



planning consultants

Minutes

Purpose: Summary of Consultation Meeting Between Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council Representatives & the Project Team for the Roseville College Student Wellness (SWELL) Centre Development (the proposed development)

Meeting Location: Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council (KMC) Administration Centre
818 Pacific Highway, Gordon NSW 2072

Development Site: Roseville College, 27-29 & 37 Bancroft Avenue, Roseville

Meeting Date: 15 August 2019

Our Ref: 20676A.9KC_KMCMinutes

Application Number: State Significant Development (SSD) – Ref: SSD-9912

IN ATTENDANCE:

Table 1 below details all persons in attendance.

| Table 1 Record of Persons in Attendance | |
|--|--|
| KMC Representatives | SWELL Project Team Representatives |
| 1. Selwyn Segall, Team Leader Development Assessment (Team South) | Roseville College (the school): 1. Michelle Scott, Business Manager |
| 2. Leona Goldstein, Heritage Advisor | EPM Projects (EPM): 2. Johan O'Brien, COO & HSEQ Executive 3. Maddy Ryan, Project Manager |
| 3. Brian O'Connell, Team Leader Development Engineering | Brewster Hjorth Architects (BHA): 4. Ian Brewster, Director & CEO 5. Rus Manaf, Associate |
| 4. Geoff Bird, Senior Development Officer, Landscape & Ecological Assessment | DFP Planning (DFP): 6. Stephen Earp, Partner 7. Kendall Clydsdale, Principal Planner |
| 5. Joseph Piccoli, Strategic Transport Engineer | Sym Studio (Landscape Architects) (SS): 8. Conrad Grayson, Director |
| 6. Craige Wyse, Team Leader, Urban Planning | Urbis Heritage (UH): 9. Alida Eiserman, Senior Consultant |
| 7. Student Planner | Parking and Traffic Consultants (PTC): 10. Felix Liu, Senior Traffic Engineer |

MEETING/CONSULTATION RECORD:

Meeting Commenced: 10.30am

1.0 Introductions

- Selwyn Segall opened the meeting and welcomed the SWELL project team to the KMC Council administration building. A round-table introduction of persons present then took place.
- Selwyn then handed over to DFP.

2.0 Project Background and Overview (DFP)

- Stephen Earp provided a background to the rationale for the proposed development, including a summary of existing development consents and development applications relating to the development site and how these consents interrelate to the proposed development
- Stephen then provided a general overview of the proposed development and handed over to BHA to provide a detailed overview of the design features of the proposal.

3.0 Presentation of Proposed Development (BHA + SS)

- Rus Manaf presented the proposed development to the meeting, this included a summary of the design studies completed in the locality/neighbourhood and the design concepts process which has taken place. The presentation (in summary) included:
 - Site and streetscape analysis;
 - Neighbourhood materials analysis;
 - Concept overview;
 - 3D internal renderings;
 - Bancroft Avenue Street views (multiple angles) with street vegetation and adjoining buildings;
 - Bancroft Avenue, eastern boundary and school campus perspective 3D rendered aerial views of proposed development from multiple angles;
 - Level-by-level (floor-by-floor) overview of the proposed development (3D renders);
 - Scale and side setback (eastern boundary) analysis (section);
 - Eastern façade sectional analysis;
 - Landscaping; and
 - Shadow study.
- Rus then handed to Landscape Architect, Conrad Grayson to provide further details about the proposed landscape elements
- Conrad provided an overview of the proposed landscape design's elements. This included detailed discussions on the approach to the protection of existing trees on-site and a summary of proposed plantings. Conrad also advised the project team is open to suggestions from Council regarding proposed tree/vegetation species.
- Stephen Earp and Kendall Clydsdale then asked if Council could provide any comments and/or feedback regarding the proposal.

4.0 KMC Comments and Questions

4.1 Landscape

- Selwyn Segall invited Geoff Bird, Senior Development Officer – Landscape & Ecological Assessment to provide comments in relation to the project's Landscape elements first. Below is a summary of the comments provided:
 - The removal of tree No. 7 (Himalayan cedar) is not supported;
 - Reliance on green walls to create landscaped elements are generally not supported. They are not common in the KMC Local Government Area (LGA). Whilst Council does not have a policy on green walls, the observation is that they tend to be removed from developments after time. Suggest deleting and consider an option with less maintenance requirements;
 - Terraced walls along Bancroft frontage are not preferred since they change the existing grading condition. It would be preferable to maintain existing grades as much as possible;
 - Eastern setback – greater tree planting rather than green walls

- Compatibility of drainage infrastructure and landscaping and in the eastern setback to be considered;
 - Usually require a 3m minimum side setback with landscape element of varying heights;
 - Exotic species for plantings preferred, to be consistent with the use of the site as a school;
 - Consider breaking down the formality of the landscaping;
 - Landscaping to provide filtering views from 39 Bancroft Avenue;
 - Setback should consist of deep soil, the inclusion of planters on structure (while not preferred) would be taken into consideration. Adequate root volume would need to be considered.
- Conrad Grayson mentioned at this time also that during community consultation the owners of 39 Bancroft expressed that they would not like to see large trees along the boundary which may overshadow their land.

