

## Relevant Information for Local Planning Panel

---

**FILE:** D/2019/1470 **DATE:** 1 July 2020

**TO:** Local Planning Panel Members

**FROM:** Graham Jahn AM, Director City Planning, Development and Transport

**SUBJECT:** Information Relevant To Item 4 – Development Application: 274-276 Glebe Point Road, Glebe – D/2019/1470

---

### For Noting

That the Local Planning Panel note the information contained in this memo.

### Additional Submissions

Following publication of the Local Planning Panel report and relevant attachments, Council has received an additional 11 submissions in objection to the proposed development at 274-276 Glebe Point Road, Glebe.

Of these submissions, all 11 are additional submissions to those previously lodged as part the application's notification period.

The issues raised in the recently received submissions include:

- Adequacy of the submitted Clause 4.6 variation requests

Response: The submitted Clause 4.6 variation requests have been assessed in accordance with the legislation and recent case law and deemed to be acceptable for consideration. The Clause 4.6 requests have also been reviewed by Council's Legal Unit.

- Inadequate time to review the documentation, recommendation and seek professional advice

Response: In accordance with the Local Planning Panel Guidelines, 7 days notice was provided to the applicant and all submitters. Notice was given on 24 June 2020 via email.

- The density proposed is at odds with the current restrictions due to Covid-19

Response: The proposed density is in line with current boarding house legislation. Covid-19 temporary restrictions are not a matter for consideration during the planning assessment process.

- No on-site laundry facilities

Response: Laundry facilities are provided on each level of the development for use by all residents.

- Proposed hours for counselling are inappropriate

Response: The hours of operation as recommended in the conditions of consent are in line with Council's base hours of operation in Section 3.15 of the Sydney DCP 2012.

- Removal of rendering from the facade is a poor recommendation

Response: The removal of the render was a recommendation of the Design Advisory Panel – Residential Subcommittee to ensure further detracting features are not added to the building.

- The existing building is not in keeping with the desired future character of the area and its retention is inappropriate

Response: The existing building is a detracting building within the conservation area, Council does not have the authority to require demolition of this building and must assess the application based on the legislative framework available.

- No on-site manager will result in operations conditions unable to be enforced

Response: A 24/7 on-site manager is proposed and the manager's unit is provided on the ground floor.

All other matters raised have been addressed in the report under consideration by the panel.

### **Response to submissions**

In Paragraph 99(l), the following response to a matter raised by a submission states:

- (l) *The proposal does not meet the architectural standards as required under SEPP 65.*

*Response: SEPP 65 does not apply to the subject development as boarding rooms do not constitute individual 'dwellings'.*

It should instead read:

*SEPP 65 does not apply to the subject development as the SEPP only applies to "development for the purpose of a residential flat building, shop top housing or mixed use development with a residential accommodation component..."*

*As the proposal is for a boarding house, it does not meet the requirements for SEPP 65 to apply.*

Prepared by: Jemima Royall, Specialist Planner

## Attachments

**Attachment A.** Additional Submissions (Confidential)

---

Approved

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'GJahn', is positioned to the right of the 'Approved' text.

**GRAHAM JAHN AM**

Director City Planning, Development and  
Transport