel is particularly interested in the sequencing of infrastructure, road access arrangements, flood evacuation arrangements and the relationship of the proposal to the balance of the URA.
- The Panel again seeks clarification on the status, required upgrades and ownership of River Road and the practical and legal arrangements for the use of this road for emergency evacuation as proposed. The Panel notes that the applicant is of the understanding that that the road is owned by Council. The applicant should provide Council with any details they have to support this position.
- Consideration needs to be given to the Council policy provisions, LEP amendment and zone objectives for the proposed use.
- The relationship to the quarry to the north and the compositing facility to the east needs to be understood, including haul routes and potential impacts on this site, including potential acoustic impacts from blasting.
- The Panel notes that clause 7.6 of the Maitland LEP 2011 for the provision of essential services applies to this proposal and needs to be duly considered.

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

- The Panel questioned the use of a concept DA for the proposal with such a small second stage and understand this is related is to satisfy the requirement of a DCP which is still in preparation. The concept plan needs to be sufficiently detailed to enable proper assessment of the of the environmental impacts of the entire concept.
- The Panel considers that the requested Social Impact Assessment is a critical issue and should have formed part of the original suite of documents lodged with the DA.
- The Panel expect a detailed analysis of the implications of flooding of Anambah Road, evacuation warning times and how often and for how long residents will be isolated.
- The Panel notes that a number of external / internal referrals are still outstanding, and further issues may be identified and will need to be addressed.

The Panel reiterates comments made in relation to the adjacent proposed subdivision as they are equally relevant to this proposal. The Panel is concerned that the application is out of sequence.

The Panel notes that the applicant has requested a three-month extension to respond to the initial information request. The Panel is supportive of this provided the applicant responds comprehensively and within the timeframe agreed.

The Panel will seek further briefings as required and in the event that the matters raised in this briefing remain outstanding, may request the Council move to complete their assessment based on the documentation currently before it.

Based on the number of submissions objecting to the proposal the Panel will need to hold a public determination meeting prior to determining the application.