



**MINUTES OF RANDWICK LOCAL PLANNING PANEL (PUBLIC) MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, 12 MAY 2022 AT 1.03PM**

Present:

Chairperson: Lindsay Fletcher

Expert Members: Janette Murrell & Peter Romey

Community Representatives: Michelle Finegan

Council Officers present:

Manager Development Assessment	Mr F Ko
Coordinator Major Assessments	Mr Scott Cox
Executive Planner	Ms A Manahan
Personal Assistant to Manager DA	Ms A Halcro
Coordinator Property and Insurance	Ms S Plunkett
Coordinator Major Projects	Ms H Segedin

Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

Nil.

Address of RLPP by Councillors and members of the public

Deputations were received in respect of the following matters:

D16/22 451 BEAUCHAMP ROAD, MATRAVILLE (DA/640/2021)

Against Andrew Connor

D17/22 1-5R KNOWLES AVENUE, MATRAVILLE (DA/576/2021)

Against Kate Mirow – 1st speaker

Against Carolyn Hook – 2nd speaker

Against Clay Chigwidden – 3rd speaker

For Sam Crawford

Ros Read (Urban Perspectives)

After the above speakers had addressed the panel, the public meeting was closed at 1.59pm.

The Panel deliberated and voted on the matters electronically.

The resolutions, reasons and voting outcomes for the items on the agenda are detailed below:

Development Application Reports

D16/22 Development Application Report - 451 Beauchamp Road, Maroubra (DA/640/2021)

RESOLUTION:

The RLPP refuses consent under Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. DA/640/2021 for demolition of existing structures and construction of 2 x part two and part 3 storey semi-detached dwellings, Torrens title subdivision, landscaping and associated works, at No. 451 Beauchamp Road Maroubra, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is inconsistent with Section 1.2 Aims of the Plan (d) under Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012, in that it does not achieve a high standard of design, has adverse impacts on the community, and will not enhance the quality of life of the community.
2. The proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the R3 Medium Density Residential zone under Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012, in that it does not recognize the desirable elements of the existing streetscape and built form nor contribute to the desired future character of the area. The proposal does not protect the amenity of residents.
3. The proposal is inconsistent with the objectives and factors to be considered in section 6.2 Earthworks under Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012, in that no geotechnical information has been provided to enable a proper assessment of the impacts on surrounding land and the amenity of adjoining properties.
4. The proposal does not comply with the Site Planning objectives in Part C1 Section 2 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of respecting the predominant subdivision and development pattern of the locality and to ensure that land subdivision creates allotments that have adequate width and configuration to deliver suitable building design and to maintain the amenity of the neighbouring properties.
5. The proposal does not comply with the Landscaping and permeable surfaces objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 2.4 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of ensuring landscaped areas are effectively distributed on the site to achieve a visual balance between building structures and open space and provision of deep soil permeable surfaces.
6. The proposal does not comply with the private open space objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 2.5 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of provision of an adequate level of private open space.
7. The proposal does not comply with the building design objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 3 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of the maximum wall height so as not to cause unreasonable impacts upon the neighbouring dwellings in terms of overshadowing, privacy and visual amenity.
8. The proposal does not comply with the setback objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 3.3 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of maintaining a consistent rhythm of street setbacks and front gardens that contributes to the character of the neighbourhood, to ensure the form and massing of development complement and enhance the streetscape character, to ensure adequate separation between neighbouring buildings for visual and acoustic privacy and solar access and to reserve adequate areas for the retention or creation of private open space and deep soil planting. The proposal does not comply with the front and rear setback controls.
9. The proposal does not comply with the earthworks objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 4.6 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of maintaining or minimizing change to the natural ground levels and ensuring that backfilling does not result in unreasonable visual, overshadowing and privacy impacts on the adjoining dwellings.
10. The proposal does not comply with the solar access and overshadowing objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 5.1 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of

- ensuring that development retains reasonable levels of solar access to the neighbouring dwellings and their private open space.
11. The proposal does not comply with the visual privacy objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 5.3 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of ensuring development minimizes overlooking or cross viewing to the neighbouring dwellings.
 12. The proposal does not comply with the safety and security objectives and controls in Part C1 Section 5.5 of Randwick Development Control Plan 2013 in terms of ensuring relevant crime prevention principles are applied in the siting and design of buildings and landscaping, in particular that the main entry to a dwelling be located on the front elevation facing the street and be readily identifiable unless the site has a narrow frontage width.
 13. The proposal is not satisfactory pursuant to the provisions of Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, in that the proposal is not in the public interest.
 14. Insufficient information has been provided to enable a proper assessment of the overshadowing impacts to the adjoining properties. Further information is required for details on plans, cross sections showing boundary levels, lot widths and air conditioning units. No geotechnical assessment has been provided.

REASON:

The Panel has visited or is familiar with the site, considered the submissions (oral and written) and reviewed the assessment report prepared by Council officers that addresses the relevant matters detailed in Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended.

The Panel refuses the application for the reasons given in the resolution above.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**D17/22 Development Application Report - 1-5R Knowles Avenue, Matraville
(DA/576/2021)**

RESOLUTION:

The RLPP grants consent under Sections 4.16 and 4.17 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended, to Development Application No. DA/576/2021 for demolition of existing structures and construction of new community hall with outdoor covered space, landscaping works including tree removal, new pathways and stairs, bicycle racks, fencing and associated works at No. 1-5R Knowles Avenue Matraville, subject to the development consent conditions attached to the assessment report and with an amendment to condition 84 to read as follows:

84. The plan of management required by condition 62 shall include a restriction on the hours and days of operation and shall provide for those hours and days to be 8am to 9pm Monday to Sunday for an initial trial period of 12 months from the commencement of use. At the expiration of the trial period, the hours and days of operation are to be reviewed and if appropriate, revised by Council.

REASON:

The Panel has visited or is familiar with the site, considered the submissions (oral and written) and reviewed the assessment report prepared by Council officers that addresses the relevant matters detailed in Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended.

The Panel supports the application for the reasons given in the assessment report.

The Panel was of the view that the concerns raised by residents regarding increased intensity of use are adequately addressed by the conditions and by the amendment of condition 84 by the Panel. The Panel in particular notes that Condition 62 requires a site specific Plan of Management that will

amongst other things control hours of operation and provide mechanisms to address complaints on an ongoing basis.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting closed at 2.52pm.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES BY PANEL MEMBERS	
Lindsay Fletcher (Chairperson)	Jan Murrell
Peter Romey	Michelle Finegan