

RECORD OF BRIEFING & SITE INSPECTION

SOUTHERN REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Wednesday, 9 August 2023, 11am – 12.30pm Site inspection undertaken after briefing, 2-3pm.
LOCATION	Briefing: Civic Centre, 68 Elizabeth Street, Moss Vale Site Visit: 3 Rainbow Road Mittagong 2575

BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSTH-252 – Wingecarribee – DA23/1070 – 3 Rainbow Road Mittagong 2575 – Affordable Housing Development

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Briefing & Site Visit: Chris Wilson, Juliet Grant, Susan Budd, Julie Walsh, Stephen Leathley
APOLOGIES	None
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	None

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Briefing & Site Visit: Hugh Halliwell, John McFadden, Adan Davis
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES	 Briefing (in-person): Andrew Coble (Coble Stephens Architects), James Lovell (James Lovell & Assoc – Town Planning), Andrew Reeves (TBG), James Bissett (Owner representative), Briefing (VC): Matthew Bissett (Anthem Care), Irene Newport (Owner Bigola Beach P/L)
OTHER	Briefing Amanda Moylan (DPE), Tim Mahoney (DPE), Tracey Gillett (DPE) Site Visit: Tim Mahoney (DPE)

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

Council Briefing:

Council assessment staff provided a background to the lodgment and progression of the DA and discussed the following matters:

- Overview of the site, development, and key issues.
- GTAs received from the NSW Rural Fire Service who raised no objections.

- Six (6) submissions received during public notification. 1 Petition with 59 signatures in total was also received. Issues raised from submissions included traffic generation, general bulk & scale/building height, landscaping, trees, heritage, water, and sewer management.
- Issues raised by Water NSW and the applicant's response, which is currently under review by Water NSW.
- Owners consent outstanding for proposed drainage works in easement on adjacent property to the rear of the site.
- Comments provided by Council's Heritage Officer in relation to the heritage item located to the east of the site.
- Inadequacy of deep soil areas provided on site and proposed replacement planting.
- Absence of information outlining location of trees on the adjoining heritage site and potential impact of works, and associated vegetation removal, on these trees.
- Car parking provision which exceeds statutory requirements.
- Building separation, side/rear setbacks and public domain interfaces.
- Uncertainty as to which units are allocated as affordable housing units.
- Further details of the elevation shadow diagrams to demonstrate solar access compliance to be requested.
- Waste management arrangements.
- Compliance with FSR requirements and calculation of bonus provision.

Applicant Briefing:

The Applicant provided the Panel with a briefing and the following matters were discussed:

- Overview of the development, site history and history of project experience in the southern highlands.
- Proposed operation and ongoing management of the facility by a registered social housing provider
- Northern alignment limits impacts of overshadowing and overlooking.
- LEP/ADG compliance.
- On street arrangements for waste collection.
- Compliance with the numerical requirements of the relevant SEPPs.
- Design philosophy with the two-building designed across the site to achieve high amenity in terms
 of solar access for occupants and location of the communal open space areas in the middle of the
 development which are also deep soil zones.
- Proposed build to rent model (100% affordable housing).

The Panel acknowledged the suitability of the site and its location for affordable housing and raised the following matters with the applicant:

- Presentation as a 3-story building. The applicant indicated the proposed roof pitch is typical for the area and is required to accommodate the bonus FSR with the dormers accommodating the additional floor space.
- Percentage of GFA proposed to be available for affordable units/housing.
- Requested the applicant demonstrate which units are affordable housing.
- The relationship of the proposed development at its interface with neighbors, the heritage item and the adjoining park.
- Tree removal (56 low value trees proposed to be removed and 17 retained) and deep soil zones, particularly at the interface with adjoining properties.

- Usability of communal space. The applicant clarified that it was intended to create usable open areas for families likely to occupy the proposed type of development. Utilizing of basement parking to allow for larger communal areas and deep soil zones.
- Solar access compliance for the communal area.
- Social impact assessment. The applicant outlined a separate assessment has not been completed. Acknowledged a demand and requirement for this type of housing.
- Public consultation process completed by applicant with members of the community (letter box drops and formal meetings at the RSL) and how the feedback has been incorporated into the design).
- Inclusion of excess parking in the FSR calculations.

Site Visit:

- Council and the Panel observed the area where the easement is proposed at the rear of the property.
- Council and the Panel agreed it would be highly beneficial to have more trees retained on the site, particularly along the boundaries.
- The Panel outlined the arborist report should be independently reviewed noting there were several discrepancies between the SEE, the landscape plans, site plans and arborist report. The SEE says there are 17 trees on site being retained but the schedule to the arborist report (March 2023 version 3) states that only 2 trees on the site are being retained (the other 15 are on neighbouring sites or the nature strip).
- Council outlined there is very little to no setback to accommodate deep soil landscaping and planting on the boundaries.
- The Panel and Council noted the access arrangements whilst on site and queried if a single combined driveway instead of separate entry and exit points would be more beneficial, particularly the ability to increase setbacks and deep soil planting at the side elevations.
- The Panel reiterated that it is not clear how much floor space is for affordable housing and what units are being used as affordable housing. It has not been nominated which units in the statement of environmental effects or on the floor plans.
- The Panel and Council noted that there are privacy and overlooking issues looking north over the rear boundary for adjoining properties.
- The Panel and Council noted there is an existing water asset on the site at No.5 Rainbow Road.

Next Steps

- Inconsistencies between the landscape plans, site plans and the arborist report, particularly in relation to proposed tree removal, are to be reviewed and addressed by the applicant.
- The applicant is encouraged to further consider the arrangements at the property interface and the relationship of the development to the neighbouring properties and the adjacent park.
- The Panel requested the applicant continue to work closely with Council to work through issues raised in referrals and the RFI and to consider the important character of the area and mechanisms to incorporate this into the design of the development.
- Further status briefing may not be required, and the application may be finalised by E-Determination.

THE PANEL IS WORKING TOWARDS A DETERMINATION IN DECEMBER 2023