

Time/Date: 2:30pm 17 August 2016

Location: NRO Longueville Rm

In Attendance:

Gavin Carrier – Holdmark.

Sue Tan – Holdmark.

Kevin Nassif - Holdmark

Joe Agius – Cox Richardson Architects

Sue Francis – City Plan Services

Roy Newsome, Acting General Manager

Liz Coad, Acting Director City Strategy and Planning

Paul Kapetas, Legal Counsel

Dyalan Govender, Business Support Coordinator

Re: Council's Submission to the 75w – MP09_216 Mod 2

Notes:

Stage A Height/DIP/VPA

Holdmark – The 75w application shows 24 stories, but the increase is only 4 stories not 5 as the competition scheme included double height stories.


Council – Council's position is that competition height is preferred to the 75w height. The additional height is not supported.




Holdmark – The Design Integrity Panel (DIP) considered the height and raised no issue. In endorsing the scheme they have endorsed the height.

Council – Council is seeking ongoing DIP certification as per the submission.

Holdmark – Which CC is Council seeking to trigger DIP certification? It is noted that Chris Johnson (DIP member) considers DIP certification at the DA stage to be sufficient given the certifier is then tasked with ensuring compliance thereafter.

Council – Design certification should be required at DA stage as well as CC for above-ground works, supporting the competition design and providing certainty that the winning design is realised.


CPS – Council appears to be seeking assurance for the built form rather than below-ground/excavation works and there are examples (Railway Parade  that suggest this is understandable.

Holdmark – Holdmark's position  as per  the letter of 1 March 2016 and Holdmark's understanding was that this was agreed, therefore the VPA offer  as structured accordingly.

Council – Council has reviewed the full application and given the increase in stories and units above the concept approval, Council considers greater public benefit to be appropriate. (Council advised that a separate meeting will be scheduled for VPA discussions – Dyalan Govender to arrange VPA meeting).

Holdmark – Holdmark's offer relates to the additional 4 stories in stage A only as per previous correspondence and discussions with Council. Council will need to provide justification for any request for additional public benefit.

Dwelling and Parking Caps

CPS – Stages 2-9 are within the cap, however, there is insufficient cap space to accommodate Stage A. In discussions with Council  Council proposed that Stage A be excluded from the cap.

The original objections to the cap prior to the concept approval were raised as a dwelling cap is too general to practically accommodate the varied dwelling sizes. A parking cap was suggested as an alternative to address the traffic issues.


Holdmark – The 75w was made in accordance with Council's position as it was articulated to Holdmark. Council provided no suggestion that this position had changed.

Council – While Council did indicate it would consider whether Stage A could be excluded from the cap, having reviewed the application and noting the issues raised by the community, Council is seeking the retention of appropriate caps. The increase in the cap proposed by Council is calculated to include the competition scheme for Stage A and also includes the additional units replacing the initial community facility in Stage 2-3. The Planning and Assessment Commission has supported the caps given the significant traffic/parking and open space demands in this locality Council also considers it important to retain the caps in light of the community submissions.

Holdmark – If Council's position is to retain a cap then this can be considered provided the numbers are appropriate. Holdmark's position is that the cap should accommodate Stage A as proposed in the 75w.


Council – Council does not support the increase of dwellings under the 75w application. The current parking cap has not yet been met and there appears to be sufficient remaining space. However, what Council has proposed is that the DCP provisions can be used to provide some flexibility should it be required at the DA stage.

Holdmark – There won't be sufficient space in the current cap – the supermarket will require approximately 88 more spaces.

CPS  the 88 space increase is considered consistent with the Concept approval then such a variation could be accommodated at the DA stage.



Council – Provided the traffic engineers are comfortable with what is proposed, Council believes such an increase could be dealt with at DA stage for the retail parking.



Community Facility

Holdmark  Holdmark is not comfortable undertaking further delay and expenditure required to move the facility again. The provision of \$3.5m as per the option provided in Council's proposed condition is preferred.

