THE CHAIRPERSON DECLARED THE MEETING OPEN AT 6.00 PM.

INTRODUCTION
The Chairperson welcomed all those present and explained the functions of IHAP and that the Panel would be considering the reports and the recommendation from the Council staff and the submissions made by objectors and the applicant and/or the applicant’s representative(s) and determining the development applications.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
The Chairperson asked the Panel if any member needed to declare a pecuniary interest in any of the items on the agenda. There were no declarations of interest.

DELEGATION
By Minute No. 205, dated 25 October 2016 the Council delegated to the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel the Council’s power to determine certain development applications, to consider all Planning Proposals and make subsequent recommendations as to whether the matter should proceed to Gateway Determination.

DECISION

1 APPLICATION TO AMEND BANKSTOWN LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2015:
913 TO 925 PUNCHBOWL ROAD AND 21 CANTERBURY ROAD, PUNCHBOWL

Site Visit
An inspection of the site was undertaken by the Panel and staff members prior to the public hearing.
Public Addresses

Mr Chris Tsioulos (project architect/proponent) and Mr Michael Gheorghiu (urban planner/proponent)

- Raised no objection to report recommendation and requests the proposal is sent for gateway.
- Advised Punchbowl club occupies the bulk of the site and will continue operations.
- Notes in accordance with the North East Local Area Plan the site is suitable for increased density and scale and the B1 zone accommodates a range of uses.
- Responded to questions from the Panel in relation to how the proposal would deal with transition to low density, if the club and residential use is envisaged at the same time and public access to plaza.
- Raised no objection to inclusion of affordable housing.

Panel Assessment

The Panel agrees with the proposed recommendation based on the development potential for the site. However the Panel is concerned that a number of matters be addressed at an early stage including:

a) the impacts from future development at the zone interface to the north of the site where the zone would change from proposed B1 to residential;

b) whether the proposed changes to height and FSR should be more specifically detailed to achieve different heights and different FSRs across the site (this would also assist in treating the zone interface) but still achieving across the site the proposed yields;

c) whether retail/commercial is necessary to the north of the easement part of the site along Punchbowl Road;

d) specific provisions to include affordable housing along with any other public infrastructure such as pedestrian accessways that the applicant may be considering.

The Panel has suggested that these matters be included in the recommendation for the gateway determination, so that they are then picked up to be addressed in the further studies that are to follow the gateway review from the Department.

IHAP Recommendation

The Panel agrees with the Council Staff report subject to the recommendation being amended as follows:

1. Amend 1(a) to read as follows:
   “Rezone the properties at 913 to 921B Punchbowl Road in Punchbowl from Zone R2 Low Density Residential to Zone B1 Neighbourhood Centre, subject to determining whether any retail or commercial uses are necessary for the area north of the drainage easement section of the site along Punchbowl Road (noting that residential flat buildings are permissible in the B1 zone).”

2. Amend 1(b) to read as follows:
   “Permit a maximum 17 metre building height and a maximum 1.8:1 FSR. This should include a consideration of different height levels across the site, in association with relevant FSRs across the site (but achieving the same potential yield), including specific treatment of the zone interface between the northern part of the site and the R2 zoning to address adverse amenity impacts.”

3. Delete 1(c).

4. Amend 1(d) by adding the following words at the end of the sentence “(if the site was to have a residential zoning which allowed residential flat buildings)”.

---
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5. Add point 1(e) as follows:
   “Investigate provisions to include affordable housing along with the provision of or access to other public infrastructure such as pedestrian accessways to surrounding public infrastructure”.

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

2 680 NEW CANTERBURY ROAD, HURSTON PARK: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHOP TOP HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 14 APARTMENTS OVER FIVE STOREYS WITH TWO LEVELS OF BASEMENT CAR PARKING AND ONE GROUND FLOOR RETAIL PREMISE

Site Visit
An inspection of the site was undertaken by the Panel and staff members prior to the public hearing.

Public Addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Tone Wheeler (applicant/architect) and Ms Amy Sutherland (planner)</th>
<th>Notes site is relatively narrow; there has been a number of design iterations resulting in a reduction in the number of apartments, is of the view amenity has been enhanced as a result.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes recommended condition 47 should refer to architectural drawing issue J not K;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In reference to recommended condition 6.1 does not see the benefit of reducing the maximum apartment depth to 8 metre, is of the view the reduction will reduce amenity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In reference to recommended condition 6.6 is of the view a 1 metre wide planter is unnecessary; would prefer an approach utilising a mix of architectural/landscape features to reduce overlooking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responded to questions from the Panel in relation to the roof terrace landscaping and maintenance. Raised no objection to a condition regarding the owners corporation maintaining landscaping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel Assessment
The Panel agrees with the recommendation in the report. The Panel notes there have been a number of iterations of the plans and that this is a difficult narrow site. The Panel also notes the proposed conditions which would address particular privacy issues.

The Panel agrees with the applicant that it is not necessary in the circumstances in this case for apartments 2 and 6 to be a maximum depth of 8 metres.

The frontage of the retail tenancies should be 50% transparent glass rather than 100% (this could include masonry or obscure glazing).

IHAP Determination
THAT Development Application DA-645/2015 be APPROVED in accordance with the Council staff report recommendation, subject to the following changes to the recommended conditions:
1. Delete condition 6.1 replace with the following:
“Specific details of an appropriate architectural treatment to the north west/south west exterior walls to provide an aesthetic outlook for the neighbours to the north west (682-704 New Canterbury Road).”

2. Amend condition 6.2 to read as follows:
“The frontage of the retail tenancy is to comprise 50% transparent glass (this could include masonry or obscure glazing).”

3. Amend condition 6.6 as follows:
   a) insert the words “and 1m wide” after the words “A 1m deep” in the first sentence;
   b) insert the words “and other necessary redesign changes to ensure no net loss of usable communal area” after the word “change” in the last sentence.

4. Delete condition 18 (o).

5. Amend condition 47 as follows:
   a) Amend condition 47.2 by replacing the reference “J” to “K”;
   b) Insert new point 47.6 “the changes referred to in condition 6.6 and 6.11”.

6. Amend condition 48.3 by rewording the first sentence to read as follows:
“A specific maintenance schedule of the new landscaping for the first 12 months”

7. Insert new condition as follows:
   “48A The landscaping is to be part of the owners corporation land and is to be maintained (including all associated drainage) for the life of the consent.”

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

The meeting closed at 7.40 p.m.