

CITY OF CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN

MINUTES OF THE

INDEPENDENT HEARING AND ASSESSMENT PANEL MEETING

**HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CAMPSIE CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTRE**

ON 1 MAY 2017

PRESENT: Ms Jan Murrell (Planning/Environment) - Chairperson
Mr Michael File (Planning)
Dr Ian Garrard (Environment)
Mr Garth Paterson (Urban Design)

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Ms Chauntelle Mitchell (Administration Officer - IHAP)
Mr Brad McPherson (Manager Governance, not present for the closed session)
Mr Mitchell Noble (Manager Spatial Planning, not present for the closed session)
Mr Ian Woodward (Manager Development, not present for the closed session)
Mr Stephen Arnold (Team Leader - Planning, not present for the closed session)
Mr Warren Farleigh (Team Leader - Urban Planning, not present for the closed session)
Mr Tom Foster (Senior Urban Planner, not present for the closed session)
Ms Casandra Gibbons (Senior Development Assessment Officer, not present for the closed session)
Mr William Hodgkinson (Development Assessment Officer, not present for the closed session)

THE CHAIRPERSON DECLARED THE MEETING OPEN AT 6.05 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. Planning proposals will also be referred to the Panel for consideration and to provide advice to assist Council.

DECISION

1 5-9 CROYDON STREET, LAKEMBA: PLANNING PROPOSAL TO CHANGE MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE BUILDING HEIGHT AND FLOOR SPACE RATIO

Site Visit

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

Public Addresses

Ms Barbara Coorey (objector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Queried the ownership of the subject property and adjacent property recently acquired.• Expressed concerns regarding the original rezoning in 2012 stating there is no paper trail relating to an increase of height to 18 metres and no FSR.• Is of the view the adjacent property recently purchased should be included in the subject planning proposal.• Raised concern regarding a lack of public space in the area and the overshadowing impact by the proposal on Jubilee Park, specifically the market garden and playground.• Does not believe the planning proposal has merit or community support. Is of the view the proposed height is not necessary. Notes the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor is not yet ratified.
Ms Helen Deegan (Planner representing owner) and Mr Frank Stanisic (Architect representing owner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provided details of ownership of the subject property and adjacent property recently acquired.• Noted this was a Council initiated planning proposal.• Provided background on DA approval and planning proposal.• In regard to overshadowing is of the view design and height satisfies all ADG requirements and there is minimal if any overshadowing on Jubilee Park; noted the site context was considered.• Believes the FSR is modest given the draft Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor study. Is of the view proposed FSR and height create a good framework and there for a good design outcome on site.• Answered questions raised by the Panel in relation to FSR and height limits, potential masterplan, purchase of adjacent property, ability to achieve full ADG compliance, potential staging, massing, deep soil, solar access to Jubilee Park and site coverage; discussed a proposed scheme for the subject site.

Panel Assessment

The Panel has been requested to provide advice on the planning proposal for 5-9 Croydon Street, Lakemba. The Panel notes that a draft Local Environmental Plan was exhibited from 1 November 2016 to 30 November 2016. Five submissions were received, including one on behalf of the property owner and one from Transport NSW. The submissions from local residents raised issues of solar access, loss of amenity, loss of privacy as well as concerns about traffic pedestrian safety and potential for increased anti-social behaviour from increased population.

The Plan that was on public exhibition contained heights ranging from 18, 24 and 33 metres. The floor space ratio (FSR) in the exhibited plan is 2.2:1. The Planning report placed on exhibition with the draft LEP commented that:

“Given the irregular shape of the subject site, building heights would need to be carefully managed. Taller development (up to 33m) could be supported in the north-west portion of the site, provided that the narrower, central part of the site remained at the current permissible height of 18m. Some additional taller development up to 24m could be supported in the north-east (fronting Croydon Avenue) and south-west portions of the site also, provided that future building designs complied fully with SEPP 65 and Apartment Design Guide provisions regarding overshadowing and building separation.”

