

Site Specific Development Control Plan for 108 Station Street, Wentworthville - Post-exhibition Report

Responsible Division: Environment & Infrastructure
Officer: Group Manager - Planning
File Number: HC-23-08-22

Summary:

The purpose of this report is to address the submissions received during the public exhibition period for the draft Site Specific Development Control Plan for 108 Station Street Wentworthville, and to provide recommendations as to how the site specific development controls, and the subsequent amendment to the Holroyd Development Control Plan 2013, should proceed.

The site specific development control plan was prepared following the Council resolution at the Ordinary Meeting of 1 February 2017 (004/2017), in accordance with the Cumberland IHAP recommendations (C041/16) of the Post Exhibition Report on the Planning Proposal and Voluntary Planning Agreement for 108 Station Street Wentworthville.

Report:

Background

The land that is the subject of the draft site specific Development Control Plan is situated at 108 Station Street, Wentworthville (referred to in this report as 'the subject site' or 'the site'). It is located within the Wentworthville Town Centre and is zoned B2 Local Centre.

The site is shown in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1 – Site Location

The Planning Proposal

The Planning Proposal to which the site specific development controls relate amends the maximum height of buildings from 20m to 29m (8 storeys) and 41m (12 storeys), and the floor space ratio (FSR) from 2.2:1 to 4.5:1 for the site. The planning proposal, and amended controls would enable redevelopment of the site for a mixed use building, comprising residential units above commercial uses.

In considering the post-exhibition report for the Planning Proposal for the site, Cumberland IHAP recommended that a Site Specific Development Control Plan be prepared and exhibited. This report provides the outcomes of that public exhibition of the draft site specific development control plan for the site.

History

The process and events to date for the Site Specific Development Control Plan and related Planning Proposal, are summarised in the table below:

Date	Event
7 May 2015	Planning proposal submitted proposing the following controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the maximum building height from 20 metres (5-6 storeys) to 43 metres (13-14 storeys) across the site. • Increase the maximum floor space ratio (FSR) from 2.2:1 to 5.5:1.
July 2015 – September 2015	Discussions between the proponent and Council on the planning proposal request.
17 September 2015	The proponent submitted a letter of offer to enter into a VPA with Council to dedicate the proposed laneway to Council freehold, at no cost to Council.
20 October 2015	Council resolution to proceed with a Planning Proposal for the subject site (as recommended in report DCS050-15) for 29m and 41m with a maximum net FSR of 4.5:1.
3 December 2015	Planning Proposal lodged with Department of Planning and Environment.
4 April 2016	Gateway Determination received from Department of Planning & Environment.
25 May 2016 – 4 July 2016	Public exhibition of draft Voluntary Planning Agreement.
15 June 2016 – 13 July 2016	Public exhibition of Planning Proposal.
31 August 2016	In response to submissions received, the proponents submitted an amended concept design for the Planning Proposal.

14 December 2016	Cumberland IHAP report C041/16 Planning proposal and voluntary planning agreement - 108 Station Street Wentworthville - Post Exhibition report. The Cumberland IHAP resolved as follows: <i>“3. Recommend that a site specific Development Control Plan be prepared prior to submission (of the Planning Proposal) for gazettal.”</i>
1 February 2017	Council report 041/17 Planning proposal and voluntary planning agreement - 108 Station Street Wentworthville - Post Exhibition Report. Council resolved the following: <i>1. Proceed with the site specific development control plan site, as proposed in this report to community consultation, with the costs of the DCP preparation to be borne by the applicant. 2. Following this consultation on the draft DCP, a report be provided to the CIHAP and subsequently to Council on the outcomes of that consultation and the review of the site specific Development Control Plan.”</i>
26 April 2017 - 24 May 2017	Public Exhibition of draft site specific development controls.

Wentworthville Planning and Placemaking Strategy and Wentworthville Centre Planning Proposal

The site is within the area covered by the Wentworthville Planning and Placemaking Strategy (the Strategy). The Strategy provides an overall vision and direction for the planning and future development of the Wentworthville Centre. The Strategy was publicly exhibited from September to November 2015. The Post-Exhibition report on the Strategy’s exhibition, addressing the community submissions and to seek direction on the way forward, was reported to Cumberland IHAP in 13 July 2016 (report C008/16) and to Council at its Ordinary Meeting of 3 August 2016 (Report 063/16)

A separate Planning Proposal to amend the planning controls for the wider Wentworthville Centre is being prepared to progress the adopted scenario of the Strategy. The Wentworthville Centre Planning Proposal excludes the property of 108 Station Street as changes to the planning controls for this property are being separately progressed. However the 108 Station Street proposal will be generally consistent with the wider Strategy and Wentworthville Planning Proposal.

