

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Tuesday, 12 April 2022
SITE INSPECTION	Tuesday, 21 June 2022 11:30hrs
LOCATION	Video conference (MS Teams) and on site

BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSTH-143 – Wollongong – DA-2022/136 – 7-9 Bellevue Road, Figtree – The proposal is for demolition of existing structures, tree removal, construction of a mixed-use seniors living complex including various ancillary uses such as a gym, wellness centre, club house, café, chapel, Seniors Day Care and flooding/ stormwater infrastructure.

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Chris Wilson (A/Chair), Renata Brooks, Tim Fletcher, David Brown,
APOLOGIES	Renata Brooks (21 June 2022)
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Michael Mantei

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Rod Thew, John Wood, Nicole Ashton
DPE STAFF (RSD TEAM)	Verity Rollason (12 April 2022), Amanda Moylan (21 June 2022)

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

- Site context.
- Pre and post-lodgement DRP consideration.
- Departures from the SEPP provisions.
- Height, FSR, and scale of the development.
- Confirmation that Cl 4.6 variation relates to height (not FSR).
- Scope of SEPP bonuses.
- Significant community interest in terms of traffic generation, amenity impacts, and context of development.
- Consistency around the application of statutory controls particularly around height and FSR
- Amenity impacts at the interface.
- Flooding;
 - Final internal advice on stormwater and flooding outstanding.
 - Flooding is considered to be a significant site constraint.
 - Incompatibility of flood controls given the classification of flood risk as moderate and proposed intensification of use.

- Location of floodway (creek) on site.
- Operation of culvert as flood management structure.
- Considerations around flood evacuation planning.
- Location of habitable buildings relative to flooding.
- \circ Flooding to the basement
- Design Review Panel comments
 - Pre and post lodgement with DRP.
 - While DRP consider the site selection for this type of development to be sound, concerns were raised in relation to;
 - Scale, and impacts at interface with other R2 adjoining lands
 - Privacy
 - Variations to the ADG.
 - Privacy issues: DRP summary said despite design changes, these changes haven't gone far enough to resolve interface issues with adjoining R2 land. There are many variations from the ADG.
- The Council advised the Panel that the proposal includes considerable departures from the SEPP relating to height and FSR and that the height appears to be excessive. FSR and Height variations are likely to be unacceptable
- Traffic;
 - Council expressed concerns regarding the compressed traffic location and complex intersection.
 - \circ $\,$ TfNSW advised that traffic arrangements in relation to State roads are satisfactory with minor changes recommended.
 - \circ $\;$ Flooding interactions with traffic and evacuation remain unresolved.
- The Council provided details about the location of the environmentally sensitive land within the site and noted that development is excluded in areas of medium to high sensitivity.
- Site contamination issues relating to the former use of the site as a car yard. The PSI does not provide sufficient information and further investigation of the history of land use on the site including is required including past use and uncontrolled fill used on site. Council considers that a Detailed Site Investigation is required.

Next Steps

The council to advise that the application remains under preliminary assessment, and a detailed status letter is to be issued outlining concerns, including comments from referral groups (internal and external) and the DRP.

The Panel recognises and supports the concerns of the Council based on its inspection of the site and the information received to date and acknowledges there are significant issues that need to be addressed and which may require a considered redesign to resolve. The Panel expects the applicant to address these concerns. The Panel acknowledges the significance of flooding issues in the area, and the complexities relating to the intersection, particularly in terms of evacuating vulnerable residents, and also shares the concerns of the DRP in terms of height, scale, and the likely overdevelopment of the site.

The Panel confirmed a public determination meeting will be required as > 10 submissions were received, in addition to the petition with >100 signatures, indicating significant community concern.

The Panel requested the Applicant be given the option to brief the Panel.