## TIME& PLACE

## SUBJECT RAMSGATE PLANNING PROPOSAL DISCUSSION & PROPONENT RESPONSE

| DATE                         | PLACE     | CH                          | AIRPERSON           | SCRIBE   |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 11am - 12:30pm<br>04.03.2022 | Via Teams | Ki                          | m Zoljalali         | Kim Zoljalali<br>Vijay Prahbu<br>Kirraly Northey |
| ATTENDEES                    |           | COMPANY                     | CONTACT             |  |
| Linda Rodriguez              | LR        | WSP                         | Linda.Rodriguez@    | )wsp.com   |
| Ellen Shannon                | ES        | WSP                         | Ellen.Shannon@w     | /sp.com  |
| Catherine McMahon            | СМ        | Georges River Council (Cour | ncil) Cmcmahon@geoi | rgesriver.nsw.gov.au                             |
| Harkirat Singh               | НК        | Georges River Council       | HSingh@georgesi     | river.nsw.gov.au                                 |
| Henry Huynh                  | НН        | Georges River Council       | Hhuynh@georges      | river.nsw.gov.au                                 |
| Stephanie Lum                | SL        | Georges River Council       | Stephanie.Lum@g     | georgesriver.nsw.gov.au                          |
| James Hall                   | JH        | TfNSW                       | James.Hall@trans    | sport.nsw.gov.au                                 |
| Bayzid Khan                  | BK        | TfNSW                       | Bayzid.Khan@tra     | nsport.nsw.gov.au                                |
| Evan Papadopoulos            | EP        | Time & Place (T&P)          | Evan.papadopoul     | os@timeplace.com.au                              |
| Kim Zoljalali                | KZ        | Time & Place                | Kim.zoljalali@time  | eplace.com.au                                    |
| Marcus Lewin                 | ML        | Time & Place                | Marcus.lewin@tim    | neplace.com.au                                   |
| Pierre Abrahamse             | PA        | Woolworths                  | Pabrahamse@wo       | olworths.com.au                                  |
| Nick Steele                  | NS        | Woolworths                  | Nsteele1@woolwo     | orths.com.au                                     |
| Tim Rogers                   | TR        | CBRK                        | Tim.rogers@cbrk.    | com.au   |
| Adam Haddow                  | AH        | SJB                         | Ahaddow@sjb.co      | m.au   |
| Ben Charlton                 | BC        | SJB                         | BCharlton@sjb.cc    | om.au  |
| Emily Wombwell               | EW        | SJB                         | EWombwell@sjb.o     | com.au   |
| Rohit lyer                   | RI        | Landform Studios            | Riyer@landform-s    | tudios.com                                       |
| Vijay Prabhu                 | VP        | Urbis                       | Vprabhu@urbis.co    | om.au  |
| Kirraly Northey              | KN        | Urbis                       | Knorthey@urbis.c    | om.au  |
|                              |           |                             |                     |  |

| APOLOGIES     |    | COMPANY               | CONTACT                         |
|---------------|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Andrew Harvey | AH | Urbis                 | aharvey@urbis.com.au            |
| Hayley Barnes | HB | Georges River Council | HBarnes@georgesriver.nsw.gov.au |

NOTES

Purpose:

To document meeting held by Time & Place with Council, TfNSW, Woolworths and Consultants to present responses to WSP's feedback regarding the Planning Proposal and to discuss Transport and Traffic issues.

| ITEM NUMBER | DESCRIPTION   | WHO         | BY WHEN |
|-------------|---|-------------|---------|
| INTRODUCTIO | DN  |             |         |
| 1.1         | Intention of meeting set out by Time & Place to present the team's response to WSP's preliminary assessment and to discuss traffic issues to better understand both TfNSW and Council's position on various items.  |             |         |
| PRPONENT R  | ESPONSE TO WSP PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT   |             |         |
| 2.1         | <ul> <li>STREET WALL <ul> <li>SJB presented the design response which lowers the majority of street wall from 6 storeys to 4 storeys.</li> <li>WSP requested dimensioned plans to better understand extent of setbacks above street wall heights.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | SJB/<br>T&P | 11/03   |
| 2.2         | <ul> <li>OVERALL HEIGHT</li> <li>– SJB explained key design moves made to mitigate impact of height<br/>(street walls, setbacks, and modulated stepping down of proposed<br/>envelope toward neighbours).</li> <li>– No further comment was made by WSP and Council.</li> </ul>   |             |         |
| 2.3         | <ul> <li>TRANSITION TO HERITAGE</li> <li>SJB explained that the future development of 201-209 Rocky Point Rd should be considered when looking at the transition to the heritage neighbour and presented corresponding diagrams and steps the Proponent team has taken to achieve this.</li> <li>No further comment was made by WSP and Council.</li> </ul>   |             |         |
| 2.4         | <ul> <li>THROUGH-SITE LINKS</li> <li>SJB presented precedent study and prepared additional photo<br/>montages to better illustrate the intent of the site-through links and to<br/>explain the rationale behind maintaining a protected plaza.</li> <li>WSP requested SJB undertake prevailing wind analysis of the plaza to<br/>ensure it is a highly useable space with good amenity.</li> </ul>              | T&P         | 25/03   |
| 2.5         | <ul> <li>SOLAR ACCESS</li> <li>SJB presented the design response which widens the plaza to increase solar in midwinter from 38% to 50% for 2 hours, with a total of 75% of the plaza receiving sunlight which is significant improvement from the 65% sunlight received for the previous plaza design submitted with the Planning Proposal.</li> <li>No further comment was made by WSP and Council.</li> </ul> |             |         |