Preparation of Draft Development Controls

The site specific development control plan was prepared for 108 Station Street, Wentworthville, in accordance with the Cumberland IHAP recommendation and subsequent Council resolution. The document was prepared by Council to align and be consistent with Option 2 of the Wentworthville Planning and Placemaking Strategy as adopted by Council. The resolution included specific aspects and elements for the future design and development of the Wentworthville Centre.

Specific elements of the Wentworthville Planning and Placemaking strategy, as adopted by Council that are particularly relevant to and incorporated into the preparation of the draft development controls for 108 Station Street Wentworthville, are:

- Community Directions, for the centre to incorporate the following:
 - Direction #1 centre redevelopment. Create a modern engaging and safe centre while maintaining the human scale and village feel of the street.
 - Direction #2 Residential Developments. High quality mid-rise residential redevelopment.
 - Direction #3 retail revitalisation. Successful and sustainable retail and commercial centre.
 - Direction #4 amenity and facilities. An accessible and green public realm.
- To extend Station Lane to the south with a new access off Station Street (opposite McKern Street)
- To prepare new development controls for the centre covering:
 - building frontage
 - street wall heights and upper storey setbacks
 - side setbacks
 - primary and secondary active frontages
 - landscape setbacks
 - building façade design
 - vehicular access
 - site through links.

In its consideration of the Strategy, the Cumberland HIAP made a recommendation that a revised Development Control Plan be prepared (for the Wentworthville Centre) that is consistent with the Strategy (recommendation #8) and a recommendation that provisions for green walls and landscaping on structures to be implemented through the revised Development Control Plan for the centre (recommendation #9) (minutes to report C008/16 of 13 July 2016). These recommendations were subsequently adopted by Council at its meeting of 3 August 2016 (Report 063/16).

Exhibition of Draft Development Controls

The public exhibition process for the site specific development control plan consisted of the following components:

- A 28-day public exhibition period commenced 26 April 2017 and concluded on 24 May 2017.
- Letter notifications sent to owner of properties in the vicinity of the site, being the same owners notified of the Planning Proposal public exhibition) and to those who made submissions to the Planning Proposal.
- Newspaper advertisements placed in the Council Corporate Page of the Parramatta Advertiser on 26 April 2017 and 10 May 2017.
- Notice on the Cumberland Council website.
Copies of the Planning Proposal and supporting documentation were placed in the Merrylands and Wentworthville libraries and in the Customer Service area of the

Council Administration buildings in Merrylands and Auburn. The documentation was also made available on Council's website.

Written submissions to the Planning Proposal were invited via post or email.

Submissions Received

During the community consultation period, no submissions were received from the local community or from a public authority.

One (1) submission was received from the owner of the subject property (**Attachment 1**). The matters raised in that submission relate to two aspects of the subject property, being the:

- i. Site specific development controls as exhibited.
- ii. Planning controls, particularly the building heights and floor space ratio associated with the Planning Proposal and amendment to the Holroyd Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2013, and the related administrative process relating to that amendment.

Matters Raised in the Submission and Response Relating to the Draft Site Specific Development Control Plan

The following matters, relating to the site specific development control document, were raised in the submission. The Council response is also provided to each matter.

Submission - Matter 1:

Chapter 3 Access. 3.1 Laneway. Controls

Controls – second bullet point: delete figures 2 and 3 and replace with figure 4.

Council response - Matter 1:

This was a typographical error in the original document. The dot point has been updated with Figure 4 as the correct figure reference.

Submission - Matter 2:

Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.1 Active Frontage. Controls - Station Street

To improve the clarity in interpretation of the controls, we request that the words 'street level' be added to the first dot point of the controls pertaining to Station Street and the basis of the measurement defined, as set out below:

- A minimum 90% of the street level building facade is to be transparent, measured from finished floor level to finished ceiling level.

Council response - Matter 2:

The dot point has been amended to include the term 'ground level' which is the standard terminology and is consistent with the terminology within the rest of the document.

Including detail of where the measurements are taken from is not supported. This level of detail is to be addressed as part of the detailed design of a future building. Also the request for the glazing to be applied to the façade as measured from finished ground

level to finished ceiling level may exclude any areas of partial façade (part levels) which would mitigate the benefits and intent of requiring an active frontage.

