

Bailey Williams

From: De Carvalho, Noni
Sent: Wednesday, 24 November 2010 10:05 AM
To: 'christopher.aston@planning.nsw.gov.au'
Cc: Woodhams, Greg
Subject: Application for Site Compatibility Certificate - 35A to 37 Anderson Street and 9A Kirk Street, Chatswood

Hello Chris,

I refer to the application for an SCC for the Presbyterian Church development at 35A to 37 Anderson Street and 9A Kirk Street, Chatswood. This email is forwarded noting the tight time frame required for the Department to consider the application for an SCC.

The proposed senior's housing development of self care units is associated with the redevelopment of St Andrews Presbyterian Church site and includes the construction of a new church building, health professional consulting rooms and basement car parking. As noted in this SCC application the proposal has been the subject of a previous certificate that is about to expire. The site of the proposed development is subject to a land swap with the Christian Brothers that will enable St Pius X College to construct a new classroom and multi purpose assembly hall building for the school.

The site of the Presbyterian Church development is partly zoned Special Uses – Church 5(a) and partly low density residential 2(a). The proposed location of the new church building on the corner of Wattle Lane and Anderson Street is on land zoned 2(a) which does not permit the new church development. The rezoning of the land to permit the church is being addressed in Council's comprehensive LEP that has been exhibited, adopted by Council with some amendments and is currently being finalised for lodgement with the Department.

Council acknowledges that the Presbyterian Church would wish to keep alive the SCC should it chose to proceed pursuant to SEPP (Housing for Senior's and People with a Disability) 2004 with the seniors housing development in response to an excessive delay with the WLEP.

Development applications have been lodged by the Presbyterian Church (DA 2009/258) and the Christian Brothers (DA 2009/250). Both development applications were considered by Council at its meeting on 7 December 2009. Council's consideration acknowledged that the rezoning process had to occur before the Presbyterian Church development that included the new church could be considered for approval. The new school development was considered and assessed pursuant to SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 and a deferred commencement approval was granted by Council.

Council's consideration of the Presbyterian Church proposal identified design, mass and bulk issues with the proposal. Council also had discussion with the Church regarding provision of some smaller more affordable units as well as ancillary support services that achieves a potential for aging in place.

Since that consideration by Council of the proposed development by the Presbyterian Church, Council has been liaising with newly appointed consultants for the Church being urban designers GMU Consulting and architects Architects Contempo. A briefing of Councillors was held on 16 September 2010 on the amended design for the development. Councillors and Council staff have indicated general support for the direction the design development has gone in. However, Council has not received as yet the amended application and acknowledges that it will be subject to public re-notification and the due process of planning assessment and gazettal of WLEP before final approval is possible.

Therefore, it was Council's expectation that any request for a further Site Compatibility Certificate would be based on the amended design development as presented to Councillors in September. The application currently before the Department reflects the original proposal which did not receive the support of Council as noted above. A request for a new SCC should reflect the current design development. This is particularly relevant to the proposed heights of the buildings, the site layout, building envelopes and the nature of the ancillary services proposed on the site in the new development proposal. Should a delay occur with WLEP and the Presbyterian Church asks Council to consider just the seniors housing on the basis of WLEP 1995 and SEPP (SH&PD) 2004, Council is of the view that the SCC if issued on the basis of the original scheme would not allow Council to consider the new scheme. The proposed height of the eastern seniors housing building in the amended design is 5 up to 6 storeys at the rear and the southern building is 10 storeys although the design is not finalised such that in a small part it may extend to 12 storeys. Also if

in providing smaller more affordable units in the development, it is my view that Council would not object to a slight increase in unit numbers up to say 70 units from 68.

Therefore, Council objects to the current application for a new SCC. However, this objection would be withdrawn if the SCC application was amended to reflect the reviewed design of the development as was presented to Council on 16 September, 2010.

As I will be away on annual leave over the next 3 weeks, should you have any further questions I would ask that you speak to the Environmental Service Director, Greg Woodhams who is familiar with the proposed development and has been present at all meetings.

Regards,
Noni de Carvalho
Chatswood CBD Place Manager,
Willoughby City Council
31 Victor Street,
Chatswood NSW 2067
Ph: 02 9777 7645

Note:

This message is for the named person's use only. It may contain confidential, proprietary or legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mistransmission. If you receive this message in error, please immediately delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, distribute, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient. Willoughby City Council and any of its subsidiaries each reserve the right to monitor all e-mail communications through its networks.

Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the message states otherwise and the sender is authorised to state them to be the views of any such entity.