

## COUNCIL ASSESSMENT REPORT

<b>Panel Reference</b>	PPSSEC-187
<b>DA Number</b>	DA-2022/46
<b>LGA</b>	Bayside Council
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Integrated Development - Demolition of existing structures, site and remediation works, removal of three trees and construction of an eleven (11) storey mixed use development comprising two commercial tenancies, basement car parking, eighty (80) residential units, comprising of 80% affordable units (64 of 80) and 20% (16 of 80) rented at market rate
<b>Street Address</b>	427-429 Princes Highway Rockdale
<b>Applicant/Owner</b>	City West Housing Pty Ltd / Mr Matthew Holt – Urbis
<b>Date of DA lodgement</b>	18/02/2022
<b>Number of Submissions</b>	Four (4)
<b>Recommendation</b>	Deferred Commencement Approval
<b>Regional Development Criteria (Schedule 7 of the SEPP (State and Regional Development) 2011</b>	Affordable Housing Cost of Works >\$5M
<b>List of all relevant s4.15(1)(a) matters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Planning &amp; Assessment Regulation 2021</li> <li>• Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S4.46 - Development that is Integrated Development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021</li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy 65 - Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development</li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004</li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021</li> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</li> <li>• Sustainable Buildings SEPP 2022</li> <li>• Bayside Local Environmental Plan 2021 (BLEP)</li> <li>• Draft EPI's <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• draft Planning Proposal (PP-2021-3892) Rockdale Town Centre</li> <li>• Employment Zones Reform</li> <li>• Review of C.4.6 of Standard Instrument</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rockdale Development Control Plan 2011</li> </ul>
<b>List all documents submitted with this report for the Panel's consideration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Assessment Report</li> <li>• Draft Conditions</li> <li>• Section 4.6 – Exception to Development Standards (Height of Building)</li> <li>• Architectural Plans</li> <li>• Landscape Plans</li> </ul>
<b>Clause 4.6 requests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height of Building</li> </ul>
<b>Summary of key submissions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How can carpark be secure if go get car share is proposed / Contractual period of the proposed agreement between City West and Go Get. What is stopping the arrangement ceasing in (eg) 3 years? And what would happen to the very small number of spaces if this were to occur? What does that mean for the rest of the flats with no parking? / How has the proponent and/or GoGet calculated that 1 share car can be easily shared across 10 apartments? Can the assumptions in this calculation be trusted or is it an arbitrary figure based on the design of the development? The GoGet letter included in the Traffic Report as attachment 3 contains almost no data just an 'estimate' and lots of assertions. It does however say that the share cars will be broadly available to any go get member not just residents of the apartments / How the 1:10 coverage ratio compares to councils where DCPs state a minimum requirement - for example, North Sydney's DCP has a much lower cap on that proposed by City West:</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Where else in metropolitan Sydney has a predominantly parking-free development been approved and constructed and how is that performing compared to the approving council's expectations?</i></li> <li>• <i>Insufficient parking / Adverse traffic impacts / Assumptions in traffic report made without thorough assessment and consultation / traffic report doesn't consider nearby flat buildings constructed and those under construction / Net traffic generation underestimated / swept paths to building entrance are incorrect / Right hand turns from princes highway southbound will be dangerous</i></li> <li>• <i>Public transport will be overwhelmed / Public transport services not investigated in traffic report / No cycle ways to access the site</i></li> <li>• <i>Not all tenants with a disability have car parking</i></li> <li>• <i>Height of building is excessive / Additional storey is not appropriate / Height inconsistent with other buildings in area / inappropriate precedent will be set</i></li> <li>• <i>Excessive density proposed</i></li> <li>• <i>High density affordable housing does not work</i></li> <li>• <i>Unattractive looking building</i></li> </ul>
<b>Report prepared by</b>	Fiona Prodromou Senior Assessment Planner
<b>Report date</b>	November 2022

#### Summary of s4.15 matters

Have all recommendations in relation to relevant s4.15 matters been summarized in the Executive Summary of the assessment report? **Yes**

#### Legislative clauses requiring consent authority satisfaction

Have relevant clauses in all applicable environmental planning instruments where the consent authority must be satisfied about a particular matter been listed, and relevant recommendations summarized, in the Executive Summary of the assessment report? **Yes**

#### Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards

If a written request for a contravention to a development standard (clause 4.6 of the LEP) has been received, has it been attached to the assessment report? **Yes**

#### Special Infrastructure Contributions

Does the DA require Special Infrastructure Contributions conditions (\$7.24)? **Not Applicable**  
*Note: Certain DAs in the Western Sydney Growth Areas Special Contributions Area may require specific Special Infrastructure Contributions (SIC) conditions*

#### Conditions

Have draft conditions been provided to the applicant for comment? **Yes**  
*Note: in order to reduce delays in determinations, the Panel prefer that draft conditions, notwithstanding Council's recommendation, be provided to the applicant to enable any comments to be considered as part of the assessment report*