

## ATTACHMENT 6 - Wollongong Development Control Plan 2009 compliance table

### CHAPTER A1 – INTRODUCTION

#### 8 Variations to development controls in the DCP

The development has been assessed against the relevant chapters of WDCP2009 and found to be unsatisfactory with regards to floodplain management, stormwater management, character of the area, contaminated land management, water sensitive urban design, built form, privacy, solar access, landscaping, communal open space, landscaped area, deep soil zone, retaining wall height, basement car parking and bicycle parking. It is noted that no variation request has been submitted for the variations to the development control plans with the application submission.

### CHAPTER A2 – ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Development controls to improve the sustainability of development throughout Wollongong are integrated into the relevant chapters of this DCP as detailed below.

Generally speaking, the proposal is not considered to be consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

### CHAPTER B1 – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

#### 4.0 General Residential controls

<i>Controls/objectives</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
<u>4.13 Fire Brigade Servicing</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>All dwellings located within 60m of a fire hydrant</li></ul>	The subject site can be adequately serviced by fire fighting vehicles in this circumstance.	Yes
<u>4.14 Services</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Encourage early consideration of servicing requirements</li></ul>	Water, electricity, sewage and telephone services are already available to the site.  The existing utility services could be augmented to support the proposed development.	Yes
<u>4.16 View sharing</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>To protect and enhance view sharing, significant view corridors</li><li>A range of view sharing measures to be considered for building design</li></ul>	The proposed development will have minimal impact on view corridors of existing development.	Yes
<u>4.17 Retaining walls</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>To ensure well designed retaining walls that are structurally sound</li></ul>	Submitted plans indicate that the proposal incorporates retaining walls greater than 1m in height. Clause 4.17.3(4) indicates that to limit the overall height impact, terracing of retaining walls is required, limiting the maximum vertical rise of a retaining wall to 1m, with a minimum horizontal setback of 1m. Clause 4.17.3(5) indicates that any retaining wall with a vertical height exceeding 1 metre in any one vertical rise must be supported by appropriate justification demonstrating how the proposal meets the objectives.  It is noted that no justification has been provided demonstrating that the retaining walls exceeding 1m in height satisfy the objectives of the clause.	No

## 6 Residential Flat Buildings

It is noted that the proposed residential flat building component of the development is subject to SEPP 65 and as such an assessment of the proposed residential flat building against the ADG is required to be undertaken.

SEPP 65 Clause 6A(2) indicates that in the event that a development control plan contains provisions that specify requirements, standards or controls in relation to a matter to which the ADG applies, those provisions are of no effect. However certain matters in Council's DCP still require assessment against relevant controls for all components of the development.

Overall, the proposed development has been considered against the provisions of WDCP 2009 below and found to be acceptable.

Controls/objectives	Comment	Compliance
<u>6.1 General</u>		
<u>6.2 Minimum Site Width Requirement</u>  This clause prescribes a minimum site width of 24m for residential flat buildings.	The subject site has frontages of 71m to Bellevue Road, 44.475m to the Princes Highway and 17m to Benney Avenue.	Yes
<u>6.3 Front Setbacks</u>  A 6m minimum is required to the primary road frontage with a 3m minimum to secondary street frontage for corner allotments. Balconies may be setback 900mm closer.  Darkes Road and West Dapto Road have been considered primary roads with the Road 1 frontage considered a secondary frontage.	The ILU has 8.33m front setback to Bellevue Road	Yes
<u>6.4 Side and Rear Setbacks / Building Separation</u>  A minimum of 6m is required for buildings up to 4 storeys where a habitable room /balcony faces the boundary.	The ILU is setback approximately 6.8m from the North western side boundary i.e. the common boundary with No.15 Bellevue Road.  The RACF is setback approximately 6m from the South western boundary i.e. the common boundary with the adjoining properties on Benney Avenue.  See 3F ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 5</b>	See 3F ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 5</b>
<u>6.5 Built Form</u>	It is considered that the buildings have been designed by a qualified designer in accordance with SEPP65. The application submission included Design Verification Statement.  The site is zoned R2 Low Density Residential. The desired future character	No

is for Figtree to remain a relatively low density leafy residential suburb with some limited potential for medium density housing in the form of villas or townhouses upon larger amalgamated sites, particularly near the Princes Highway as is evidenced by zoning, floor space ratio, building height and minimum lot size mapping.

