

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING/DATE/TIME	19 November 2020 10.00am to 10.30am
LOCATION	Teleconference

BRIEFING MATTER

PPSSCC-134 - DA 270/2021/JP – The Hills Shire
 Lot 5 DP 30916 Commercial Road Rouse Hill
 Residential Flat Building Development containing 339 Units

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	David Ryan – Acting Chair Susan Budd Mark Colburt Gabrielle Morrish
APOLOGIES	Abigail Goldberg and Chandi Saba
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Nil

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Harrsion Depczynski Paul Osborne Cameron McKenzie
OTHER	George Dojas – Regionally Significant Development Suzie Jattan – Planning Panel Secretariat

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED:

- Application falls under the Design Excellence Clause in the LEP so must be considered by the Council's Design Excellence Panel. The matter has been considered by the Panel at 3 meetings. The Panel is of the view that the proposal, as presented does not achieve Design Excellence particularly on the grounds of bulk, scale and amenity as well as other issues.
- Council considers further amended plans might be forthcoming.
- Councils primary remaining issues are –
 - GFA calculation – The site has the potential to benefit from a GFA incentivized clause linked to apartment sizes. However the applicant has not included a number of areas in the plans that attract GFA and therefore when calculated accurately the proposal would exceed the FSR controls including the incentive.

Planning Panels Secretariat

- Two buildings exceed the height plane – Building A and C – a CI 4.6 application has been submitted.
- Council has concerns regarding both FSR and height exceedance as they are linked.
- Inclusion of dual key apartments to justify unit floor areas to trigger the GFA incentive rather than providing larger unit sizes potentially undermines intent of the incentive.
- Variation to DCP setbacks are proposed to Commercial Rd and the western boundary.
- ADG non compliances occur as the proposal exceeds the number of units not receiving solar access. Council considers this site such as this should be able to satisfy the ADG.
- Subterranean apartments below ground level are proposed in Building C creating amenity impacts which are exacerbated by a 5m high retaining wall. This creates unacceptable amenity. Building A has similar issues.
- Building length exceeds the 50m building length control in the DCP resulting in long and bulky forms.
- A public park is proposed to the northern end of the site but there is a further landscaped area in the scheme that would function as communal open space. In the current plans there is no delineation between the two areas to understand how the public versus private interface would be managed. The Council is concerned the applicant is borrowing amenity from the public park to supplement the communal open space.
- Other issues include aboriginal heritage, stormwater, contamination etc which could delay determination of the application.
- The Panel supported the concerns of Council and the DRP and sought further clarification regarding:
 - The number of apartments below ground level which appears to be approximately 10- 15 units.
 - Whether the park would be dedicated to Council.
 - The amenity of the balcony areas for the studio portion of the dual key apartments due to the A/C location on the balcony space.
 - The prevalence of ‘snorkel’ apartments within the plans.
 - How dual key apartments should be treated in terms of types of units, unit areas and bedroom count.