Prior to exhibition the Council commissioned an independent urban design assessment (Annand Associates Urban Design, 2015) to look at various scenarios of floor space ratios and height controls. The urban design report concluded in July 2015:

“d. Conclusions

Thus it would appear that a much improved building form can be designed which:

- *Improves location, size, usability and orientation of communal open space*
- *Substantially reduces on-site self-shadowing issues*
- *Reduces overshadowing of properties to the south and improves solar access to them.*

This can be achieved with building heights of 7 storeys (N-S) and 4-5 storeys (E-W) at an FSR of approximately 2:1.

Note that with increased heights of N-S buildings to 10 storeys an FSR of 2.1:1 - 2.4:1 might be achieved.

This would appear to fit on the site with minimal on-site and off-site shadow/solar impacts whilst providing a much improved usable, north facing communal open space. This would seem appropriate given the proximity to the railway station/town centre.”

It is noted that the owner of the subject land made a submission to the draft LEP. The land owner, Eloura Holdings had commissioned *TPG Town Planning and Urban Design* to undertake a review and prepare a submission in response to the planning proposal which was then under exhibition. The planning proposal as shown in the draft LEP is to amend the Canterbury LEP 2012 height of building map from 18m over the entire site to a range of height areas of 18, 24 and 33 metres, and to amend the CLEP 2012 floor space ratio map from 1.6:1 to 2.2:1. The submission's main focus was to review the rezoning proposal in light of the Apartment Design Guide which had come into effect in 2015 after the preparation of the planning proposal draft LEP. The submission sought a number of amendments to address the ADG more fully including for example, building depth, balcony protrusions, building setback and separation distances. The submission concluded that building separation distances or boundary setbacks should be adjusted by slightly enlarging the 33m and a 24m portion on the height map so as to accommodate the ADG requirements.

At the public meeting the Panel was addressed by a resident objector concerned about the proposal being out of context with the existing area and concern about overshadowing of

the adjoining Jubilee Park and the communal market garden. A concern about a lack of a paper trail was also expressed to the Panel.

The Town Planner and Architect/Urban Designer on behalf of the owners of the subject site addressed the Panel and advised that a further assessment of details of a scheme demonstrates that a 2.2:1 floor space ratio is appropriate for the subject site with the height controls as generally shown on the exhibited height control map. The submission also referred to the Draft Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor.

The Panel notes that the draft LEP is consistent with the draft Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Draft Structure Plan that was exhibited from October 2015 to February 2016. It is anticipated that the draft corridor plan will be finalised in the near future.

The Panel does not have the benefit of assessing the documentation referred to at the public meeting for the first time, and in the absence of a detailed analysis to demonstrate that a scheme that is fully compliant with the ADG can be accommodated on the site with an FSR of 2.2:1, the Panel could not support the making of the LEP with an FSR of 2.2:1.

The Panel considers that prior to Council referring the Plan under Section 69 to the Department for making that it should have the benefit of a scheme that can demonstrate full compliance with the ADG's requirements with a floor space ratio of 2.2:1. The Panel also considers that the location of communal open space on the site is necessary to maximise solar access and consideration should also be given to a suitable minimum lot size for residential flat buildings to be included in the LEP to ensure the comprehensive development of the site achieves a quality built form outcome compatible with the ADG. (The Panel also notes that post the LEP being made that subdivision of the subject parcel would not achieve the required planning outcome and should be avoided).

In terms of the advice sought from the Panel, the Panel is generally of the opinion that the draft LEP as exhibited is consistent with the draft corridor plan and that subject to a more detailed analysis of full compliance with the ADG requirements, the Plan would be capable of being recommended for making.

At this stage the Panel is satisfied that a floor space ratio of 2:1 can be accommodated on the subject site and is also of the opinion that the heights as proposed, subject to any impacts in particular on the park, are appropriate.

By way of comment, on the finalisation of the Draft Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor the Panel suggests that the Council give consideration to preparing a draft LEP for the whole precinct and any necessary DCP amendments in order to facilitate an orderly planning outcome for the precinct. For example this would include consideration of the sites fronting Railway Parade where there would appear to be an opportunity for increased heights and densities.

