



planning consultants

Minutes

Purpose:	Summary of Consultation Meeting Between Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council (KMC) Representatives & the Project Team for the Roseville College New Sport and Wellbeing Centre Development (the proposed development)
Meeting Location:	Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council Administration Centre 818 Pacific Highway, Gordon NSW 2072
Development Site:	Roseville College, 27-29 & 37 Bancroft Avenue, Roseville
Meeting Date:	16 July 2020
Our Ref:	20676A.17KC_KMCMinutes200716
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	Roseville Project Team Representatives
1. Selwyn Segall (SS), Team Leader Development Assessment (Team South)	Roseville College (the school): 1. Michelle Scott (MS), Business Manager
2. Leona Goldstein (LG), Heritage Advisor	Brewster Hjorth Architects (BHA): 2. Andrew Hjorth (AH), Director
3. Geoff Bird (GB), Senior Development Officer, Landscape & Ecological Assessment	DFP Planning (DFP): 3. Kendall Clydsdale (KC), Principal Planner

BACKGROUND TO MEETING:

The Roseville project team has been working to refine the design of the proposed development to address comments raised by KMC in their submission to DPIE in relation to SSD-9912, dated 10 December 2019. A revised design package was subsequently forwarded by DFP to KMC via email for consideration and comments on 19.06.2020. Documents provided were:

- Architectural drawings prepared by BHA; and
- Landscape architecture information prepared by Sym Studio which provides written responses/discussion to landscape concerns raised by Council and neighbours along with an alternate landscape master plan scheme for the development

They key changes to the design (in comparison the SSDA submitted design) were summarised as follows:

- *'The side boundary setback to No. 39 Bancroft Avenue has been significantly increased. This provides for an increased landscape buffer to No. 39 Bancroft and in turn increased soil depths for soft landscape elements;*
- *The perception of bulk and scale is greatly reduced through the above mentioned side setback increase and a redesign of level 3 which substantially "pulls back" the south eastern corner of the building from the eastern boundary, providing built form more centrally on the site. This also reduces the height of the development in the south-eastern corner with only a small portion of level 3 now being within the 37 Bancroft Avenue allotment;*
- *The general height across the proposal has slightly decreased; and*
- *The skillion roof awning/covered area which was previously proposed on the eastern side of the sports courts is no longer proposed. This further reduces the perception of bulk and scale and potential shadowing impacts'*

KMC subsequently invited DFP to attend the KMC administration building to meet and discuss the proposed changes on 16 July 2020. Below is a record of the meeting.

MEETING/CONSULTATION RECORD:

Meeting Commenced: 11.00am

1.0 Introductions

- SS opened the meeting and welcomed the project team to the KMC Council administration building. A brief introduction of persons present then took place. AH provided A3 sized hard copies of the Architectural design package to SS, LG and GB for their reference in the meeting.
- SS thanked the Roseville project team for attending and then handed over to DFP.

2.0 Presentation of Revised Development Proposal (BHA + DFP)

- KC provided a brief overview to KMC regarding the design work which has been undertaken in response to Council's SSDA submission. KC also highlighted the project team's on-going consultation which had been undertaken with the owners of No. 39 Bancroft Avenue. This overview included referring to the comparative view 3D renderings/perspectives which had been developed by BHA. The perspectives provided a comparison between the SSDA submitted design and the revised concept as viewed from No. 39 Bancroft Avenue.
- AH then went through the Architectural package which included the SSDA submitted design, the proposed revised design and a suite of 3D renderings/perspectives. AH highlighted the changes to the design level-by-level

3.0 KMC Comments and Questions

3.1 Landscape

- SS invited GB to provide comments in relation to the revised design's Landscape elements. **Section 5.0** below provides details of the comments from GB.

3.2 Heritage

- SS then invited LG to provide any comments in relation to the revised development from a heritage perspective. LG acknowledged the revised design was an improvement from the SSDA proposal and advised she would provide comments via email. **Section 5.0** below provides details of the comments subsequently issued by LG.

3.3 Planning

- SS asked if the car parking proposed in the revised design was compliant with KMC's Development Control Plan (DCP), AH confirmed the number of spaces provided still satisfied the DCP.
- SS acknowledged the revised design was an improvement from the SSDA proposal and advised he would collate comments from GB and LG and forward to KC via email.

4.0 Meeting End

- KC asked if Council had any further comments or concerns with the proposal.

- SS advised that there were no further comments or questions.