4.2 Heritage

- Council's Heritage Advisor, Leona Goldstein provided the following comments:
 - Demolition of dwelling located on 37 Bancroft Avenue is generally not supported. Dwelling is located in a Heritage Conservation Areas (HCA), demolition is inconsistent with Council's Development Control Plan (DCP). Strong justification to support demolition would be required;
 - 39 Bancroft avenue is also located in a HCA. Council would ordinarily require a 12m setback to 39 Bancroft Avenue with reductions only where stepping etc justifies it. Consider more separation adjacent to the dwelling on 39 Bancroft;
 - Consider reorienting the proposed pool to achieve greater separation;
 - With materials proposed, can see the design is trying to address the character of the area and be sympathetic, building still quite contemporary; and
 - Agree with Landscaping comments – a landscape buffer between the proposal and 39 Bancroft
- Alida Eiserman at this time mentioned that UH's assessment of 37 Bancroft Avenue being demolished and the development in general was supportable.

4.3 Traffic

- Confirmed there is to be no student population increase
- Intended use outside of school hours to be clearly proposed
- Operation arrangements for car park usage (i.e. afterhours access, week use and specific use of each of the two levels of the car park etc) to be clearly described and shown.

4.4 Stormwater

- Council's engineer and the project's engineer (ACOR) have been liaising on the stormwater requirements for the proposed development.
- On-site detention (OSD) was discussed. Rus (BHA) described its location on level 2. It is within the footprint of the proposed building and will discharged to Recreation Avenue, filtered before discharged
- Council prefers to see captured rainwater reused on-site as much as possible
- There are stormwater pipes and pits on the eastern boundary, Fire services also run through the middle of the site, these will need to be realigned/adjusted for the proposed development.
- It needs to be confirmed if stormwater assets in Recreation Avenue are Council or Sydney Water owned.
- Suitability of parking facilities for all site uses and possible shared arrangements (i.e. neighbouring tennis club) to be considered. Michelle Scott, Business Manager for Roseville College mentioned at this time that the school and the tennis club had a good relationship and that parking/shared use of the proposed tennis courts has already been discussed.
- ACOR will contact Council further regarding the design requirements for the development.

4.5 Planning

- Craig Wyse asked what community and resident consultation had taken place. Kendall (DFP) provided a brief overview and handed to Michelle Scott to provide further detail on the consultation undertaken to date, a summary is below:
 - The school has engaged Australian Public Affairs (APA) to assist with consultation for the project;
 - Consultation with the community and neighbours has taken place;
 - APA, on behalf of the school has undertaken a letterbox drop. APA and Michelle Scott have met with some of the neighbours, post the letterbox drop;

- The school has met with four (4) nearby and surrounding residents one-on-one;
 - APA and the school have held two (2) community consultation sessions where designs were available for the community to view with school, APA and BHA staff on hand to answer questions about the development.
 - At the consultation sessions, questionnaires were also available for interested parties to complete
 - The school's website also has a dedicated information page regarding the proposal
 - The main concern from residents is traffic.
- Craig asked in the school had a masterplan. Michelle advised, yes there is an internal masterplan in conjunction with the Anglican School's Corporation.

5.0 Meeting End

- Kendall asked if Council had any further comments or concerns with the proposal.
- Selwyn advised that there were no further comments.

Meeting Closed: Approximately 11.45am

Additional Notes:

On Monday 26 August 2019, Council's Heritage Advisor Ms Leona Goldstein provided the following dot points to the project teams Alida Eiserman, Senior Consultant (UH) via email summarising the main Heritage issues discussed in the meeting:

- *'Justification for **demolition** of No.37 Bancroft is required. See Council's Heritage Controls, 19B.1 **Demolition** within HCAs.*
- ***Streetscape Context** is important. Consideration of Council's Heritage Controls 19F.1. **Local Character and Streetscape**.*
- ***Separation** of the proposed building from the neighbouring house at No. 39 Bancroft is important. See Council's Heritage Controls 19F.2 **Building Setbacks** The proposed pool is located fairly close to the side boundary of No. 39. Consideration of Council's Heritage Controls 19F.2 **Building Setbacks** should be considered. Further setback especially near the house is necessary.*
- *Formal street **planting** is not appropriate in the vicinity of an HCA. Consideration of Council's Heritage Controls 19F.3 **Gardens and Landscaping** should be considered as planting should be informal.*
- *Proposed building **materials and colours** should consider buildings in the nearby HCA. See Council's Heritage Controls and 19F.1. Also consider Controls 19D.1 and 19D.4 as part of the building is within the HCA.'*

DFP PLANNING PTY LTD



**KENDALL CLYDSDALE
PRINCIPAL PLANNER**



**STEPHEN EARP
PARTNER**

Date: 16 September 2019