Both buildings exceed the maximum 9m height limit and 0.5:1 FSR development standards, set by WLEP 2021. It is noted that there are greater height and FSR controls that may be achieved through the SEPP (Housing) 2021. However, the proposed heights for both the ILU and RACF significantly exceed the non-discretionary development standards as detailed at SEPP (Housing) 2021 Section 107 and Section 108.

The bulk and scale of the development is not consistent with the existing streetscape along Bellevue Road or Benney Avenue when the applicable planning controls for the area inclusive of building height, floor space ratio, street frontage heights, building setbacks and other built form controls are taken into consideration. The development is considered to be out of context with regard to the desired future character of the area.

The scale of the development is likely to give rise to visual impacts on the surrounding low density residential development and streetscape. The bulk and scale of the development is not considered to positively contribute to the public domain.

The proposal was formally reviewed by the Panel on 30 March 2022. The Panel was concerned with the bulk and scale of proposal's interfaces with the low-density residential neighbourhood adjoining the sites northwest and southwestern boundaries.

Further comments on built form are provided in the ADG assessment at **Attachment 5**.

The objectives, design criteria and design guidance for visual privacy in residential flat building development are provided in the Part 3 of the ADG. As such the proposed development has been assessed against objectives, design criteria and design guidance of the ADG for visual privacy at Part 3F ADG assessment at **Attachment 5**

The application has been reviewed by the DRP and Council's Design Officer.

See 3F ADG assessment at **Attachment 5** and DRP recommendations at **Attachment 5**

## 6.6 Visual privacy

	<p>Variations to the ADG were noted with regard to visual privacy. There were a number of design amendments recommended by the DRP at the time to achieve ADG amenity objectives for proposed units and to minimise privacy impacts on adjoining residential development.</p> <p>Given flooding and drainage matters remain unresolved an overall redesign and response has not been forthcoming by the proponent.</p>	
<u>6.7 Acoustic privacy</u>	<p>The objectives, design criteria and design guidance for acoustic privacy in residential flat building development are provided in the Part 4 of the ADG. As such the proposed development has been assessed against objectives, design criteria and design guidance of the ADG for acoustic privacy at Part 4H ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 4</b>.</p> <p>With regard to privacy the DRP highlighted concerns with regard to privacy impacts on adjoining neighbours and recommended that all balconies oriented to the North west and South west boundaries be removed to reduce potential privacy issues with adjoining residential neighbours. Greater setbacks were recommended so as to reduce the density closer to the boundaries as per the advice of the ADG.</p> <p>Given flooding and drainage matters remain unresolved an overall redesign and response has not been forthcoming by the proponent.</p>	See 4H ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 4</b> and DRP recommendations at <b>Attachment 5</b>
<u>6.8 Car Parking Requirements</u>		
1 car parking space per dwelling (<70m <sup>2</sup> ) or 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling (70-110m <sup>2</sup> ) or 2 car parking spaces per dwelling (>110m <sup>2</sup> ), plus 0.2 car parking spaces per dwelling for visitors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 51 Spaces provided as basement parking for RACF;</li> <li>• 50 Spaces provided as basement parking for ILU; and</li> <li>• Additional 41 uncovered parking spaces at grade provided.</li> </ul>	Yes
1 bicycle space per 3 dwellings (residents) and 1 bicycle space per 12 dwellings (visitors).		Yes
1 motorcycle space per 15 dwellings Large Rigid Vehicle (Waste Contractor)		Yes
>10 dwellings – side loading waste collection vehicle	<p>The proposal complies with the minimum parking requirements. Details of the application submission were referred to Council's Traffic Officer for comment. Advice received is that the application is considered satisfactory with regard to the provision of onsite parking.</p> <p>Bicycle Parking:</p> <p>It was noted by Council's Traffic Officer that the application was unsatisfactory with</p>	No

