

16 November 2017

Team Leader
Modifications Assessment
Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

cc. natasha.harras@planning.nsw.gov.au
michelle.niles@planning.nsw.gov.au

**Proposed Modification to Shell Cove Boat Harbour Concept Plan
(MP 07_0027 MOD 1)**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the above modification application regarding proposed amendments to the concept plan approval for the Shell Cove Boat Harbour Precinct.

The following submission has been prepared by Council officers and has not been adopted by Council.

Council is a partner with Frasers in the development of Shell Cove.

This submission reflects the assessment by Council officers responsible for land use planning, traffic/transport and waste.

Many of the concerns have been picked up via council's current assessment of draft urban design guidelines (UDG) for Precinct E1 and Precinct E2 and a current development application (DA) for Precinct E. Both the UDGs and DA pre – empt and generally reflect the modification application.

Following is a commentary of Council's concerns from a regulatory perspective. To address these, it is formally requested that the italic commentary be worked into any consolidating instrument of approval.

~~Traffic circulation, heavy vehicle servicing and on street parking~~

~~It is important that sufficient on – site parking is provided throughout the modification application area to ensure on street parking is not overly relied on. Precinct E1 for instance is a lower density residential area, constrained in on street parking capacity by narrower lot widths (as narrow as 11m) and 7.5m carriageways with box kerb and gutter. These road reserve features compound the importance of sufficient on – site parking. With higher densities and similar road geometry, as proposed in the modification application, the potential for on street parking to be relied on may increase, as will the importance of~~

sufficient on-site parking. The draft Precinct E1 UDGs propose 1 space for a 2 bedroom dwelling which Council considers inadequate. These UDGs are unclear on parking provision for 3 bedroom or other dwelling types.

Minimum parking for dwellings should be as per Council's DCP: i.e. 2 on site.

Dual occupancy and multi dwelling housing should have parking as per Council's DCP. See attached DCP extract.

For other parking improvements, see also italic text under below heading Pedestrian amenity and driveways.

Based on the streets proposed in the modification application, 8.8m vehicles would need to cross over to the wrong side of the road if localised kerb widening (extensions) occurs.

No localised kerb widening (extensions) should be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that 8.8m vehicles can operate without crossing to the wrong side of the road. Parking restrictions should not only apply to intersections, but also to 90 degree bends that are not located at a junction or intersection.

Any modification application approval should acknowledge that approved street layout/traffic management measures may need amendment to comply with the relevant technical standards for intersections and heavy vehicle access/waste servicing.

Pedestrian amenity and driveways

Development, especially with double garages (Draft Precinct E1 Urban Design Guidelines) may adversely affect pedestrian amenity by footpaths being punctuated by footpath cross overs every few metres.

To benefit pedestrian amenity and on street parking capacity, footpath cross overs should be limited to a maximum 4m width. Multi dwelling corner lot development needing 2 vehicular access points, should have 1 on each frontage. Footpath cross overs should abut one another. This would mean for instance on a street running east-west, a lot's cross over may be located at its eastern edge, with the lot to the east having its cross over on its western edge (so the 2 cross overs abut one another).

For Precinct E1 for instance, this requirement may necessitate additional dwelling design options to achieve suitable amenity and design.

Parking for hotel/serviced apartments, restaurant and function centre

Reference is made to the Colston Budd Rogers and Kafe report.

Council notes the reduction in on-site parking it advocates in comparison to the previous report by Chris Hallam.

It's recommended that any modification application approval does not lock in any parking provision requirement for the hotel/serviced apartments, restaurant and function centre development.

Parking for the hotel/serviced apartments, restaurant and function centre development must be further assessed at development application stage. This assessment must demonstrate enough on – site parking is provided to not adversely impact on street parking in the town centre and surrounding precincts. Final numerical parking provision may therefore vary to that advocated in the Colston Budd Rogers and Kafe report of 17-11-16.

State Environmental Planning Policy 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development

In the interest of design and amenity, the Department should satisfy itself that apartment development can potentially comply with SEPP 65 and its associated apartment design guide.

Solar access

~~The Shellharbour Development Control Plan requires residential development (except SEPP 65 development) to be capable of allowing a minimum of 3 hours mid – winter continuous and direct solar access on its principal private space and to neighbouring main living areas.~~

~~The Draft Precinct E1 Urban Design Guidelines require only 2 hours of solar access to 50% of private open space in detached housing. And this solar access can be broken up temporally and spatially. Where this standard is derived is unknown.~~

~~The Department should be in a good position to determine appropriate solar access provisions given its responsibilities in assessing major projects, its work on the missing middle/Draft Medium Density Design Guide and Housing Code and its work towards genericising development control plans.~~

Public open space and pedestrian links

~~When compared with the approved concept plan, numerous parks/pedestrian links have been introduced. Some will function as narrow pedestrian links.~~

~~Crime prevention through environmental design principles should be applied to parks/pedestrian links. This includes dwellings addressing the open space/pedestrian link and suitable boundary/paving/ground cover treatments to signify public and private domain and that allows passive surveillance.~~

Development with a rear and front street frontage

~~Development with a rear and front street frontage such as in Precinct E should be required to address both street frontages via suitable fencing and site/building design.~~

Public access around harbour perimeter

It appears setback from the harbour of development in Precincts F and G has been reduced. It is unclear whether Precinct G has any setback at all.

Continuous and sufficiently wide public access should be available around the entire harbour perimeter and thence to the beach on either side of the harbour entrance.

Business Park inclusion

The modifications report and concept plan design report (Appendix B) do not map the business park. The business park is to remain, as part of the modified instrument of approval and modifications report.

Any modification application approval should be clear in its mapping about the business park inclusion.

Should you have any enquiries, please contact myself on the number below.



Geoff Hoynes
Group Manager City Planning
Attach.