It is therefore recommended that this dot point be amended as noted.

Submission - Matter 3:

Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.1 Active Frontage. Controls - Station Street

“It is requested that the fifth dot point be amended and *child care centres* be added as another indicative active use, after gymnasium.”

Council response - Matter 3:

It is considered that this requested change is not necessary for the following reasons:

- This dot point is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of possible uses but a few indicative uses that may be appropriate and feasible at this location, subject to the normal development application and assessment processes and considerations.
- A gymnasium is specified as a particular type of use, which comes under indoor recreational facilities which are also permitted with consent under the B2 Local Centre land use zoning, and that may be appropriate and feasible in this location.
- Child care centres are ‘permitted with consent’ use under the B2 Local Centre land use zoning which applies to the site.
- However, child care centres are a specialised land use that may not be appropriate in this location and this building land would require a detailed assessment of suitability. The submission notes that Station Street is identified as a road not considered suitable to locate a childcare centre, and raised concerns over traffic movements and safe drop off and pick up.
- If Council specifies a childcare centre within these controls as an indicative land use, it would create an expectation that such a land use is appropriate at this location and would, in principle, be supportable by Council. However it is not recommended that Council imply that a childcare centre is appropriate and feasible when there are fundamental concerns and issues, and potential for non-compliances, with such a use on this site or location.

It is therefore recommended that ‘child care centres’ are not listed as an indicative use within the site specific development control plan.

Submission - Matter 4:

Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.1 Active Frontage. Controls - Station Street

“If this site is not flood prone we suggest the second sentence of the sixth bullet be deleted”

Council response - Matter 4:

The full wording of this draft control is as follows:

“On sloping sites, the maximum level change between ground floor tenancies and the adjacent footpath is to be maximum 600mm. On flood prone land advice should be sought from Council’s engineers.”

The subject site is flood prone and a flood risk, being partially affected by stormwater overflow / flooding. Therefore this statement within the dot point is recommended to remain without change.

Submission - Matter 5:*Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.1 Active Frontage. Controls - New Laneway*

“We request that the word “Commercial” be added at the beginning of the bullet point, the words “at lower ground and ground (Station Street) levels” after “Laneway” and the words “(measured from finished ground level to finished ceiling level)” at the end of the sentence.”

Council response - Matter 5:

The current wording of the draft controls is as follows:

“Frontage along the new laneway should be visually activated by incorporating clear glazing to minimum 90% of the façade.”

The suggested new wording of the control, in full incorporating the requested change, would be *“Commercial frontage along the new laneway at lower ground and ground (Station Street) levels should be visually activated by incorporating clear glazing to minimum 90% of the façade (measured from finished ground level to finished ceiling level).”*

The word ‘commercial’ is not considered suitable as it may not cover all possible uses that may be proposed. The term ‘non-residential’ would be more encompassing of the range of land uses and activities that may be permissible within these spaces.

The existing draft control confirms that the glazing would apply to the building façade. Vehicle entry and access points may not have a building façade as such or are captured in the (maximum) 10% of frontage not requiring glazing treatment.

Including detail of where the measurements are taken from is not considered necessary. This level of detail is to be addressed as part of the detailed design of a future building. Also the request for the glazing to be applied to the façade as measured from finished ground level to finished ceiling level may exclude any areas of partial façade (part levels) which would mitigate the benefits and intent of requiring an active frontage.

However, to provide clarity and to be consistent with the control change applied to Station Street (per Matter 2 above), the phrase ‘at ground level’ has been added at the end of the dot point, noting that the ‘ground level’ for the building entry in the laneway is at a lower elevation than on Station Street.

It is therefore recommended that this draft control be amended to:

“Frontage along the new laneway should be visually activated by incorporating clear glazing to minimum 90% of the façade at ground level”

Submission - Matter 6:*Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.1 Active Frontage. Controls – New Laneway*

“We suggest that, since Figure 4 concerns active street frontage locations and access points, building heights should not be shown on this diagram. They are already shown on Figure 10.

Showing heights on two diagrams increases the risk of errors and misinterpretation.”

Council response - Matter 6:

The building heights on this figure provide the context of the laneway, and the building form that it faces and provides consistency in the figures presentation through the document. The building height notations on the figure are small and discrete and are not considered to cause confusion.

It is recommended that this figure remain, retaining the building height information.

