

Record of Briefing Meeting Sydney South Planning Panel

| | |
|---|--|
| PANEL REFERENCE, DA NUMBER & ADDRESS | PPSSSH-103- Sutherland– DA-21/1251 – 6 Hinkler avenue, Caringbah |
| APPLICANT / OWNER | Adam Martinez - Hinkler Ave 1 Pty Limited Owner: Hinkler Ave 1 Pty Limited; Hinkler Ave 2 Pty Limited; Hinkler Ave 3 Pty Limited; |
| APPLICATION TYPE | Capital Investment Value > \$30M |
| REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT CRITERIA | Clause 2, Schedule 7 of the SRD SEPP |
| KEY SEPP/LEP | SEPP 55, Design & Place SEPP, Affordable Rental Housing SEPP, BASIX SEPP, Sutherland Shire LEP 2015 |
| CIV | \$71,061,819.00 (excluding GST) |
| MEETING DATE | 5 April 2022 |

ATTENDEES

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| PANEL CHAIR | Helen Lochhead |
| PANEL MEMBERS | Stuart McDonald, Heather Warton, Carol Provan, Kent Johns |
| COUNCIL OFFICERS | Amanda Treharne, Thomas Walters, Beth Morris, Vivian Tran, Hannah Painter, Ros Read |
| CASE MANAGER | Leanne Harris |
| SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER | Carolyn Hunt |
| PROJECT OFFICER | Holly McCann |

DA LODGED: 13 Dec 2021

RFI ISSUED TO APPLICANT

TENTATIVE PANEL DETERMINATION DATE: 7 June 2022

ISSUES LIST

- The uplift relies on Health Services Facilities (HSF) and sufficient landscaping. These requirements have not been met
- Uplift in FSR1.45:1 (CI 6.21 of SSLEP) and height (additional 11m) have been applied for.
- The Housing SEPP (0.5:1 FSR) has been applied across the whole site rather than just residential portion of site area.
- This approach results in an overdevelopment of the site compromising setbacks, residential amenity, landscaping and deep soil, which are insufficient and/or difficult to comply with.

KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION

- The proposed development in its current form is considered excessive for the site as a number of key development standards are not being met or are currently compromised.
- The FSR for the Housing SEPP should be calculated only for the residential part of the site, not the whole site
- Stage 1 (residential buildings A&B) are separated from the HSF which provides the uplift (but this is in Stage 2)
 - HSF needs to be developed as part of Stage 1 to access the uplift under (CI 6.21 of SSLEP)
- Council's detailed RFI considerations need to be addressed (as noted below)
- Inadequate CI 4.6 justification needs to be substantiated

REFERRALS REQUIRED

Internal

- Concerns regarding:
 - waste management and vehicle access for council vehicles
 - landscaping and deep soil
 - Groundwater impact
 - Traffic and parking
 - Design Review Forum and built form and amenity considerations

External

- Sydney water concerns about interference with aquifer is being investigated
- NSW Transport - SIDRA analysis required

KEY ISSUES IN RELATION TO PUBLIC EXHIBITION

11 Submissions received (9 unique objectors) raised the following key issues:

- Traffic congestion and parking difficulties
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy and noise
- Impacts on amenity
- Affordable housing
- Loss of mature trees
- Lack of clarity and detail
- Environmental impacts