

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Monday, 6 March 2023, 11:15am to 12:30pm
LOCATION	Videoconference

BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSWC-261-Campbelltown – 2278/2022/DA-RA-32 Queen Street Campbelltown, 2560 - Construction of a mixed use development incorporating: - Five towers across two podiums containing 558 apartments - Ground floor Commercial premises - Five levels of basement car parking - Internal access roads.

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	David Kitto (Acting Chair), Brian Kirk, Greg Woodhams
APOLOGIES	Louise Camenzuli
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Justin Doyle: has declared a conflict as he does work for the applicant Pacific Planning. Karen Hunt and George Brticevic both declared conflicts having previously voted on the matter at council in their capacity as councilors.

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Luke Joseph, David Smith
APPLICANT	David Hamilton, Ryan Lane, Andrew Stacey, Aaron Brazzale
DPE	Sharon Edwards, Kate McKinnon

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED 6 MARCH 2023

- Council and the Applicant are in disagreement on several matters, including:
 - vehicle access to the site: Council opposes the location of the loading dock and basement car parking access off Queen Street and says these accesses should be relocated to the secondary roads on the site in accordance with the DCP
 - pedestrian access: Council considers that the proposal should provide for better general pedestrian access through the site - particularly connecting to the future open space and to the south and back to the CBD where several sites are likely to be redeveloped over the next few years - consistent with what was envisaged in the DCP

- design excellence: Council is seeking several changes to the design of the buildings to ensure they exhibit design excellence, including improving the articulation between the podiums and towers. The Panel discussed the merits of another conversation between the proponent and the Design Excellence Panel as soon as practicable to identify and if possible resolve outstanding issues, but this did not mean a workshop starting from design principles.

- Council indicated that it was likely to recommend that the Panel refuse the DA if these issues were not adequately addressed by the Applicant.
- The Panel noted that the DCP for the site was the result of a long planning process, and that current proposal now diverges from the DCP, particularly in relation to vehicle and pedestrian access.
- The Panel raised concerns about the planning merits of locating the loading dock and basement parking access off Queen Street and the proposed configuration of pedestrian access through the site.
- It also questioned the merits of proposing a scheme for the site that was at odds with the DCP without seeking concurrent amendments to the DCP to ensure the DCP remains current and provides strong guidance for assessing the merits of any future DAs or modifications to DAs on the site.
- The Panel indicated that Council and the Applicant should meet as soon as possible to try and resolve the matters in dispute.
- Following the meeting, Council should report back to the Panel and advise when it is likely to submit its recommendation to the Panel for the determination of the DA.

PREVIOUS KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

- The Applicant now has copies of the 2 x objector submissions and is in the process of reviewing and responding to those submissions.
- The Panel Chair noted that a submission has recently been received by the Department of Communities and Justice (**DCJ**) raising security concerns. The Chair suggested that the Applicant and the Council arrange a workshop with the DCJ to work through the DCJ's concerns to the greatest extent possible.
- The Council informed the Panel that there were a number of outstanding referrals that may also raise matters relevant to final design.
- The Panel understands that the Applicant is looking for further guidance as to whether further consultation with the Design Excellence Panel (**DEP**) is required. The Applicant has provided what it considers to be a fulsome response to the various issues raised by the DEP, but the Panel wishes to understand what the outcome of the review of the objector submissions, the workshop with DCJ and any design matters arising from the outstanding information and the internal and external referrals may mean for refinements for the design before forming a concluded view as to whether further design input from the DEP is required.
- The building height non-compliances were briefly discussed. The Panel understands that the non-compliances arise largely as a consequence of the proposed height of the commercial levels and the transfer slabs. The non-compliances also arise as a consequence of the lift over-runs. The Panel wishes to be provided with further justification as to the required heights for the commercial levels of the buildings, ideally from a prospective tenant(s) of these spaces in order to consider the clause 4.6 variation request further. The Panel is aware that the number of storeys of each building is consistent with the DCP and the overall FSR is less than contemplated by the controls.

Planning Panels Secretariat

- The Panel also awaits the Council's assessment of ADG compliance matters in considering the proposed floor plate sizes (noting that the floor plates are larger than recently approved floor plates, but compliant with the DCP) and the various issues raised by the DEP.
- The Panel understands that the Applicant will be provided with a request for further information relating to the outstanding matters before the year end, with a view to Council finalising its assessment report early in the new year, subject to any further required design input.