



planning consultants

File Note

Purpose: Summary of meeting between owners of 39 Bancroft Avenue, Roseville and Project Team members for the Roseville College Sport and Wellbeing Centre Development.

Meeting Location: Video Conference

Property: Roseville College, 27-29 & 37 Bancroft Avenue, Roseville

Meeting Date: 28 May 2020

IN ATTENDANCE:

Table 1 below details all persons in attendance.

Table 1 Record of Persons in Attendance	
Owners of No. 39 Bancroft Avenue, Roseville	SWELL Project Team Representatives
1. Wayne Leamon	1. Michelle Scott, Business Manager – Roseville College
2. Kristine Leamon	2. Stephen Earp, Partner – DFP Planning
	3. Dennis Macan, Capital Works Manager – The Anglican Schools Corporation (TASC)

Meeting Commenced: 9:00am

- Michelle opened the meeting with welcomes and introductions;
- Stephen provided a summary of the State Significant Development (SSDA), Response to Submissions (RTS) and Independent Planning Commission (IPC) process, together with a description of where we currently sit and what other consultation is being carried out (with authorities);
- Stephen then summarised the amendments to the scheme, including details of changes to the setbacks/interface zone;
- Stephen then identified the main items that were being raised for discussion with Kristine and Wayne, including:
 - Response to changes/setbacks;
 - Preference for roof-top shade area;
 - Preferences for landscaping treatments, including trees and planting on building;
- Wayne outlined that their fundamental objections to the proposal remain unaddressed, those being:
 - Objection to any development on the site at all;
 - Objection to any works to the dwelling at 37 Bancroft Avenue;
 - Concerns regarding loss of privacy from a 3-storey building;
 - Concerns regarding the loss of amenity to their dwelling and rear yard;
 - Fundamental objection to a shade area on the roof top level, noting that:
 - The height adds another level to the building from their perspective, contributing to an 'imprisonment effect' that blocks their view to the sky;

- Noise generated under the shade area will be amplified down to their property;
 - Their preference would be to have the shade structure moved to the western side of the courts;
- Michelle confirmed that the College will remove the shade structure from the scheme, thereby addressing these concerns. Kristine and Wayne confirmed this would be “a welcome change”;
- In regard to trees, Wayne said that it is difficult to provide a response because the proposal is unclear from their perspective. The amount of landscaping on the structure would need to be considered to help determine whether trees were going to be necessary. For example, Wayne said that if there was substantial landscaping on the structure itself along their façade, and then a chain-link fence (or similar) with a creeper vine on it (to filter views but still let light through), this would mean that they wouldn't need trees (or as many trees) to provide screening;
- In response to this, Stephen offered that the project team could provide them with two (2) new 3D perspectives taken from agreed viewpoints, which would reflect the increased setback and show them the areas of landscaping being proposed on the building itself (3D views to ignore any new trees). Wayne confirmed this would help them be able to make a decision on landscaping;
- Wayne also enquired about the type and extent of landscaping along the structure and also of what trees might be considered along the boundary. Input from the Landscape Architect is required for the College to consider, and then to be conveyed to the neighbours to consider together with the 3D perspectives;
- The above information will help Kristine and Wayne determine their preference with landscaping. Stephen also noted that we have to meet with Council to discuss landscaping requirements (as they are asking for trees along the boundary) and so any feedback, including the neighbours preference for tree species, the number and locations of trees, would be very helpful when we discuss with Council; and
- The meeting concluded with a commitment to provide Kristine and Wayne with additional information to help them consider and respond via email on landscaping matters.

DFP PLANNING PTY LTD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen Earp', is written over the printed name.

**STEPHEN EARP
PARTNER**

Date: 11/06/20