<p><u>6.9 Basement Car Parking</u></p>	<p>regard to the provision of bicycle spaces.</p>	
	<p>The proposed basement carparking levels do not appear to extend beyond the building footprint.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>It noted that the development as proposed does not satisfy Council's minimum landscaped area and deep soil zone requirements.</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>The roof of the basement carparking level for the RACF does not protrude greater than 1.2m above natural or finished ground level.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>The roof of the basement 01 carparking level for the ILU appear to protrude greater than 1.2m above natural or finished ground level.</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>Reasonable setbacks from the basement to the site boundaries has been provided.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>It is considered that ventilation has been oriented away from habitable rooms and private open space areas.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><u>6.10 Access Requirements</u></p>		
	<p>Details of the application were referred to Council's Traffic Officer for comments. Advice received indicates that access arrangements including dimensions and grades are conditionally satisfactory.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><u>6.11 Landscaping Requirements</u></p>		
<p>30% of the site area to be provided as landscaping</p>	<p>Approximately 23% of site area (3123m<sup>2</sup>) provided as landscaping.</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>Details of the application submission including landscaping plans were referred to Council's Landscape and Environment Officers for comment.</p>	
	<p>Council's Landscape Officer has provided an unsatisfactory referral response indicating insufficient information has been submitted with the application submission to demonstrate compliance with Council development control plans, insufficient landscaped area and deep soil planting has been provided to demonstrate compliance with the SEPP (Housing) 2021 and no detail of streetscape treatment has been provided..</p>	
<p><u>6.12 Deep Soil Zone</u></p>		
<p>15% site area = 2037m<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>Council's Landscape Officer has provided an unsatisfactory referral response indicating insufficient information has been submitted with the application submission to demonstrate compliance with Council development control plans, insufficient landscaped area and deep soil planting has</p>	<p>No</p>

	been provided to demonstrate compliance with the SEPP (Housing) 2021 and no detail of streetscape treatment has been provided.	
<p><u>6.13 Communal Open Space</u></p> <p>Development with more than 10 dwelling must have communal open space calculated at a rate of 5m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling (110m<sup>2</sup> req'd for the ILU)</p>	<p>No communal open space appear to have been provided for the ILU</p> <p>The proposed development includes RACF consisting of 102 beds as such the minimum area of communal open space required under SEPP (Housing) 2021 would be 1020m<sup>2</sup>. The development provides 656.7m<sup>2</sup> of dedicated roof communal open space. Planted areas do not count towards COS. The shared plaza is a public area and does not meet this requirement. Therefore, the development as proposed does not satisfy this development standard.</p> <p>Further comments on Communal Open Space are provided in Part 3D of the ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 4</b></p>	No
<p><u>6.14 Private Open Space</u></p>	<p>The objectives, design criteria and design guidance for private open space in residential flat building development are provided in the Part 4 of the ADG. As such the proposed development has been assessed against objectives, design criteria and design guidance of the ADG for private open space at Part 4E ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 4</b>.</p>	See 4E ADG assessment at <b>Attachment 4</b>
<p><u>6.15 Adaptable Housing</u></p> <p>10% of dwellings must be designed to be capable of adaptation. (Min req'd 0.1 x 108 = 10.8)</p>	<p>22 Units provided capable of adaptation in the ILU.</p> <p>6 provided in RACF</p>	Yes
<p><u>6.16 Access for People with a Disability</u></p>	<p>The proposed development is considered satisfactory with regards to Access for People with a Disability in this circumstance. The application submission including a specialist Access Consultants report was referred to Council's Building, Community Services and Traffic Officers for comment with satisfactory referral advice provided.</p>	Yes
<p><u>6.17 Apartment Size and Layout Mix for Larger Residential Flat Building Developments</u></p> <p>Min 10% studio or 1 BR</p>	<p>The ILU provides the following mix of units:</p> <p>9 x 1 BR</p> <p>2 x 2 BR</p> <p>11 x 3BR</p>	Yes

#### 6.18 Solar Access

All units within the ILU are adaptable units.  
Apartment mix has been assessed under Part 4K of ADG assessment at **Attachment 4**

The objectives, design criteria and design guidance for solar and daylight access in residential flat building development are provided in the Part 4 of the ADG. As such the proposed development has been assessed against objectives, design criteria and design guidance of the ADG for solar and daylight access at Part 4A of ADG assessment at **Attachment 4**.

Advice from Council's Design Officer is that the ILU floor plan appears capable of achieving solar access requirements. It is noted that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate this though.

