

Matthew Rosel

From: Sue Francis
Sent: Monday, 30 November 2015 12:13 PM
To: Meryl Bishop; Liz Coad; Sandra Bailey
Cc: Gavin Carrier; Carlo Di Giulio; George Youssef; Kevin Nassif; Christina; Ricc Rossi; Tony Stodart; Steve Kennedy (steve@kennedyassociates.com.au); Joe Agius
Subject: SHEPHERDS BAY - Discussion and Outcome of Meeting with Council of 24 November 2015

Dear All

The meeting was attended by Sandra Bailey, Meryl Bishop, Liz Coad and Paul Yang from Council . Holdmark was represented by Kevin Nassif, George Yousef, Christina Boumelhem, and Ricc Rossi, Architects for the projects were Turner (Nick, Tony, Annorai) for 2/3 and 8/9 and Cox and Kennedy and Associates for Stage A. CPSD was represented by Sue Francis.

The initial discussion related to Stage 2/3 and increased yield. The following was resolved:-

1. The dwelling cap condition should be amended to exclude Stage A BUT must not be exceeded by the remainder of the site.
2. The parking cap condition likewise should be amended to exclude Stage A but must not be exceeded by the remainder of the development.
3. Council accepted and agreed that the s75W should include all elements – ie the community facility swap, the increased 2/3 yield and the Stage A changes.
4. Council agreed and were pleased that the s96 for the 'community facility swap' would also include any increased yield request.
5. Council noted that the Stage A DA would follow as a DA early in the new year.
6. The reduced yield (from 40 to 28) in 2/3 (in addition to the 17 net additional agreed in the Deed) was noted from previous discussions but there was still concern raised as to amenity and compliance with condition 21 of the amended concept approval. It was imperative to accept any additional yield that this condition be satisfied. Turner advised that they were in the process of checking this compliance.
7. Council noted the 8% offer of affordable housing. It was discussed whether this could be added as part of the existing Deed but it was considered that a separate VPA offer should be made as part of the s96.
8. Council were not keen to attend a meeting at the DPE to support the s75W approach but were happy to speak to the DPE separately.

The Community Facility design was presented by Turner. The following was resolved:-

1. The 'flared' design was noted.
2. The possibility of view loss from the exiting RFBs to the west was raised and Turner accepted that this would be addressed in their submission.
3. The fuel pipe considerations were discussed. Council noted that there has been discussion re its diversion. No resolutions were made in respect of this matter.

Stage A was presented by Cox and Kennedy and Associates and the following was resolved:-

1. Council staff were enthused by the design and were very encouraged that the design competition had created such an innovative and quality design.
2. Council stressed the need to maintain the integrity in the design. It was explained that the Design Integrity Panel had been engaged specifically for this purpose.
3. Access for service vehicles off Church St was the key issue. Council raised concern as to the likelihood of this satisfying the RMS. They noted an existing service lane and were concerned of a service lane off a service lane. It was noted that this needed to be resolved to the satisfaction to RMS and council's traffic

engineers prior to submission of the s75W. If access not achievable off Church St then alternate arrangements would affect the design and the integrity of the Stage A public domain which was considered a desirable design element.

4. Council noted the desire of the supermarket to have 150 car spaces. This would need to be balanced against the demand parameters in this location and the servicing capabilities.
5. Council noted the potential to improve views from the north by the design and acknowledged the need to establish view impact, critically from the west.
6. Council stressed the need to maintain amenity in the Stage A development.

PRIORITIES FOR SUBMISSION ON 11 DECEMBER

1. Ensure access is possible and more importantly likely to be approved from Church St for Stage A. This is a necessary component of any s75W submission – **Cox/Kennedy** to liaise with traffic experts (incl Council and RMS)
2. Ensure support of the Design Integrity Panel with written comment from them as part of the s75W for Stage A – **Cox/Kennedy** has arranged meeting
3. Ensure that the Stage A satisfies the ADG – **Cox/Kennedy** to provide info to **CPSD** and **Holdmark**
4. To minimise the consequences of the breach of the parking cap, parking in Stage A should be minimised as far as justified – **Cox/Kennedy** to brief traffic experts
5. The additional dwellings in 2/3 both for the community facility swap (17 net additional) and increased yield (now 28) must satisfy condition 21 – **Turner** to provide info to **CPSD** and **Holdmark**.
6. View impact material for Stage A from **Cox/Kennedy** and in respect to the new community building for Stage 8/9 from **Turner**.
7. Confirmation of discussions and consultation with Vero re the oil pipe.

Sue Francis

Executive Director | STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT

LEVEL 1, 364 KENT ST, SYDNEY NSW 2000

TEL: +61 2 8270 3500 FAX: +61 2 8270 3501

WWW.CITYPLAN.COM.AU

CITY PLAN SERVICES

PLANNING | BUILDING | HERITAGE | URBAN DESIGN

Confidentiality Notice: This message contains privileged and confidential information intended for the use of the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that you must not disseminate, copy or take any action or place any reliance on it. If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately and then delete this document. Violation of this notice may be unlawful.



Please consider the environment before printing this email