

SUMMARY TABLE

The following provides a summary of the proposed modifications to the Concept Approval for MP 10_0101 and Council comment:

Proposed Modifications	Position	Comment
1. Increase in Indicative building envelope by the addition of three (3) levels to the top of the Stage 1 portion of the building;	Opposed.	<p>As with the original proposal and previous modification, this proposal substantially exceeds the height controls for the site set in Council’s DCP No 2 ranging from 15-23m (4-7st). The original proposal represented a 128% increase in height (storeys) over Council’s planning control.</p> <p>This current proposal represents a 20% increase in height (storeys) and a 14% increase in GFA. In terms of FSR the planning control of 3-4.0:1 has been increased to 6.78:1 (Mod 1-69.5% increase) and now proposed at 7.74:1 (Mod 2 -14%increase).</p>
2. Increase in gross residential floor area primarily due to the addition of three levels to the top of the building and minor increase to residential floor area on the ground level;	Opposed.	This change stems from the increase in levels which is opposed, and introduction of the child care on the ground floor.
3. Changes to basement and ground floor levels including a 0.5m adjustment to basement car park levels and addition of mezzanine level;	Not opposed.	Changes arising from design development and do not result in any significant change in terms of bulk, scale, height and intended uses.
4. Decrease in the gross retail floor space on the ground level to be replaced with a child care centre;	Not opposed.	While Council’s planning controls encourage retail, commercial and other active street level and frontage uses the introduction of the child care use is an acceptable alternative use and likely to assist in addressing demand. This will not be a Council facility. Council’s position and requirements for the community space remain unchanged.
5. Addition of a child care centre on the ground level and upper ground level;	Not opposed.	See above.
6. Changes to the car parking provision and layout resulting in an increase in the total car parking provision that meets the requirements of Hurstville City Council DCP No. 2;	Not opposed.	Increase of 95 car parking spaces addresses a previous concern raised by Council.
7. Amend the ‘Green Travel Plan’ that forms part of the Statement of Commitments to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investigation of the use of a community bus; - Promotion of a car share scheme; and - Details of the provision of bicycle facilities. 	Not opposed.	The Statement of Commitments is supported however there is no definitive commitment to specific initiatives or consequences in the event that none prove to be implementable or viable. The preference should be to focus on deliverable initiatives and for these to be conditioned in any subsequent consent eg. Provide a car share and bicycle scheme,

The key reasons for the proposed modifications promoted by the applicant and Council comments are:

Reasons for Proposed Modifications	Position	Comment
1. In the preparation of finer grain detail drawings for a development application it was found that efficiency of car park design yields a significant increase in the number of car parks available;	Justified.	No comment
2. Preliminary assessment indicated that additional 3 levels of residential floor space in Stage 1 of the development has minimal increased environmental impact on amenity of the locality, particularly in relation to overshadowing, traffic and parking impacts;	Not justified	Bulk and scale of the buildings increased by an additional 4,023m ² of GFA representing an increase of 14%. This impact is translated into increased overshadowing to properties in Kogarah where representations have previously been made on this issue and again with this proposal.
3. The additional 3 levels will continue to be well below the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) provided by the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA)	Not justified	All buildings regardless of height must be below the limitations sets by CASA. This limitation does not represent the height planning control for buildings in Hurstville which this building already exceeds.
4. The release of the draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney identifies a significant expansion in housing supply on the estimates from previous strategies and has set a target of at least 545,000 new dwellings across Sydney by 2031	Not justified	<p>While the comments are noted these stem from a metropolitan wide position where it is the role of local plans to interpret the preferred locations for density development. Council's Draft Hurstville City Centre LEP and Development Control Plan No 2 provide this local based planning framework and coupled with the recently gazetted Hurstville LEP 2012 clearly provide for housing targets to be met for Hurstville.</p> <p>The recently completed and endorsed Transport management and Accessibility Plan based on the Draft LEP did not propose any increase in height controls. Rather it accepted Council's plan as a long term vision for Hurstville City Centre and set planning goals for a time horizon of 2036. The TMAP estimated that by 2036 only 73% of the LEP capacity would be met and on this basis there can be no justification for this site to be increased in height in order to meet a metropolitan or local housing target.</p>
5. Recent approval from Joint Regional Planning Panel to increase the height of Building E in East Quarter, 95 Forest Road, Hurstville to 19 storeys (65.15m).	Not justified	Each proposal needs to be considered on merit. The planning controls for East Quarter allowed taller buildings than the subject site. These range from 23-60m with an FSR of 2.5:1. The resulting FSR impact was to increase from 2.63:1 to 2.82:1 over the whole site an increase of 7%.