In terms of solar access and overshadowing impacts, the DRP noted concerns with access to natural lighting for several units. Advice from Council's Design Officer is that the private open space of neighbouring properties in particular those to the South west are impacted by overshadowing from the proposed development which is result of the additional height and bulk of the development. The ILU overshadows the internal court yard for almost the entire day making it unlikely to be usable in winter.

See 4A of ADG assessment at **Attachment 4** and DRP recommendations at **Attachment 5**

#### 6.19 Natural Ventilation

The objectives, design criteria and design guidance for natural ventilation in residential flat building development are provided in the Part 4 of the ADG. As such the proposed development has been assessed against objectives, design criteria and design guidance of the ADG for natural ventilation at Part 4B of ADG assessment at **Attachment 4**.

See 4B of ADG assessment at **Attachment 4**

### **CHAPTER D1 – CHARACTER STATEMENTS**

#### Kembla Grange

Chapter D1 indicates that the desired future character is that Figtree will remain a relatively low density leafy residential suburb with only some limited potential for medium density housing in the form of villas or townhouses upon larger amalgamated sites, particularly near the Princes Highway.

The existing character of Bellevue Road is low scale (predominately 1-2 storey development) characterised by an active retail shopping strip (Figtree Plaza and Figtree Square), shop top housing and other single storey villas and dwelling houses situated further west along Bellevue Road. Further west, Bellevue Road transitions to a suburban character defined by detached housing.

Both buildings exceed the maximum 9m height limit and 0.5:1 FSR development standards, set by WLEP 2021. It is noted that there are greater height and FSR controls that may be achieved through the SEPP (Housing) 2021. However, the proposed heights for both the ILU and RACF significantly

exceed the non-discretionary development standards as detailed at SEPP (Housing) 2021 Section 107 and Section 108.

The bulk and scale of the development is not consistent with the existing streetscape along Bellevue Road or Benney Avenue when the applicable planning controls for the area inclusive of building height, floor space ratio, street frontage heights, building setbacks and other built form controls are taken into consideration.

As such the development is considered to be out of context with regard to the desired future character of the area. The proposed land use is permissible in the R2 zone and could be considered consistent with the desired future character for the locality, however, significant issues have been raised by Council's Strategic planning, Design and Stormwater Officers in relation to the built form impact on the character of the area and the proposed developments response to the site context.

#### **CHAPTER E1: ACCESS FOR PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY**

It is considered that disabled access to the proposed development is acceptable in this circumstance. Council's Building Officer has reviewed the application submission including the Access Consultant's Report and returned a satisfactory referral response.

#### **CHAPTER E2: CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN**

<i>Control/objective</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
<u>3.1 Lighting</u>	Lighting to public areas to be provided according to AS1158. Entries are to be appropriately lit.	Yes
<u>3.2 Natural surveillance and sightlines</u>	The proposed development does account for and will improve natural surveillance of adjoining properties and the street.	Yes
<u>3.3 Signage</u>	Appropriate directional signage will be provided within the develop site and within the road corridor.	Yes
<u>3.4 Building design</u>	It is considered that the proposed development satisfies CPTED principles in minimising areas of entrapment and concealment, natural surveillance and access controls.  Details of the application submission were reviewed by Council's Safer Communities Officer and no issues were raised with regards to Building Design.	Yes
<u>3.5 Landscaping</u>	It is considered that the proposed development satisfies CPTED principles in minimising areas of entrapment and concealment, natural surveillance and access controls.  Details of the application submission were reviewed by Council's Safer Communities Officer and no issues were raised with regards to Landscaping.	Yes



<i>Control/objective</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
<u>3.6 Public open space and parks.</u>	Not Applicable. The proposal is not opposite an area of public open space or park.	N/A
<u>3.7 Community facilities &amp; Public Amenities</u>	Not Applicable.	N/A
<u>3.8 Bus stops and taxi ranks</u>	The proposed development will have no impact on existing lighting to the taxi rank directly forward of the church hall.	Yes

### **CHAPTER E3: CAR PARKING, ACCESS, SERVICING/LOADING FACILITIES AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

Council's Traffic Officer has assessed the application submission and considered the proposal satisfactory with regard to impacts on the local road network, vehicular access and egress and the provision onsite car and motor cycle parking.