Meeting Closed: Approximately 11.45am

5.0 Comments received:

On Monday 3 August 2020, SS provided the following comments to KC via email:

'Thank-you for your recent presentation to Council staff on 16 July 2020 highlighting the following changes;

- *The side boundary setback to No 39 Bancroft Avenue has been increased. This now provides for screen landscaping to No 39 Bancroft Avenue by increasing soil depth for deep planting.*
- *The increased setback and redesign of level 3 reduced the perception of bulk and scale providing built form more centrally on the site. This also reduced the height of the development in the south-eastern corner with only a small portion of level 3 being within 37 Bancroft Avenue .*
- *The height across the proposal has been slightly decreased.*
- *The skillion roof awning/covered area which was previously proposed on the eastern side of the sports courts is now no longer proposed. This further reduces the perception of bulk and scale and potential shadowing impacts.*

Following is a brief review and comments focusing on the planning, heritage and landscaping issues as requested.

1.0 Planning

While the proposal is still be out of character with the area, some amendments will reduce the impact on the streetscape, the surrounding two HCA's and several heritage items . The school site does not have height or floor space ratio development standards under KLCLEP. Improvements to the design will reduce the breaches in the height and floor space ratio development standards of KLEP and will have less impact on No 39 Bancroft Avenue. The height at No 37 Bancroft Avenue is now within the 9.5m height development and the floor space ratio has been reduced over this portion of the property. Being a school that has been established in the area for as long as the residential houses it must be expected that some sort of improvements to the school facilities will be undertaken over time. Similar recent examples have recently been achieved at Knox Grammar, Abbotsleigh, Brigidine College, PLC and Ravenswood in the Ku-ring-gai Council LGA and similarly in the St Catherine's in the Waverly Council LGA which has even greater densities as well as HCAs in the immediate vicinity.

Council is still of the opinion that It is very unfortunate that it is proposed to demolish No 37 Bancroft Avenue, which is identified as a contributory item in a HCA No.C32. The unsatisfactory location of the substation will be discussed in greater detail in the heritage and landscaping sections below .

2.0 Heritage

1.1 Proposed Built Form

The reduction in bulk and scale of the proposed development's overall presentation to Bancroft Ave will have a reduced impact on the HCA.

The eastern side setback adjacent to No. 39 Bancroft Avenue, has been increased to 3.6m from the ground floor level and 6.1m from the first floor level (wall of the pool area) and is more acceptable than the original plans.

The proposed stepping back and reduction in height of the blank wall of the pool area will have a less impact on the neighbouring property at No.39 Bancroft Road.

1.2 Landscape

The proposal must retain Tree 7, a mature *Cedrus deodora* (Himalayan Cedar) located within the HCA in the Bancroft Avenue frontage.

The tree has high heritage significance and makes a positive contribution to the established streetscape character and landscape setting of the HCA as a mature original specimen. The existing ground levels around the tree are to be retained. (See Landscape Officer's comments about measures to be taken for the viability of the tree).

The proposed amended planting is now less formally structured but will need further amendments. See Landscape Officer's comments for specific responses in relation to the proposed plantings and landscaping in general.

The eastern side setback from the adjacent property (No 39 Bancroft Avenue) has been substantially increased and will provide suitable screen planting that is consistent with the landscape character within the HCA.

1.3 Streetscape

The location of the proposed substation within the Bancroft Ave streetscape is an uncharacteristic element and reduces the landscape area.

The Landscape Officer recommends, "the substation be relocated to the Recreation Ave site frontage which has a more commercial character where there is a dominance of the built form and away from residential properties. If there is no other viable option for the location of the substation, the following shall be considered:

- Locating the substation within the basement
- If above ground locating it perpendicular to the site frontage with a maximum setback from Bancroft Ave to include screen shrubs and trees."

3.0 Landscaping

While the amended plans are an improvement for landscape outcomes, they have not adequately addressed the viable retention of Tree 7. It is noted that no arboricultural impact assessment has been provided with the amended plans and that the TPZ and development encroachment is underestimated.

3.1 Trees

- Tree 7 – two options have been put forward:

Option 1 – Retaining Tree 7

Option 2 – Removing Tree 7

Council's position regarding the landscape significance and the retention value of Tree 7 has not changed.

The retention of Tree 7 with suitable development setback to enable its viable retention is the preferred landscape outcome.