Submission – Matter 7:*Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.2 Building Setbacks and Build-to Lines*

“For clarity, we suggest that this section heading and the title of *Figure 5* be changed to “*Setbacks and Build-to Lines at Ground Level*””

Council response – Matter 7:

The wording provided in the draft development control plan applies standard terminology for addressing setbacks and build to lines, including as used in the Apartment Design Guide. However, to improve clarity, it would be suitable for the word ‘building’ to be replaced with ‘street’ for the setback distance.

Correspondingly, the caption for Figure 5 should also be updated to specify ‘Street Setbacks’.

Amending the wording to specify ‘at ground level’ could theoretically imply that a development may extend over or beyond those setback values and build-to lines at levels above ground level ie storeys 2-12 may extend into the airspace. This may result in unintended and untested building outcomes in this case.

It is recommended that the section heading be amended to replace ‘Building Setbacks’ with ‘Street Setbacks’ and the caption for Figure 5 be amended to also specify ‘Street Setbacks’.

Submission – Matter 8:*Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.3 Street Wall Heights- Figure 6*

“We interpret Figure 6 to show the condition at the eastern end of the laneway, at its lowest point. For clarity, we suggest that the words “*Lower Ground Floor (east end of laneway)*” and “*Ground Floor (Station Street)*” be added to the diagram.”

Council response – Matter 8:

It is considered that the submission request is to clarify where Figure 6 is viewed from given the slope of the lot and so different building levels.

To address the underlying point of the request, it is considered appropriate for the caption of Figure 6 to be amended to specify ‘West’. Furthermore the two dot points of the Controls should be amended to include ‘with upper level setback’ to note this setback requirement and as shown in Figure 6.

It should also be noted that the diagrams provided in the development controls are conceptual plans to support and be read in conjunction with the objectives and controls of the respective clause.

It is recommended that the caption for Figure 6 be amended as noted above.

Submission – Matter 9:

Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.4 Upper Level Setbacks Figure 8

“Again, we interpret Figure 8 to show the condition at the eastern end of the laneway. The setbacks need to be adjusted to show compliance with ADG setbacks for habitable rooms / balconies.”

Council response – Matter 9:

With respect of the first part of this request, it is considered that this is to clarify where Figure 8 is viewed from given the slope of the lot and so different building levels.

To address this issue, the caption of Figure 8 can be amended to specify ‘west’, consistent with the caption for Figure 6.

Figure 8 should also be revised so as to demonstrate compliance with the ADG, regarding setbacks, can be achieved with the building concept shown within the site specific development control plan. The original site boundary, laneway (6.6m width) and new site boundary are now shown. Setback distances marked on the figure are from the new site boundary, and when added to the 3.3m distance taken from the laneway centreline to the new property boundary demonstrate that compliance with the ADG can be achieved.

It should also be noted that the diagrams provided in the development controls are conceptual plans to support and be read in conjunction with the objectives and controls of the respective clause.

It is recommended that the caption for Figure 8 be amended and the content within Figure 8 be updated as noted above.

Submission – Matter 10:

Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.4 Upper Level Setbacks. Figure 9

“Given that the draft DCP is site specific, it is requested that Council consider amending Figure 9 so that it indicates the slope of the site, such that at the rear of the site a lower ground floor level will be achieved, thereby realising a 2-storey podium height at the rear, rather than a single storey as currently shown. This diagram also needs to be amended so that it is consistent with the setbacks adjusted for ADG compliance as discussed immediately above.”

Council response – Matter 10:

The caption of Figure 9 can be amended to specify ‘west’, consistent with the captions for Figure 6 and 8.

Figure 9 should also be revised so as to demonstrate that compliance with the ADG, regarding setbacks, can be achieved with the building concept shown within the site specific development control plan. This is consistent with the approach for the revised Figure 8.

It is recommended that the caption for Figure 9 be amended and the content within Figure 9 be updated as noted above.

Submission – Matter 11:*Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.5 Building Bulk and Design. Controls*

“We request that Council give consideration to deletion of the second dot point of the controls pertaining to building bulk and design. As the site is the subject of a separate Planning Proposal, the floor space ratio for the site will not be consistent with those indicated in the FSR range for the fringe in either Options 1 or 2 of the Wentworthville Centre Planning and Placemaking Strategy.”

“If it is so agreed, the floor plate area in the third dot point should be changed from “500m²” to “550m²”.

Council response – Matter 11:

The second dot point of the controls in this section as exhibited was as follows:

“Floor space ratio for the site should be in accordance with the Wentworthville Centre Planning and Place Making Strategy.”

