

## BRIEFING DETAILS

<b>BRIEFING DATE / TIME</b>	Monday, 2 March 2020, 12:00pm and 12:30pm Site inspection undertaken before briefing
<b>LOCATION</b>	Camden Council, 70 Central Avenue, Oran Park

## BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSWC-27 – Camden Council – DA/2019/710/1 – 320 Dwyer Road, Leppington – Demolition of existing structures and construction of a church, hall, early learning centre, carpark, landscaping, building identification signage and associated works

## PANEL MEMBERS

<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	Justin Doyle (Chair), Nicole Gurran and Lara Symkowiak
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	Louise Camenzuli & Theresa Fedeli
<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	None

## OTHER ATTENDEES

<b>COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF</b>	Jamie Erken, Ryan Pritchard, Stephen Pratt and David Rowley
<b>OTHER</b>	

## KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

- The land the subject of the application is unsewered, which has constrained the development of the locality. Both the practicality of approving the development at this scale with a pump out system (as currently proposed), and the cumulative effect of such an approach if replicated, will need to be considered.
- The success of the proposed minimalist design will likely be dependent on the quality and type of materials employed. This might need to be nominated at DA stage.
- The proposed height non-compliance of around 50% would have to be justified according to the usual principals applying to a 4.6 Percent variation. While this is a large site, the proposed building is shown close to a side boundary where it will be elevated above the adjoining property due to topography. These matters will need to be evaluated.
- The car park design would seem to be improved from a visual and heat sink perspective by introducing canopy tree planting and potentially breaking up the length of the car park into smaller components. Again, the elevation of that car park which may make it visually prominent is a factor to be considered.
- The setbacks proposed are less than those recommended by Council's DCP policy for other land uses. While there are no controls adopted specifically for the proposed uses, that does not mean that established setbacks and the setbacks required for other forms of development, are irrelevant. On a large greenfield site such as this, where the use will be quite different to its rural surroundings, narrow

setbacks such as the front 4 metre setback and the effectively zero setback to the western boundary car park (which would prevent any screening or acoustic mitigation) would need strong justification.

**TENTATIVE PANEL MEETING DATE: N/A**