It was, however noted that the application was unsatisfactory with regard to the provision of bicycle spaces.

The proposal provides the following with respect to onsite parking:

- 51 Spaces provided as basement parking for RACF;
- 50 Spaces provided as basement parking for ILU; and
- Additional 41 uncovered parking spaces at grade provided.

### **CHAPTER E6: LANDSCAPING**

The application submission was referred to Council's Landscape Officer for comment. Advice received indicates there are issues with the proposal.

Council's Landscape Officer has indicated the following:

- Submitted plans do not detail all existing trees accurately plotted on the site;
- Arboriculture Impact Assessment Report is required which may result in a redesign of the proposal in order to accommodate trees that are to be retained;
- The Landscape Plan has not detailed all retaining walls;
- A minimum 1.5m wide landscaped area is required for the full length of the boundaries;
- Landscaping and Deep Soil Zone complying with the requirements of SEPP (Housing) 2021 is required;

### **CHAPTER E7: WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Conditions could be imposed to ensure that Waste Management is carried out to Council's Waste Management specification during construction.

Council's Traffic Officer has reviewed the proposal and raised no issues with regard to waste servicing of the proposal.

### **CHAPTER E13 FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT**

The application has been reviewed by Council's Stormwater Officer in relation to floodplain management. Advice received indicates that there are issues with the proposal.

Council's Stormwater Officer has indicated the following:

- The proposal is contrary to the controls in Schedule 4: Prescriptive Controls – Allans Creek Floodplain, of Appendix C of Chapter E13 of the WDCP 2009, which stipulate that 'Critical Utilities' such as seniors housing are an unsuitable land use within the High and Medium Flood Risk Precincts;

- The proposal does not comply with the floor levels and evacuation controls for critical utilities in Schedule 4 of Appendix C of Chapter E13 of the WDCP 2009;
- The proposal will result in significant flood impacts on other land outside the development site including more extensive floodway areas, increased flood hazard, velocities, and increased flood levels;
- The proposal includes filling and a car park located within an existing floodway and High Flood Risk Precinct area, which is considered contrary to the controls, objectives, performance criteria in WLEP 2009 Section 5.21 and WDCP 2009 Chapter E13;
- The proposal includes piping and modification of a natural watercourse, contrary to Section 5.5 of Chapter E13 of the Wollongong DCP2009;
- The proposed driveway passes through parts of the floodplain where flood depths and velocities are outside safe criteria;
- The proposal includes car parking areas where flood depths and velocities are outside safe criteria;
- The proposal will result in an increase in the frequency and duration of surface water flows being conveyed onto and across the downslope land;
- Concerns with the submitted flood study as follows:
  - Is inconsistent with Council's adopted flood study, with the flood levels predicted by Rienco being up to 200mm lower at the subject site than those predicted by Council's adopted model;
  - Uses manning's n values that are inconsistent with Council's adopted study;
  - Does not include certain structures/obstructions on the site that are likely to have a significant influence on flood flow behaviour such as an existing building and car port structure (which has an enclosed eastern wall) over the piped watercourse and landscaping/vegetation on the site and adjoining property where Rienco has applied manning's n values of 0.03 and 0.02, reflecting 'short maintained grass' and 'road pavement'.
  - Indicates significant flood impacts on other land outside the development site including more extensive floodway areas, increased flood hazard, velocities, and increased flood levels that exceed the 'Permissible Flood Impacts' stipulated in Table 2 of Chapter E13 of the Wollongong DCP2009 and do not satisfy the controls, objectives, and performance criteria in chapter E13 and Clause 5.21 of the Wollongong LEP2009.
  - Appears to contain the incorrect plan in Figure C5.3 (it appears that the post-development 1 % AEP flood velocity map has been provided as Figure C5.3, which is intended to be the pre-development 20% AEP flood velocity map).
- The proposed basement car parks are not protected from inundation during a 1 % AEP flood level;

## **CHAPTER E14 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT**

The application has been reviewed by Council's Stormwater Officer in relation to stormwater management. Advice received indicates that there are issues with the proposal.

