

DATE OF DECISION	15 November 2018
PANEL MEMBERS	Paul Mitchell (Acting Chair), Mary-Lynne Taylor, Paul Stein and Paul Moulds
APOLOGIES	None
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	None

PLANNING PROPOSAL

2017SWCC141 – Cumberland – PGR_2016_HOLRO_002_00. at 1 Crescent St, Holroyd

The proposal seeks to amend the Holroyd LEP 2016 to rezone land at 1 Crescent St, Holroyd from B5 Business Development, to B4 Mixed Use, R4 High Density Residential (including "commercial premises" as an additional permitted use), RE1 Public Recreation, SP2 Infrastructure and amend associated development standards.

BACKGROUND

On 30 August 2018 the Panel, having been appointed as the Planning Proposal Authority, met to consider the amended planning proposal and determine whether it should be forwarded to the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) under Section 3.34 of the Environment Planning and Assessment Act for Gateway Determination. The Panel determined that the proposal was not ready to proceed to Gateway and requested that the applicant amend and provide further details about the planning proposal.

The applicant subsequently requested another meeting to brief the Panel, which took place on 15 November 2018.

PANEL DECISION

The Panel continues to recognise the strategic importance of the subject site and believes a modified version of the current proposal could result in its productive use. However, the Panel's decision is that the planning proposal is not ready nor documented in sufficient detail to be sent to Gateway. Specifically, the Panel requires:

1. Further consideration of urban design matters.

The heights of proposed buildings along Crescent St are to be no higher than originally proposed meaning parts of proposed buildings A and B are to be reduced to 8 storeys as shown in the attached plan. The bulk and height of proposed buildings on the corner of Crescent Street and Woodville Road (see attached plan – Buildings E, F and G) are to be re-examined in the light of the reduced land area available as a result of the resumption by RMS. The Panel is concerned about the large building footprints and reduced setback from the realigned street and believes smaller footprints but with somewhat taller buildings may be a better outcome; to this end removal of the proposed 8 storey building between buildings E and F is to be considered.

2. Proper consideration of transport matters.

The Panel's position is that the proposal must not cause a reduction in levels of transport service in the affected locality and preferably some improvement in transport capacity should occur. As such, the Panel requires investigation of the Proposal's impacts on transport services and specification of measures to ensure the Panel's position will be achieved. The investigation is to include analysis of the effects of the currently proposed development density on levels of transport service and recommend any reduction in density that may be needed to achieve the Panel's position. It is also to include examination of future operational conditions and levels of service at the Crescent St/Woodville Rd intersection.

3. Independent review

The Panel repeats its earlier request that an independent review of the traffic and transport investigation by Item 2 is to be provided. Specifically, the review is to comment on the adequacy of the technical investigation and the practicality and effectiveness of the transport measures proposed. The applicant is to meet the cost of the independent review and prior to commissioning the reviewer should consult the DPE to obtain its opinion on the independence and technical suitability of the intended reviewer.

4. Reconsideration of the development density currently proposed.

It is not evident to the Panel that the currently proposed FSR of 3.95:1 is satisfactory. Reconsideration of the proposed density is to occur considering the findings of the traffic and transport investigations and independent review (items 2 and 3), and changes to the building bulk and height of the proposed buildings (item 1). In addition, opportunities to provide more on-site convenience retail and community service facilities are to be investigated, including the effects on Granville and other nearby town centres.

5. Documentation of the applicant's proposals for provision of public services and infrastructure.

The documentation is to itemise the specific services or facilities that would be provided, timing of their provision and arrangements for ongoing management.

6. Documentation of arrangements for provision of affordable housing.

This is to include all necessary details to satisfy the Panel that the arrangements will be socially beneficial, practical and timely.





7. Revision of the proposed height of buildings maps.

The current height of buildings map has a single maximum across each proposed zone and the Panel believes this results in insufficient regulatory certainty. Accordingly, the map is to be revised so that heights coincide with the footprints of proposed buildings. Further, the heights proposed seem to be greater than needed for the number of storeys proposed; the Panel believes that heights per storey of 3.2m and 3.6m for residential and commercial development respectively are generally appropriate and should be used in the revised map.

8. Meetings with agencies

The applicant is encouraged to meet regularly with the DPE and Cumberland Council while it is undertaking the work specified in items 1 – 7. The Panel would like to see agreement on methods for the conduct of the specified investigations prior to their commencement and, if possible, on necessary modifications to the proposal as well as on the infrastructure and services to be provided.

The Panel's decision was unanimous.

PANEL MEMBERS	
 Paul Mitchell OAM (Chair)	 Mary-Lynne Taylor
 Paul Stein AM	 Paul Moulds AM

Attachment: plan referred to in above decision

