Shaun,

I refer to the above matter and provide the following comments for the Department's review and action.

Council has previously expressed its position in relation to the front fencing treatment for the proposed development. As noted in my previous email of 30 July 2018 to the proponents environmental consultant (and cc'd to your email address), Council's preference is for a decorative masonry fence to the front of the property to effectively screen the proposed use from the street in conjunction with suitable landscaping treatment located in front of this fencing. Council maintains this position.

Recent documentation forwarded by the applicant increased the landscaping planting densities within the front setback area as requested by Council, and this landscape treatment is now acceptable. However, Council maintains that this modified landscape planting arrangement within the front setback area be situated in front of a decorative masonry wall rather than in front of a 2.1 metre high metal palisade fence setback 1.0 metre from the front property boundary.

While it is accepted that the applicant's proposed fencing treatment may generally comply with Council's DCP controls, given the nature of the proposed development, which involves external activities exposed to view (rather than being contained within a building) a more substantial screening treatment should be adopted to reduce potential visual impact of the proposed development. Council does not accept that landscape planting in conjunction with metal palisade fencing will provide sufficient visual screening, and certainly not until landscape planting has reached a mature height.

With respect to the wording of Condition B61, Council accepts the applicants position that the existing condition makes Council (effectively) an approval body for fencing treatment prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. It is not appropriate that a condition of consent be worded in such manner.

Council has made its position clear with respect to the front fencing treatment and it is now a matter for the Department in its assessment of this application to make a determination on the basis of the above advice.

Hoping this information clarifies Council's position on this matter.

Please feel free to contact me if you require any further information.

Regards,





This mail, including any attached files, may contain confidential and privileged information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive information for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author.

From: Shaun Williams <Shaun.Williams@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Sent: Friday, 10 August 2018 2:26 PM

To:

Cc: Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@camden.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: FW: HPE CM: RE: HPE CM: FW: Smeaton Grange - Follow up from call with Council

Hi

As previously mentioned, EMM consulting on behalf of Roussakis Holdings Pty Ltd is additionally seeking the modification of Condition B61 (attached) as part of the modification application to the Smeaton Grange Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7424 MOD 1) pursuant to section 4.55(1a) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

Could Council please review the documentation and provide comment by **COB 24 August 2018**. If no comment is received by the Department by COB 24 August 2018, the Department will consider that Council has no comment on the proposed modification and will proceed with the assessment.

The proposed modification application and associated documents are available on the Department's website at:

http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=9434

Please contact me on the details below if you have any enquiries.

Regards,

Shaun Williams Planning Officer Industry Assessments

320 Pitt Street | GPO Box 39 | Sydney NSW 2001 T 02 8275 1345 | E shaun.williams@planning.nsw.gov.au