| ITEM NUMBER | DESCRIPTION   | WHO | BY WHEN |
|-------------|---|-----|---------|
| 2.6         | ACCESS TO NEIGHBOURING SITE<br>– SJB explained Proponent's response to WSP's comments by offering an<br>easement on the Planning Proposal site to enable Council waste<br>vehicles to enter the neighbouring site using their existing vehicle<br>access.   |     |         |
|             | <ul> <li>Council questioned vehicles accessing the neighbouring site, not just waste vehicles.</li> <li>CBRK responded by providing further explanation that the swept path analysis was undertaken on a Council sized waste vehicle.</li> <li>CBRK also noted the following:         <ul> <li>vehicle movement within the neighbouring site is the responsibility of the future development</li> <li>the proposed solution will maintain vehicle access to 201-209 Rocky Point Rd as per the existing condition</li> <li>the proposed easement will ensure Council garbage trucks can also access the neighbouring site via the existing service lane</li> <li>No further comments made by WSP and Council.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |     |         |
| 2.7         | <ul> <li>DEEP SOIL / WESTERN BOUNDARY</li> <li>SJB/Landform provided precedent examples of successful developments with extensive on structure planting and proposed landscaping treatment of the western boundary to mitigate impact to neighbour. Landform also noted that the species chosen for perimeter planting will provide high quality landscape amenity and will thrive in this location. <ul> <li>Council/WSP flagged that a 1.5m setback is inadequate for canopy trees.</li> <li>WSP mentioned preference is to have deep soil.</li> </ul> </li> <li>SJB also presented solar testing for neighbouring properties. <ul> <li>No further comment from WSP and Council.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                           |     |         |
| 2.8         | <ul> <li>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</li> <li>– T&amp;P explained to WSP/Council that discussions have occurred with Council's VPA Officer (Nerida Stores). Based on the discussions with Council's VPA officer, and because there is no adopted Affordable Housing Contributions Scheme that applies to Ramsgate, the proponent will address provision of traffic infrastructure as part of the VPA offer instead of affordable housing.</li> <li>– No further comment from WSP/Council.</li> </ul>   |     |         |

| ITEM NUMBER | DESCRIPTION   | WHO | BY WHEN |
|-------------|---|-----|---------|
| TRANSPORT   | & TRAFFIC ISSUE DISCUSSION  |     |         |
| 3.1         | <ul> <li>TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT TARGO &amp; ROCKY POINT ROAD</li> <li>CBRK noted that the Proponent is not opposed to banning Right Hand<br/>Turns (RHT) during peak hours and maintaining the right turn off peak,<br/>flagging that if we ban the right turn it will just push traffic further down<br/>Rocky Point which will have a similar impact.</li> <li>Council noted they would consider this solution but would require<br/>further analysis on traffic counts on Hasting Street, Burgess Road and<br/>Targo Road if this is a proposed detour.</li> <li>Council's preference is not to divert traffic.</li> <li>TfNSW highlighted they need advice from Council for further<br/>consideration – Council to email TfNSW with its assessment/view.</li> </ul> |     |         |
| 3.2         | <ul> <li>RAMSGATE ROAD MEDIAN STRIP</li> <li>Council's concern is westbound movement on Ramsgate Rd.</li> <li>CBRK flagged that in order to provide the requested median strip, lane narrowing is required, recommending a 600mm wide median.</li> <li>Council to advise on its position on: median width &amp; extent of median <ul> <li>Council noted they will need to speak to the property owners if the median is to be extended beyond the proposal</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |     |         |
| 3.3         | LOSS OF PARKING<br>– Council requires written advice from Bayside Council.<br>Note: it is understood that Bayside Council will provide written advice<br>once contacted by Georges River Council for comment. At the time of<br>issuing these minutes, it is understood that Georges River Council is yet<br>to seek formal written advice from Bayside Council on this matter.   |     |         |
| 3.4         | <ul> <li>NEXT STEPS</li> <li>Council to respond formally in writing to TfNSW.</li> <li>Council noted they have not completed their assessment yet as they require more data. Details of the required data will be provided in WSP's letter response to the proponents expected in w/c 14 March 2022.</li> <li>TfNSW to share updated traffic counts to CBRK.</li> </ul>   |     |         |

| ITEM NUMBER | DESCRIPTION   | WHO | BY WHEN |
|-------------|---|-----|---------|
| OTHER ITEMS |   |     |         |
| 4.1         | CONCLUSION<br>- As a concluding remark, WSP noted that overall, the proposal is moving<br>in the right direction. |     |         |