IHAP Recommendation

The Panel considers that, in the absence of the Council being satisfied that an FSR of 2.2:1 would provide a built outcome for the site that fully complies with the ADG requirements, the draft LEP should not be made at this stage until such time as the Council is in receipt of documentation to demonstrate this.

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

2 107 CHAPEL ROAD, BANKSTOWN: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SITE STRUCTURES AND CONSTRUCTION OF A BOARDING HOUSE CONTAINING 45 BOARDING ROOMS, ONE MANAGER’S ROOM WITH ASSOCIATED BASEMENT LEVEL CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND SITE WORKS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING) 2009

Site Visit

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

Public Addresses

Mr Joseph El Khawaja (Applicant /Architect) and Mr Peter Kalithrakos (owner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answered questions raised by the Panel in relation to landscaping, complaints management and on-site detention. The applicant raised no objection to the removal of the Camphor laurel tree and confirmed the site manager will reside at the property.• Raised no objection to Panel’s suggested conditions:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Relocation of the large Crepe myrtle tree;- Retention of the small Crepe myrtle tree on the northern property boundary to maintain a barrier;- Provision of a 1.8 metre masonry wall to the east boundary;- Provision of amended Landscape plans.
--	--

Panel Assessment

The Panel endorses the Council Officer’s report and recommendations that the boarding house be approved subject to conditions.

The Panel considered the context of the site with the residential flat building to the north on the adjoining site, and the nursing home to the south on the opposite corner provides a suitable context for the proposed boarding house.

With respect to the Clause 4.6 variations to the standards within the R4 high density residential zone under the Bankstown Local Environmental Plan it is noted that 1000sqm is required and the subject site has an overall area of 828.4sqm. The other variation sought is that the minimum width of the site required by the control is 20 metres, whereas the subject site has a minimum lot width of 19.11 metres at the front building line.

After careful consideration the Panel considered that the Clause 4.6 variations are considered well founded in the particular circumstances of this case and the objectives of the standards are met. As such the Panel supports the Clause 4.6 variations and approves the variations as sought.

The Panel considered the potential for amalgamation of sites in terms of minimum allotment size and is of the opinion that the size of the site in its context does not create unreasonable impacts and furthermore the consolidation of sites to the east would not provide for a more appropriate development given the relatively small width of the site. The residential flat building to the north clearly is one that will remain in situ for some time to come, and as such amalgamation to the north is not considered possible.

With respect to the Bankstown Development Control Plan (BDCP) there are a number of non-compliances. It is also noted however that the affordable housing SEPP takes

precedence over the DCP. Nonetheless, the Panel has considered the DCP controls, in particular the four storey height proposed for the development, as opposed to the three storeys provided for in the R4 zone. It is noted that the Council can approve boarding houses up to four storeys within certain areas. The Panel notes that the RL of the subject proposal is below the pitched roof ridge of the residential flat building to the north, and in the context of the nursing home opposite, the height of the building on the corner is justified in the circumstances and strict numeric compliance is not necessary.

In terms of site constraints the Panel notes that the design footprint allows for the retention of the Eucalypt tree in the south-west front corner on the adjoining property having regard to the drip line and tree protection measures. The Panel does not object to the removal of the Camphor Laurel tree in the south east corner. The Panel discussed the existing Crepe Myrtle on the northern boundary and the possibility of it being retained and the applicant agreed to the possibility of relocating the Crepe Myrtle tree to the south west corner in deep soil. Also the applicant agreed in discussion with the Panel to provide for taller species of Lillypillies intermittently on the northern boundary to provide some filtering of views between the boarding house and the existing residential flat building.

The amended landscape plan should also be accompanied by an arborist report on the health of the Eucalypt on the adjoining property to the north-west. The conditions are amended accordingly.

With respect to the minimum setbacks, the Panel notes that the setback to the secondary road is less than 6 metres being 3.6 metres, once again the Panel is satisfied the development will provide for a satisfactory streetscape presentation in its context.

The Panel discussed with the applicant the appropriateness of providing a masonry fence on the eastern boundary that adjoins the residential dwelling to provide enhanced acoustic attenuation for the proposed garage entrance that adjoins this boundary. The applicant agreed to construct a masonry fence at his expense and an appropriate condition has been imposed accordingly.