It is recognised that the FSR of this site will not be as per the Strategy, noting the strategy provided a range of FSR values, but also the Voluntary Planning Agreement which provides for the laneway and so the FSR of the gross versus the nett (excluding laneway) site, which affect the FSR applicable to the developable property at 108 Station Street.

Therefore it is recommended that this dot point be deleted from the controls.

No justification or reasoning has been provided in the submission for the increased floor plate area. The floor plate area of 500m² as specified in the development controls is recommended to remain without change. This floor plate area has been modelled and tested as part of these controls and the overall ability of the building to achieve ADG compliance – at the revised location of the tower as shown in the revised site specific development control plan (discussed below). Any variation to that should be considered through a detailed assessment at the Development Application stage.

It is recommended that this floor area of 500m² remain unchanged in the development controls.

Submission – Matter 12:*Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.5 Building Bulk and Design. Figure 10*

“It is requested that this Figure be amended to align with the building heights and revised setbacks as discussed above. It is essential to avoid misinterpretation that all diagrams are consistent.”

Council response – Matter 12:

Figure 10 has also been revised so as to demonstrate that compliance with the ADG, regarding setbacks, can be achieved consistent with the approach for the revised Figures 8 and 9.

As noted above, the building heights shown on this figure provide the context of the laneway, and are recommended to remain.

The revised Figure 10 shows the tower element located within the site so as to demonstrate compliance with the setback requirement of the ADG (discussed below).

It is recommended that the amended Figure 10 be included in the site specific development control plan.

Submission – Matter 13:

Chapter 4 – Built Form. 4.7 Building Separation. Figures 12 & 13

“We request that Figures 12 and 13 be amended in the same way as we suggest for Figure 9 above.”

Council response – Matter 13:

It would be appropriate for Figures 12 and 13 to be amended to demonstrate a building concept, including setbacks, which can comply with the ADG requirements.

It is recommended that the revised Figures 12 and 13 be included in the site specific development control plan.

Submission – Matter 14:

Chapter 6 – Environmental Performance.

“Section 6 of the draft DCP seeks the incorporation of a roof garden (green roof) and a biowall (green wall) in any development proposal for the site.

It is requested that the requirement for a green roof / green wall be deleted from the draft DCP.”

Council response – Matter 14:

This clause of the development controls was developed from and is consistent with the resolution of Council, per the Cumberland IHAP recommendation for the Wentworthville Planning and Placemaking Strategy, The Cumberland IHAP made a recommendation for “provisions for green walls and landscaping on structures to be implemented through the revised Development Control Plan for the Centre”. This recommendation was subsequently resolved by Council.

Therefore, this clause of the development controls for 108 Station Street is consistent with the development controls that will be prepared and applied over the entire Wentworthville Centre. This is also consistent with the overall Strategy that highlighted the need for and included in visual impressions an increase in greenery and vegetation in the streetscape including above ground level (green walls).

The wording of the controls per the exhibited draft development control is as follows “consideration should be given to utilising roof space for developing roof gardens (green roof)” and “where appropriate biowalls (green walls) should be incorporated in the design of buildings.” Therefore, consideration is to be given to incorporating such measures into a design, but are not mandatory. However, any future development application that does not incorporate a green roof and biowalls into a design would need to address and justify that exclusion and so why the control has not been met.

Therefore it is recommended that the wording of this part be retained without change.

Review of the draft site specific Development Controls

With further internal modelling and testing of a theoretical building concept, and in considering the submission made, changes have been recommended to several figures

of the revised site specific development control plan. These changes include additional text on setback distances and demonstrate those setbacks through 3-D models. These setbacks provided are in line with and demonstrate the ability of a development to comply with the ADG. As a result of this testing and modelling, the location of the tower within the site, as shown in the figures, has been shifted to the south and east from the property boundary. The distance of this shift of the tower is about 3m and 5.5m.

it is noted that the location of the tower within the site, and therefore of the 41m maximum building height, is in a different place to that as shown in the LEP amendment maps.

The recommended revised site specific development control plan is provided at **Attachment 2**.

