

# Modification of Minister's Approval

Section 75W of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*

As delegate of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure under delegation dated 14 September 2011, we the Planning Assessment Commission of New South Wales **refuse** to give approval for the modification of the project application referred to in schedule 1, for the reasons listed in schedule 2.



**Garry Payne AM**  
Member of the Commission



**Donna Campbell**  
Member of the Commission

Sydney

1 December 2011

---

## SCHEDULE 1

**Project Approval:**

**MP 10\_0057** granted by the Planning Assessment Commission on 2 May 2011

**For the following:**

Project Approval for a residential development including:

- Demolition and excavation;
- Construction of 6 residential buildings of 4-6 storeys in height comprising 298 apartments;
- Adaptive – reuse of monastery building for communal facilities including pool and gymnasium;
- Basement parking; and
- Landscaping works.

**Modification:**

MP 10\_0057 MOD 3: Modification includes:

- deletion of Condition No. B1A(f) relating to car parking to comply with the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (Town Centres) 2010;
- reduction to the number of visitor parking spaces from 75 to 48 spaces; and
- redesign of the basement car parking levels.

## SCHEDULE 2

### REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. There is insufficient justification to deviate from the original approval condition that visitor parking spaces should be provided in accordance with Ku-ring-gai Council's Development Control Plan.
2. Although the site is located in close proximity to a strategic bus corridor, St Ives has very limited public transport services particularly during off peak hours and weekends.
3. St Ives is classified as a village in the Subregional Strategy – North Subregion. It is not identified in the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* as a major centres or potential specialised centre. The RTA recommended rates of 1 space per 5 units and 1 space per 7 units apply to metro regional centre (CBD) and subregional centre respectively.
4. Ku-ring-gai Council has consistently applied the DCP43 parking requirement to other developments in the area and it has not been justified why this development should be treated differently.