IHAP Determination

THAT Development Application DA-325/2016 be **APPROVED** in accordance with the Council staff report recommendation, subject to the following changes to the recommended conditions:

1. Condition 6 to be modified to read as follows:
 - “6. A detailed landscape plan prepared by a qualified landscape architect or designer is to be approved prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. The landscape plan is to be prepared in accordance with the relevant DCP and is to show all features, built structures including retaining walls, irrigation, mulch and natural features such as significant gardens, landscaping, trees, natural drainage lines and rock outcrops that occur within 3 metres of the site boundary. The landscape plan shall consider any stormwater, hydraulic or overland flow design issues where relevant.
 - a) The Landscape Plan shall be modified in accordance with the following conditions:

- i. 1 x tree, 100 litre specimen known to attain a minimum height of 10 metres at maturity in the front setback.
- ii. The tree located on the southern boundary (the Crepe Myrtle) must be transplanted and located in the south western corner of the front setback. The tree should be transplanted in accordance with the below specifications.
- iii. The tree located on the northern boundary (the Crepe Myrtle) is to be retained.
- iv. The landscape plan must be amended to include the provision of *Elaeocarpus eumundii* (Quandong) minimum container size of 45 litres along the northern elevation. The existing landscape plan must be amended to show alternative plantings between the Lilly pilly as shown and the Quandong on the landscape plan.

The amended Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the principal certifying authority for final approval prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate.

- b) The following tree transplanting guidelines are to be complied with:
 - i. All tree/s proposed for transplanting are to be located as shown on the approved landscape plan.
 - ii. The tree/s are to be transplanted under the care and control of a suitably qualified arborist experienced in advanced tree transplanting, the name and contact details to be provided to the approving authority not less than fourteen (14) days prior to commencement of building works.
 - iii. The preparation of the selected tree/s for transplanting is to be carried out to accepted arboricultural standards and best practice, and commenced well in advance prior to being moved to ensure adequate root development within the root ball area. If the tree/s are a deciduous species then the appropriate time for transplanting is when the tree is dormant (winter once all its leaves have dropped).
 - iv. Prior to moving the selected tree/s the root ball is to be carefully wrapped with a suitable material, such as wire mesh, hessian, geotech fabric, or similar to ensure the root ball is not damaged and does not dry out during transporting. Watering of the root ball during transport may also be necessary.
 - v. If required the tree/s can be stored off-site for the duration of the development providing that it can be demonstrated that they will be appropriately cared for and remain sustainable to be returned to the subject site.
 - vi. The hole into which the subject tree is to be planted shall be prepared well in advance, with adequate drainage and any necessary soil amelioration works undertaken as required. Soil backfill around the root ball is to be free of compaction, have a suitable pH, with at least 10% composted organic material (by volume) and be similar or compatible with the existing soils on site to promote lateral root development into the existing soil.