Council's Stormwater Officer has indicated the following:

- A stormwater concept plan has not been provided that satisfies the requirements of Chapter E14 of the Wollongong DCP2009, including the provision of On-site Stormwater Detention (OSD);
- The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of Section 9.3.17 of Chapter E14, with respect to local overland flow from the adjoining land that naturally falls towards the development site, including localised overland flows contributing to the site along the north-western and south-western property boundaries.

## **CHAPTER E15 WATER SENSITIVE URBAN DESIGN**

The proposal seeks a residential apartment buildings involving more than 20 apartment therefore the proposal requires the incorporation of appropriate water sensitive urban design measures for the development. Details of the application submission were referred to Council's Environment Officer for comment. Advice received is that insufficient information has been submitted with the application submission for Council to assess the application and a Water Sensitive Urban Design Report is to be submitted with development application.

## **CHAPTER E17 PRESERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF TREES AND VEGETATION**

The application proposes the removal of several trees to facilitate the proposal. Council's Landscape and Environment Officers have assessed the application submission. Advice received from Council's Landscape Officer indicates there are issues with the proposal.

Council's Landscape Officer has indicated the following:

- Submitted plans do not detail all existing trees accurately plotted on the site;
- Arboriculture Impact Assessment Report is required which may result in a redesign of the proposal in order to accommodate trees that are to be retained;
- The Landscape Plan has not detailed all retaining walls;
- A minimum 1.5m wide landscaped area is required for the full length of the boundaries;
- Landscaping and Deep Soil Zone to comply with the requirements of SEPP (Housing) 2021 is required.

## **CHAPTER E19 EARTHWORKS (LAND RESHAPING WORKS)**

The proposal involves excavation to facilitate the development as proposed. Information regarding the earthworks to reshape the land were submitted with the application.

The application was referred to Council's Stormwater and Environment Officers for comment. Council's Stormwater Officer has raised issues with the proposed land-reshaping works noting the following:

- The proposal will result in significant flood impacts on other land outside the development site including more extensive floodway areas, increased flood hazard, velocities, and increased flood levels;
- The proposal includes filling and a car park located within an existing floodway and High Flood Risk Precinct area, which is considered contrary to the controls, objectives, performance criteria in WLEP 2009 Section 5.21 and WDCP 2009 Chapter E13;
- The proposal includes piping and modification of a natural watercourse, contrary to Section 5.5 of Chapter E13 of the Wollongong DCP2009;
- The proposal will result in an increase in the frequency and duration of surface water flows being conveyed onto and across the downslope land;

The extent of landform modification to facilitate the proposal is not considered to be site responsive and insufficient information has been lodged to determine whether the proposed land re-shaping works will not have a detrimental impact on environmental functions and processes, neighbouring uses and features of the surrounding land.

## **CHAPTER E20 CONTAMINATED LAND MANAGEMENT**

Council's Environmental Officer has reviewed the history of the site. Advice received is that there was uncontrolled fill material brought on to the site to fill the water courses on a number lots. In addition, there was a vehicles sales yard with garage/workshop on Lot 100 DP 614698. The uncontrolled fill material may have potentially caused land and/or groundwater contamination.

A Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) Report that identifies the exact nature, degree and extent of any contamination within the soil and/or groundwater table (if any) is required. Based on the findings of the DSI a Remediation Action Plan must be prepared so that the site can be made suitable for the proposed development.

This information has not been provided with the application submission and as such it is considered insufficient information has been provided with the application to demonstrate that the proposal will be satisfactory with regard to SEPP (Hazards and Resilience) 2021 matters.

## **CHAPTER E21 DEMOLITION AND ASBESTOS MANAGEMENT**

The application submission proposes demolition of existing structures. A Site Waste Minimisation Plan, including waste removal was included in the application submission. Conditions could be imposed to minimise impacts and ensure that demolition is carried out to Council's and Safe Work NSW requirements.

## **CHAPTER E22 SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL**

Conditions could be imposed to minimise the impacts of the proposed works on the environment.

## **CHAPTER E23: RIPARIAN LAND MANAGEMENT**

The Riparian Land Map indicates the site contains riparian land. The application submission was referred to Council's Environment Officer for comment. Advice received indicates there are no issues with the proposal.

The application submission included advice from DPE – Water, previously known as Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR), indicating that the watercourse is not considered a river and as such the application did not require referral to DPE – Water as integrated development.