Council – Council confirmed that it is seeking \$3.5m in lieu of the facility as per the deed.

Stage A View Loss

Cox Richardson – For clarity the  Competition Podium RL is 35.7m and the 75w Podium RL is 37.1m. The Competition Tower RL is 76m and the 75w RL is 89.8m. The floor to floor height was initially 3.1m for residential floors and 5.4m for retail,, following discussion with the retailer the retail floor to floor was changed to 6m 

Holdmark  provided a reduced podium height with an associate  PA contribution amount recognising that there may be some benefit to reducing the height of the podium while increasing the height of the tower. The increased tower height has minimal to no view/design/amenity/heritage impact. This would mean the net public benefit is better.

Council – Council's architect and planners reviewed the 75w and our position is that a reduced podium and the competition height are preferred to what is proposed in the 75w.

Overshadowing

Holdmark – Overshadowing impacts have been assessed on the dwellings identified in Council's submission and there is minimal impact – the updated diagrams were provided to Council.

Traffic/Parking

Holdmark – RMS has approved the proposal in principle and this was forwarded to Council on 16 July and 8 Aug. Holdmark, Council and the RMS also met and discussed the requirements prior to the lodgement of the 75w.

Council – Council will review its records for the RMS approvals and notes that the provisions it proposed in the submission are not intended as objections, they are consistent with previous discussions held between Holdmark, RMS and Council and are simply to ensure these measures are appropriately enshrined in any modification.

(Note: Dyalan Govender has subsequently confirmed that the plans submitted to RMS for review were CC'd to Council on 13 July 2016, however RMS's response does not appear to have been provided).


Holdmark – The additional pedestrian fence at Well St was not previously raised and is considered by Holdmark and the RMS to be problematic and the proposal as it stands is preferred.

Council – Council will review the origins of the request for the pedestrian fence at Well St.

(Note: When asked to provide input to Council's submission, having regard for the proposal and the plans provided on 13 July, Council's engineers proposed the addition of the pedestrian fence to ensure pedestrians use the refuge. Council's engineers are concerned that pedestrians will cross the extended splitter island).

Affordable Housing

Holdmark – Holdmark  PA offer (letter 14 March 2016) is for \$4.13m including the affordable housing.

Council – Council understands that 8% of additional units in 2-3 will be provided to Council as Affordable Housing. Council agrees that it understands that separate from this 8%, \$4.13m has been offered  and the 2% Affordable Housing in Stage A is included in that \$4.13m.

Modification proposed to Stages 2/3

Holdmark – Holdmark confirmed that as Council raised no objection both parties are in agreement.

General

Holdmark – Holdmark is seeking that Council give consideration to re-stating it's position to indicate in principle support for the modification subject to the amendments discussed.

Council – Council's submission is a reflection of its position noting the discussions to date, the evolution of the proposal, and the feedback of our elected representatives and the community.

Council – The Community Facility deed expires in September 2016, this needs to be addressed.

Holdmark – Holdmark and Council can agree to extend the expiry date to allow the completion of the 75w process.

Council – Council requests that letters of exchange be provided to Council to facilitate an extension.

Holdmark – Holdmark is still awaiting feedback on the Section 96 applications as per Council's undertaking during the deed discussions to consider the applications in parallel to the 75w.

Council – The s96's cannot proceed until the 75w's are determined.

CSP – noting the intention to provide monetary benefit in lieu of the community facility, assessment of the Stage 8-9 s96 is not required at this time, and it is likely that Stage 2-3 will not require significant change. Council could proceed to undertake some work on the Stage 2-3 s96 application in anticipation of the 75w determination.

Council – Council's resources have been devoted to the 75w, noting that there are limits to what Council will be able to assess until the 75w is determined, Council will review what has been done to date and will seek to confirm sufficient information has been provided.

Council's Note Taker:

Dyalan Govender

Business Support Coordinator

City Strategy and Planning