- vii. All transplanted trees are to be guyed / staked for at least twelve (12) months, or until it can be demonstrated that the tree/s are self-supporting in all weather conditions. Protective fencing is to be installed around the tree/s following transplanting to the edge of the Tree Protection Zone, or in the case of Palm species not less than 3 metres from the trunk. This is to facilitate the development of replacement roots to support the plant safely and securely in its new location.
 - viii. The approving authority is to be notified on completion of transplanting and fencing works for inspection by the approving authority.”
2. Condition 7 to be modified to read as follows:
- “7. The landscape plan shall include provision for the replacement of all side and rear boundary fencing. A new 1.8m fence is to be erected along all northern boundary of the subject allotment at full cost to the developer. The colour of the fence along the northern elevation is to complement the development and the fence is to be constructed of lapped and capped timber paling, sheet metal or other suitable material unless the type of material is stipulated in any flood study prepared for the site.
- A new 1.8m high fence must be provided along the eastern boundary of the site, shall be constructed of masonry material unless otherwise specified elsewhere in this consent. This fence is to be erected wholly within the subject allotment at full cost to the developer. The selection of the materials and finishes must complement the proposal. The fence and materials must be constructed to a high quality professional finish. Fencing forward of the building line shall be no higher than 1m unless otherwise approved by Council.”
3. Insert new condition 7A as follows:
- “7A All boundary fencing behind the building line shall be replaced in accordance with condition 7. The fence and materials must be constructed to a high quality professional finish. Fencing forward of the building line shall be no higher than 1m unless otherwise approved by Council.”
4. Insert new condition 7B as follows:
- “7B Prior to the commencement of works, the *Eucalyptus botryoides*, Bangalay tree located at the front of the property at 109-113 Chapel Road, Bankstown shall be inspected by an appropriately qualified arborist AQF LEVEL 5 and a report on the condition and health of the tree shall be provided to Council. A tree protection plan shall also be prepared and provided to Council. The Tree protection plan shall be compliant with AS 4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites. The tree protection plan shall outline all measures necessary to ensure that the tree will be protected during the demolition and construction process. The health and condition of the tree is to be reviewed by the consulting arborist at the completion of works, prior to the removal of the tree protection measures.”
5. Condition 32 be modified to read as follows:
- “32. The plan of management prepared by Planning Ingenuity titled, ‘*Operational Plan of Management (Incorporating the House Rules) for a Boarding House at 107 Chapel Road South, Bankstown*’ dated February 2016, must be amended to reflect the updated architectural and resulting reduced number of rooms, boarders, car parking spaces and motorcycle/bicycle spaces. The management plan must ensure that no double room within the boarding

house has more than 2 boarders and that all single rooms contain only 1 boarder. The amended plan of management must form part of the development consent.

The amended Plan of Management for the boarding house, must include an address of the following, to Councils satisfaction:

1. Establishing house rules;
 2. Resident behaviours;
 3. Maintaining good relations with neighbours;
 4. Noise;
 5. The use of external areas;
 6. The holding of parties;
 7. The consumption of alcohol on the premises;
 8. The use of stereos and like equipment;
 9. The carrying out of activities likely to cause a nuisance;
 10. The parking of vehicles;
 11. The registering of complaints;
 12. Complaints Management (to a standard consistent with the February 2016 'Operational Plan of Management');
 13. Cleaning of premises;
 14. Disposal of waste;
 15. Safety of residents;
 16. Use of community room;
 17. Furniture to be included in the community room and courtyard areas;
 18. Use of car space;
 19. Role of the boarding house manager;
 20. Fire safety and security regulations;
 21. Energy efficient fittings within the boarding house;
 22. Use of parking spaces;
 23. Occupancy agreement and registration; and
 24. Community Liaison (to a standard consistent with the February 2016 'Operational Plan of Management')."
6. Insert new condition 77A, B and C as follows:
- “77A A security system is to be installed at the entrance to the building to prevent unauthorised access into the building. Visitors should only be able to gain access into the building via a buzzer system.
- 77B All lodgers must be subject to an Occupancy Agreement for a term of at least three months.
- 77C The building shall be used exclusively for the purposes of a boarding house within the meaning of State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009.”

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

3 689 PUNCHBOWL ROAD, PUNCHBOWL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES AND CONSTRUCTION OF A FOUR STOREY MIXED COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING OF GROUND FLOOR COMMERCIAL TENANCY, ELEVEN RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND BASEMENT PARKING

Site Visit

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

Public Addresses

Mr William Karavelas (Applicant) and Mr Nick Lycenko (Architect)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Raised no objection to Panel's suggested conditions to provide a replacement canopy tree.
--	---

Panel Assessment

The Panel has considered the Officer's planning report, and generally concurs and endorses the recommendation that the residential flat building be approved. However, the Panel considers additional conditions are appropriate to be imposed.

The context of the subject site is that on either side of the proposal there are two recently developed residential flat buildings above shops. The right of carriageway through the site for the relatively new development to the east was required to provide access to the subject site so as not to create another driveway onto the main road. At the rear of the subject site there is an unusual subdivision pattern, with a number of properties converging. The subject development proposal is considered to provide an appropriate fit in the streetscape when viewed from Punchbowl Road.

