

**BRIEFING DETAILS**

<b>BRIEFING DATE / TIME</b>	Tuesday, 15 August 2023 Site inspection and briefing
<b>LOCATION</b>	56 Merool Road, Moama

**SITE INSPECTION/BRIEFING MATTERS**

PPSWES-182 – Murray River Council – DA 10.2023.110.1 – PAN - 312975 - 56 Merool Road, Moama – Development Application for the erection of 88 independent living units and ancillary facilities under State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021.

**PANEL MEMBERS**

<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	Garry Fielding (Chair), Graham Brown, Donna Rygate
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	Chris Bilkey
<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	None

**OTHER ATTENDEES**

<b>COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF</b>	Chris O'Brien, John Guilsøyle
<b>OTHER</b>	Nil

**KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED**

The Panel strongly supports the provision of independent living units and ancillary facilities in Moama. The provision of this form of residential accommodation, however, needs to be carefully assessed against the relevant planning controls and, importantly, assessed having regard to the people who will ultimately live in this type of accommodation. It is not just residential accommodation but accommodation for people with special needs. While the Panel supports this form of accommodation in Moama, the proposed development in its current form has a number of shortcomings that need to be addressed before consideration of the development application can progress.

**1. Subdivision layout**

A subdivision that reflects a more rectilinear pattern rather than a design based on existing lot boundaries is more appropriate and will provide a safer and a more efficient outcome. Streets that enter another street at acute angles should be avoided as should unnecessary 90 degree turns and streets that change in width. The use of roads that are only 6m in width for significant lengths must be questioned given the likely age of the proposed residents where these residents would need to walk on the roads to move around the proposed development. A 6m road reserve can only accommodate 2-way traffic with no footpaths. Cross sections of the proposed 6m and 8m road reserves need to be provided to show that future residents can move around the site in safety.

## **2. Road hierarchy**

The subdivision has no obvious road hierarchy, with street widths changing for no obvious reason. The need for proposed streets that leave the site into adjoining properties has not been established nor has the reason why internal streets provide access to the club carpark when access should be restricted to external roads to avoid amenity impacts on the proposed residential properties.

## **3. Tree retention**

The site has few trees, and it is proposed that these few trees be removed. The retention of existing trees, as part of the subdivision layout and open space planning, would enhance the amenity of the development for future residents.

## **4. Stormwater disposal**

The Drainage Design is inadequate. No relative levels are provided to determine how stormwater will be disposed of. A drainage concept design should be provided that identifies likely building levels, gradients for stormwater lines and where the stormwater will be ultimately deposited. This is particularly important given the very flat nature of the site and any likely impacts on the council stormwater system.

## **5. Sewer disposal**

No details are provided on sewage disposal. Again, details are necessary to ensure that sufficient grade is available to dispose of sewage (from the proposed dwellings to the disposal point) and also whether sufficient capacity is available at council's sewerage treatment plant.

## **6. Impact of licensed premises**

The likely impacts of a licensed premises through noise associated with noisy patrons and vehicular movements is an important consideration when it directly adjoins a residential area. The proposal appears to give little regard to this potential problem, with residential properties directly adjoining the club carpark. Vegetative screening and acoustical fencing should be considered, as should the deletion of any roads through the proposed development that lead to the licensed club carpark.

## **7. Social impact**

The social wellbeing of future residents seems to be totally addressed through the adjoining licensed club, including the proposed bus that is to be utilised to provide access to Moama town centre for future residents. The proposal to have the last bus returning to the proposed development at 11.10am on Monday to Friday and 10.10am on Saturday and Sunday is not acceptable. The proposed development should be largely independent of the licensed club in addressing the social needs of the proposed development. While the licensed club can provide additional social benefits for some future residents of the development, it is not appropriate to rely solely on this facility to provide all social needs of the development. Similarly, the statement that the proposed Community Centre will provide "functional amenities that will provide a range of needs" is unacceptably short on detail. Addressing the future social needs of future residents needs to be reassessed.

## **8. Biodiversity/Conservation**

If the need to remove existing trees is to be pursued, the advice from the Department of Planning and Environment requires more information. The retention of the trees is a more preferable outcome for the development and the future residents of the site.

## **9. Open space**

The small pocket parks scattered through the site are unsuitable for the intended residents of the site. These areas provide little more open space than is proposed to be provided on the individual properties. The small areas of open space, and the area containing existing trees, should be combined and located near the Community Centre to provide a focus for the future residents of the development to socialise and congregate.

## **Planning Panels Secretariat**

## **10. Pedestrian links**

Pedestrian links within and external to the development are inadequately addressed. Given the proposed residents' pedestrian access throughout the site and to external facilities such as bus stops, the licensed club and the recreation area directly to the north should provide convenient and safe access.

**BRIEFING DATE** – To be determined after Council discusses the Key Issues above with the applicant.

**DETERMINATION DATE** – To be determined after the decision to proceed or withdraw has been made by the applicant.