Amended plans 02 Level 1–Plan Rev G dated 15/06/20 and 03 Level 2–Plan Rev G dated 15/06/20 indicate a development setback of 5.6m to the outer northern wall of Level 1. The applicant has calculated this as an encroachment of 14.3%. The development encroachment has been incorrectly calculated and is greater than that shown for the following reasons:

1. The TPZ (Tree Protection Zone) has been incorrectly calculated. The trunk diameter is 800mm which has a TPZ of 9.6m when assessed against AS4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Construction Sites. The applicant has incorrectly identified a TPZ of 8.4m. Therefore the TPZ is greater than that shown, and therefore the development encroachment and potential impact is greater than that depicted at 14.3%.
2. The shown development encroachment has not considered a proposed retaining wall that runs parallel to the northern façade. The retaining wall is setback 3.0m from Tree 7 and at the outer edge of its SRZ (structural root zone) further reducing the development setback within the tree's root plate and increasing potential tree impact through root severance. The tree's RL is identified as 84.54, with the proposed ground level/entry shown as 82.9, resulting in an excavation greater than 1.6m. It is likely the excavation

will result in the severance of structural and a significant number of feeder roots, and therefore adversely impacting the health and viability of Tree 7.

The following is recommended:

- *In the first instance a detailed arboricultural impact assessment shall be undertaken as per AS4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Construction Sites. This may require detailed non-destructive root mapping and investigation to determine the impacts of the proposal to the root plate.*
- *The proposed retaining wall and level changes north of the building should be deleted, and existing levels and grades retained to the greatest extent possible within the TPZ of 9.6m. As per AS4970-2009 (3.3.2) it is recommended the area of encroachment be compensated elsewhere and contiguous with the TPZ.*
- *It is recommended the area of encroachment be minimised. This can be achieved with the reduction in width of the northern side pedestrian path, currently proposed at approximately 2.4m wide. This path can be significantly reduced in width.*
- *Subject to arboricultural impact assessment there is opportunity to amend the location of the development as a whole towards the south where there is a streetscape character dominated by the built form (therefore reducing the development impacts to tree 7 and the Bancroft Ave residential streetscape).*

3.2 Eastern setback

- *The amended eastern setback to a minimum 3.0m has greatly improved the ability for the development to provide appropriate amenity planting inclusive of evergreen screening shrubs and a mix of small deciduous and evergreen trees.*
- *No details have been provided regarding the location of services and additional development infrastructure, but it is recommended that no services (beyond surface drainage) be located within the 3.0m eastern side setback*

3.3 Landscape design outcomes

- *Planting within the eastern setback is predominantly limited to evergreen shrubs. While this in time will provide eye level screening, it does not visually filter views of the main structure. It is recommended additional small deciduous tree species e.g. Lagerstroemia indica/Crepe Myrtle; Pyrus calleryana 'Capital' / Ornamental pear (an upright form) be proposed to provide mid storey amenity and screening, while providing solar amenity (winter sun/summer shade).*
- *The planting of Cassia javanica (Java Shower Tree) is not recommended as it is a tropical species and is unlikely to grow well in Roseville's cooler winters. There are more appropriate species consistent with the established landscape character*
- *The planting of Podocarpus elatus (Brown/Plum Pine) is not recommended as its mature dimensions (>18m) is inappropriate to the restricted setbacks. It is recommended a smaller tree species be proposed.*
- *Planter volume depths appear to be minimal and insufficient to support the planting proposed (no dimensions have been provided). It is recommended the ADG (Apartment design Guide) Part 4P Table 5, be used as a minimum guideline.*
- *The amended landscape plan is conceptual, however the planting of Hydrangea sp individually within an area of lawn is ill-advised. Hydrangeas are best suited to a mixed shrub border.*
- *The planting of an additional Cedrus deodar/Himalayan Cedar within the Northern setback is supported and an appropriate species for the HCA and streetscape character. Its location however should be amended so that it does not conflict with the proposed sub-station to ensure its long term viability.*

3.3 Streetscape

- *The location of the proposed substation within the Bancroft Ave site frontage is uncharacteristic of the established residential streetscape character, and reduces the available unrestricted deep soil landscape area within the Bancroft Ave site frontage for the provision of replenishment tree planting. It is recommended the substation be relocated to the Recreation Ave site frontage which has a more commercial character where there is a dominance of the built form and away from residential properties.*

- *If there is no other viable option for the location of the substation, the following shall be considered:*
 - *Locating the substation within the basement*
 - *If above ground shall be located perpendicular to the site frontage with a maximum setback from Bancroft Ave to enable the viable planting of screening shrubs and trees. In this regard the substation can be located immediately adjacent to the proposed tennis court and sufficiently setback from the existing federation era building (former dwelling), therefore maximising the available deep soil landscape area within the Bancroft Ave site frontage and reducing its visual impacts from the public domain.*

Hope the above is helpful for you to advance your application but please feel free to call me on 9424-0988 if you require any further information or input.'

Yours faithfully

DFP PLANNING PTY LTD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Clydsdale'.

**KENDALL CLYDSDALE
PRINCIPAL PLANNER**

kclydsdale@dfpplanning.com.au

Date: 7 August 2020

Reviewed: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen King'.