

Local Planning Panel

Meeting No 72

Wednesday 10 August 2022

Notice Date 3 August 2022

minutes

Index to Minutes

ITEM	PAGE NO
1. Disclosures of Interest	3
2. Confirmation of Minutes	3
3. Development Application: 5020 Chapman Road, Annandale - D/2022/253.....	4
4. Development Application: 25-27 Dunning Avenue, Rosebery - D/2021/1491.....	5

Present

Mr Steven Layman (Chair), Professor Helen Lochhead, Mr Ron Edgar and Mr John McInerney.

At the commencement of business at 5.05pm, those present were:

Mr Layman, Prof Lochhead, Mr Edgar and Mr McInerney.

The Chair opened the meeting with introductory comments about the purpose and format of the meeting and an acknowledgement of country.

Item 1 Disclosures of Interest

In accordance with clause 4.17 of the Code of Conduct, all Local Planning Panel members have lodged an annual Disclosure of Pecuniary Interests written return. The Disclosure of Pecuniary Interests written returns were received and noted.

In accordance with section 4.9 of the Code of Conduct for Local Planning Panel Members, all panel members have signed a declaration of interest in relation to each matter on the agenda.

No members disclosed any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests in any matter on the agenda for this meeting of the Local Planning Panel.

Item 2 Confirmation of Minutes

The Panel noted the minutes of the Local Planning Panel of 20 July 2022, which have been endorsed by the Chair of that meeting.

Item 3 Development Application: 5020 Chapman Road, Annandale - D/2022/253

The Panel granted consent to Development Application No. D/2022/253 subject to the conditions set out in Attachment A to the subject report.

Reasons for Decision

The application was approved for the following reasons:

- (A) The proposal is consistent with the relevant objectives and controls of Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP) and Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (DCP).
- (B) The proposal is in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the RE1 - Public Recreation zone.
- (C) The application has demonstrated the proposal will not result in unacceptable amenity impacts on surrounding properties. The site is to be remediated, addressing the SEPP (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 – Chapter 4 Remediation of Land, such that the site can be made suitable for the proposed use.
- (D) The proposal is consistent with the City's Johnstons Creek Parklands Master Plan 2013, in that it will facilitate the future use of the site as a synthetic sports field and is considered to be in the public interest.

Carried unanimously.

D/2022/253

Speakers

Wade Benson, Sue Heath (Glebe District Hockey Club).

Lucy Farley (City of Sydney) – on behalf of the applicant.

Item 4 Development Application: 25-27 Dunning Avenue, Rosebery - D/2021/1491

The Panel refused consent for Development Application No. D/2021/1491 for the reasons outlined below.

Reasons for Decision

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- (A) The application fails to demonstrate that the land can be made suitable for the proposed commercial development. As such the application fails to satisfy the provisions of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 (SEPP), Chapter 4 - Remediation of Land.
- (B) The proposal includes a development that will dominate the appearance of the existing heritage item and includes a significant level of demolition and facade alteration. This has a significant and detrimental impact on the existing heritage fabric and the internal and external appearance of the heritage listed warehouse building known as 'Paradise Garage' (local heritage item No. I1376). Consequently, the proposal fails to comply with:
 - (i) Clause 1.3(f) under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 as the proposal fails to promote the sustainable management of built and cultural heritage, given the level of demolition proposed.
 - (ii) Clause 1.2(2)(k) 'Aims of Plan' under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 which promotes the conservation of environmental heritage.
 - (iii) Clause 5.10(1)(b) under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 to conserve the heritage significance of heritage items and heritage conservation areas, including associated fabric, settings and views.
 - (iv) Clause 6.21C(4)(d)(iii) - Design Excellence under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012, which requires any heritage issues and streetscape constraints, to be adequately addressed.
 - (v) Part 3.9.5 – Heritage Items under the Sydney DCP 2012 in particular provisions (1)(a) minimising the extent of changes to the fabric, (1)(c) enabling interpretation of each significant value, (1)(d) provide a use compatible with its significance and (1)(j) respect the pattern, style and dimensions of original windows and doors.
 - (vi) Part 3.10.1 of the Sydney DCP 2012 where warehouses and industrial buildings older than 50 years old are to be conserved and adaptively re-used to maintain the legibility of their historic use and alterations and additions are sympathetic in scale and style to the existing building.
- (C) The applicant has failed to satisfy Clause 4.6(4) of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012. The submitted Clause 4.6 statement fails to demonstrate that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of the case. Nor has the statement justified that there are sufficient environmental grounds to justify contravening the standards.

- (D) The proposal has a detrimental impact on the heritage item. It consequently fails to deliver the desired future character of the locality and fails to minimise adverse impacts on the amenity of the locality. As such the development is not entitled to 'additional floor space' accessed through the delivery of Green Square community infrastructure. The proposal fails to comply with:
- (i) Clause 6.14(1)(b) under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012.
 - (ii) Section 5.2 - Green Square and 5.2.3 Community Infrastructure under the Sydney DCP 2012.
- (E) The proposal fails address part 3.11 Transport and Parking of the Sydney DCP 2012 in particular insufficient information was provided to address large vehicle movements on site.
- (F) The proposal fails to adequately address part 3.14 Waste requirements of the Sydney DCP 2012 as the waste management plan fails to demonstrate acceptable waste calculations and servicing.
- (G) The proposed development fails to satisfy Clause 4.15(1) - Matters for Consideration under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 as the proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. The site is not suited to the development and the proposal will have a significant impact upon the qualities of the heritage item.
- (H) In light of the above, the proposal is not considered to be in the public interest, contrary to Clause 4.15(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.

Carried unanimously.

D/2021/1491

The meeting of the Local Planning Panel concluded at 5.38pm.

CHAIR