The Panel has considered the Clause 4.6 variations to the development standards under the Bankstown Local Environmental Plan, and these relate to the floor space ratio control of 1:1, whilst the proposed development is 1.97:1. The 1:1 floor space ratio relates to development in the B2 zone Local Centre that has a frontage less than 20 metres. The Panel notes there is no opportunity for site amalgamation, given the recent developments to the east and west. The development of the subject site will provide a much desired redevelopment to complement the streetscape. The Panel is satisfied that the variation to the floor space ratio for this narrow site of 15.24 metres is justified in the circumstances and will provide for a better planning outcome. Given the time elapsed the Panel is supportive of the use of Clause 4.6 in this instance, however in future cases it may be more appropriate to consider the use of a concurrent planning proposal given the extent of the departure.

The Panel discussed with the applicant and his architect the opportunity of providing a tree in the north-west corner, to compensate for the removal of the Port Jackson fig tree, and provide for an appropriate filtering of the development when viewed from the rear residential flat buildings and surrounding properties. Furthermore, a canopy tree in the corner location of some 3 x 3 metres will provide for increased amenity to the occupants of the subject site. The Panel considers that this is necessary given that two trees of significance, the Melaleuca and Port Jackson fig will be removed by the proposed development, and it would be appropriate to offset this loss by the provision of a canopy tree in the rear corner. The applicant agreed that the architectural plans will be amended accordingly and a condition is imposed for the species and pot size be approved by Council's landscape officer prior to the issue of the construction certificate.

IHAP Determination

THAT Development Application DA-817/2016 be **APPROVED** in accordance with the Council staff report recommendation, subject to the following changes to the recommended conditions:

1. Insert new condition 2 c) as follows:
"2 c) The upper level of basement is to be reduced in footprint to allow for a sufficient deep soil zone to accommodate a replacement tree within the rear western corner of the site that is to be maintained for the life of the development. The tree is to be a deciduous species approved by Council's Tree Management Officer. This is to be reflected on the Construction Certificate Plans and shown on the Landscape Plan."
2. Delete conditions 7 and 8 and renumber subsequent conditions accordingly.
3. Amend condition 26 by deleting the last paragraph (commencing with the words "In addition a RMS Approval") and replacing with the following wording:
"In addition a Road Occupancy Licence from the RMS Transport Management Centre will be required for works that may impact traffic flows on Punchbowl Road or within 100m of a traffic facility including roundabouts and traffic signals."
4. Amend condition 48 as follows:
 - a) Delete the first sentence "The post development storm water discharge from the subject site into RMS drainage should not exceed the pre-development discharge".
 - b) In the fourth paragraph, delete the words "The Sydney Asset Management Roads and Maritime Services PO Box 973 Parramatta CBD 2124" and replace with the following words:
"Suppiah.Thillai@rms.nsw.gov.au"

A plan checking fee will be payable and a performance bond may be required before Roads and Maritime approval is issued. With regard to the Civil Works requirement please contact the Roads and Maritime Project Engineer, External Works Ph. 8849 2114 or Fax: 88492766."
5. Amend condition 49 by inserting the following paragraph after the last sentence:
"The developer is to submit all documentation at least six (6) weeks prior to commencement of construction and is to meet the full cost of the assessment by Roads and Maritime.

The report and any enquiries should be forwarded to:

Project Engineer, External Works
Sydney Asset Management
Roads and Maritime Services
PO Box 973 Parramatta CBD 2124"

6. Insert new condition 49A as follows:
"49A All demolition and construction vehicles are to be contained wholly within the site and vehicles must enter the site before stopping. A construction zone will not be permitted on Punchbowl Road."
7. Modify condition 66 to read as follows:
"66. Off street car spaces are to be provided in accordance with the submitted plans. Two (2) spaces are to be provided for people with mobility impairment in accordance with AS 2890.1 as shown on the approved plans. All car parking spaces shall be allocated and marked according to these requirements."

Vote: 4 – 0 in favour

The meeting closed at 9.50 p.m.