Matters Raised in the Submission Relating to Planning Controls under the LEP

The submission raised three points that relate to the proposed planning controls under the Planning Proposal and future LEP amendment, being the:

- i. Location of the 41m (12-storey tower) within the site, shown in the Planning Proposal, draft LEP amendment maps and the draft site specific development control plan as being in the Station Street / Lane corner of the site at the property boundaries.
- ii. Floor space ratio (FSR), in particular the requirement for the minimum 0.9:1 of FSR to be for non-residential uses recommended by Cumberland IHAP and as resolved by Council ((Report #004/17 for Council meeting on 1 February 2017 – **Attachment 4**) following the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, and
- iii. Administrative matters relating to the planning controls and LEP amendment process
The Planning Proposal with the building heights configuration has previously undergone a public exhibition and Council has resolved to finalise Planning Proposal and so make the LEP amendment. The minimum non-residential FSR stipulation, as recommended by the Cumberland IHAP (Report #C041/16 and minutes - 14 December 2016 – **Attachment 3**), was also resolved by Council through that report and meeting. The LEP amendment is yet to be completed and will be finalised so as to come into force in conjunction with the proposed DCP amendment.

Conclusion:

The community consultation period for the proposed site specific Development Control Plan for 108 Station Street, Wentworthville concluded on 24 May 2017. One submission was received on behalf of the property owner.

Each of the matters raised during the community consultation period which relate to the Development Controls Plan have been considered and a recommendation made on whether the requested changes can be accepted or are not supported.

The submission also addressed matters that relate to the maximum building height and the location of the tower within the building envelope, and the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) as it relates to the non-residential portion of the site. These matters are not addressed in this report as they relate to the planning controls previously considered by the Cumberland IHAP and resolved Council through the Planning Proposal process, for the LEP amendment, for 108 Station Street Wentworthville.

Next Steps

Upon Council resolution to adopt the revised Site Specific Development Control Plan, it will be finalised as an amendment to the Holroyd DCP 2013.

Consultation:

There are no consultation processes for Council associated with this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications for Council associated with this report.

Policy Implications:

There are no policy implications for Council associated with this report.

Communication / Publications:

The Amendment to the Holroyd DCP 2013 will be notified in the local newspaper following adoption by Council.

Report Recommendation:

That the Cumberland Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) recommend that Council adopt the revised site specific development control plan dated July 2017 for 108 Station Street, Wentworthville (per Attachment 2).

Attachments:

1. Submission received from Beaini Projects dated 21 June 2017
2. Revised site specific development control plan for 108 Station Street Wentworthville dated July 2017
3. Cumberland IHAP report (C041/16) and minutes of 14 December 2016
4. Council Report (004/17) for the Ordinary Meeting of February 2017

(CIHAP) that Development Application No. DA-500/2016 for Demolition of the dwelling house and ancillary structures and construction of a new two storey boarding house comprising eight (8) boarding rooms on land at 75 Graham Street, AUBURN be granted deferred commencement approval subject to the conditions listed in the attached schedule and the following amendment to condition 4:

The boarding house is approved to accommodate a maximum of 9 lodgers.

For: The Hon. Paul Stein AM, QC (Chairperson), Mr. Brian McDonald, Mr. Stuart McDonald, and Mr. Paul Mould AM.

Against: Nil

ITEM C028/17 - SITE SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN FOR 108 STATION STREET, WENTWORTHVILLE - POST-EXHIBITION REPORT

Note: Mr. Geoff Baker and Mr. Andrew Robinson addressed the panel on this item. Mr Mickey Beaini tabled a draft sketch at the meeting.

Resolved unanimously by the Cumberland Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (CIHAP) that the Cumberland Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) recommend that Council:

1. Adopt the revised site specific development control plan dated July 2017 for 108 Station Street, Wentworthville (per Attachment 2) with the following amendment for the purposes of re-exhibition:
 - a) Substitute the proponents draft sketch tabled at the meeting for Figure 10 in the draft DCP with the exception of the four storey area to the east of the two storey podium line and subsequent amendments to Figure 4.
2. Amend the draft LEP as follows:
 - a) Amend the draft LEP height of buildings map to move the 41 metre height limit area in a south easterly direction to align with the new Figure 10 in the DCP.
 - b) Amend the non-residential floor space in the draft LEP to a minimum requirement of 0.5:1.
3. Re-exhibit the draft LEP and draft DCP.

For: The Hon. Paul Stein AM, QC (Chairperson), Mr. Brian McDonald, Mr. Stuart McDonald, and Mr. Paul Mould AM.

Against: Nil

ITEM C029/17 - PLANNING PROPOSAL REQUEST FOR 2 PERCY STREET, AUBURN

Note: Mr. Paul Naylor, Mr. Izzet Anmak, Ms. Helen Deegan and Mr. Graham Guy addressed the panel on this item.

Resolved unanimously by the Cumberland Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel