

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Thursday, 31 March 2022, 9:30am and 10:30am
LOCATION	MS Teams videoconference

BRIEFING MATTER

PPSHCC-89 – Central Coast – 49565/2016/8.2review - 76 Hills St; 35, 37 and 41A Dwyer St and 372, 374, 393, 395 and 397 Mann St, North Gosford - STAGED 8.2 REVIEW - Mixed Use Development - 6 Towers - Staged Development - Stage - 1 Blocks 3 & 4, Stage 2 - Blocks 5 & 6, Stage - 3 Blocks 1 & 2

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Graham Brown (Chair), Marcia Doheny, Heather Warton, Greg Flynn and Tony Tuxworth
APOLOGIES	None
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Alison McCabe, Juliet Grant and Sandra Hutton

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Janice Buteux-Wheeler and Brett Newbold
DEPARTMENT STAFF	Jeremy Martin and Lisa Foley

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

- Gosford LEP repealed provisions are applicable to the subject application; being Clause 8.5 for design excellence, and Clause 8.9 for bonuses to floor space and height. Clause 4.6 variation submitted to vary Clause 8.9 for roof elements. Previous refusal for multiple storeys above the 30% bonus.
- Gosford SEPP considerations for design outcome are not a statutory requirement for the subject application. The Panel is interested in the strategic perspective for Gosford City Centre. Urban design outcomes should be a clear mandatory requirement in the assessment of any development application in the area. Once a determination has been made on the subject application, correspondence with the Department of Planning and Environment may be beneficial for future development and the RSDA process.
- Merit issues with the application discussed at length. Zone interface considerations and an understanding of the context of the site are important for the development of the surrounding area.
- The Urban Design Framework (UDF) for Gosford City Centre discussed at length. The UDF demonstrates detailed block models of the Gosford City area with existing approvals, principles, and directions.

Although the UDF is not a statutory requirement for the development application, voluntary application of the UDF has not been considered as a guideline to achieve urban design outcomes as an urban village. Design issues have been identified years prior (eg. traffic – intersection treatment), and the applicant has not addressed the issues within the assessment process. The applicant should be proactive in the RSDA process and engage with council to find solutions before a refusal of the development application.

- Report for determination to be prepared within nine weeks. A suitable date needs to be finalised to determine it. An appeal has been lodged that is subject to RPP consideration and there are currently no facts and contentions or s.34 conciliation.
- The Panel raises concerns with the Clause 4.6 variation. The proposed 10% on 30% variation may provide further grounds for refusal of the development application.
- The Panel discusses if the development application can be considered substantially the same development. Council will review the previous refused development application in conjunction with the subject application to address the number of units, height, and floor space. Clear detail of what was previously proposed before and now are required for further consideration.

DETERMINATION DATE TBC