

Panel Members

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Chairperson | Donna Rygate |
| Panel Experts | Grant Christmas Greg Flynn |
| Community Representative/s | Mark Elsley |

Central Coast Council Staff Attendance

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Andrew Roach | Unit Manager Development Assessment |
| Ailsa Prendergast | Section Manager Development Assessment |
| Karen Hanratty | Senior Development Planner |
| Rachel Callachor | Meeting Support Officer |

The Chairperson declared the meeting open at 2:04pm and advised in accordance with the Code of Meeting Practice that the meeting was being recorded.

The Chair read an acknowledgement of country statement.

Apologies

The Panel noted that no apologies had been received.

1.1 Disclosures of Interest

The Panel noted that declaration forms had been received and no conflicts had been identified.

2.1 Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous Local Planning Panel Meeting held on 23 June 2022 which were endorsed by the Chair of that meeting, were noted.

Public Forum

The following people addressed the Panel:

Item 3.1 - DA/63260/2021 - 16 Sydney Avenue, Umina Beach - Dual Occupancy Attached & Demolition of Existing Structures

- 1 Deborah Sunartha, on behalf of Peninsula Residents Association, Committee member – against recommendation
- 2 Nicole Stokie – against recommendation
- 3 Shaw Stokie – against recommendation
- 4 Greg Smith, Director, KM Design Partners – applicant – for recommendation

Item 3.2 DA/62203/2021 – 37 Paul Street, Umina Beach – Multi Dwelling Housing – 3 units & Demolition of existing dwelling

- 1 Peter Boardman – against recommendation
- 2 Greg Smith, Director, KM Design Partners – applicant – for recommendation

The Local Planning Panel public meeting closed at 2:45pm. The Panel moved into deliberation from 2:50pm, which concluded at 3:30pm.

3.1 DA/63260/2021 - 16 Sydney Avenue, Umina Beach - Dual Occupancy Attached & Demolition of Existing Structures

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Site Orientation | Yes |
| Relevant Considerations | As per Council assessment report |
| Material Considered | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation with application• Council assessment report• 16 Submissions |
| Council Recommendation | Approval |
| Panel Decision | <p>1 That the Local Planning Panel refuse Development Application No. 63260 for a Dual Occupancy Attached & Demolition of Existing Structures on Lot 36 DP58974, 16 Sydney Avenue Umina Beach.</p> <p>2 That Council advise those who made written submissions of the Panel's decision.</p> |
| Reasons | <p>1 Shadow impacts on the adjoining property are unacceptable and approval of the proposed development would therefore not be in the public interest.</p> <p>2 The proposal does not comply with a number of clauses in the Gosford Development Control Plan 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3.2.3.1.3 – Building Envelope• 3.2.3.4.2 – Private Open Space• 3.2.3.4.3 – Minimum amount of sunlight• 3.2.3.4.4 – Privacy• 3.2.3.6.2 – Façade Articulation Controls <p>3 The proposed filling of the land on the site is likely to exacerbate the negative impacts of the proposed development.</p> |
| Votes | The decision was unanimous. |

3.2 DA/62203/2021 - 37 Paul Street, Umina Beach - Multi Dwelling Housing 3 units & Demolition of existing dwelling

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Site Orientation | Yes |
| Relevant Considerations | As per Council assessment report |
| Material Considered | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation with application• Council assessment report• 16 Submissions |
| Council Recommendation | Approval |
| Panel Decision | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>1 That the Local Planning Panel grant consent to DA/62203/2021 - Lot 22 DP 26543, 37 Paul Street, Umina Beach - Multi Dwelling Housing 3 units & Demolition of existing dwelling subject to the conditions detailed in the schedule attached to the report and having regard to the matters for consideration detailed in Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</i><i>2 That Council advise those who made written submissions of the Panel's decision.</i> |
| Reasons | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1 While the proposal does not comply with a number of DCP requirements, the impacts on adjoining properties are not significant for reasons including the orientation of the site with respect to solar access.2 The proposal is satisfactory having regard for the relevant environmental planning instruments, plans and policies.3 There are no significant issues or impacts identified with the proposal under s.4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. |
| Votes | The decision was unanimous. |

PLANNING REPORTS - OUTSIDE OF PUBLIC MEETING

4.1 DA/63420/2021 - 88 Glenworth Valley Road, Wendoree Park - DESIGNATED & INTEGRATED Jetty, Wharf & Pontoon

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Site Orientation | Yes |
| Relevant Considerations | As per Council assessment report |
| Material Considered | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation with application• Council assessment report |
| Council Recommendation | Approval |
| Panel Decision | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>1 That the Local Planning Panel grant consent to DA63420/2021 – Lot 11 DP 25510 No.88 Glenworth Valley Rd Wendoree Park - DESIGNATED & INTEGRATED Jetty, Wharf & Pontoon subject to the conditions detailed in the schedule attached to the report and having regard to the matters for consideration detailed in Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</i><i>2 That Council advise relevant external authorities of the Panel's decision.</i> |
| Reasons | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1 The Panel has based its interpretation of the proposal on the plans and diagrams provided in the Council assessment report, rather than the photos.2 Council advised the Panel that its ecologist has assessed and fully supports the proposal, and that construction of the jetty and walkway will have no adverse effects on the ecology of the area.3 The proposal is satisfactory having regard to the relevant environmental planning instruments, plans and policies.4 There are no significant issues or impacts identified with the proposal under s.4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. |
| Votes | The decision was unanimous. |