

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

TO: Central Coast Local Planning Panel
FROM: Andrew Roach Unit Manager Development Assessment
SUBJECT: Additional Information (Development Application No. DA56190/2019)
Proposed Multi Dwelling Housing Development (32-36 Melbourne St East Gosford)
DATE: 19 November 2020

I refer to the abovementioned Development Application which is to be considered by the Central Coast Local Planning Panel at its meeting of 26 November 2020. Following a final review of the agenda, a number of typographical errors were found in the report item 3.3 relating to the Multi-dwelling Housing Development at East Gosford.

This addendum provides an update on those matters.

Typographical Errors Within the Report

a) It has been noted that on page 176 under title *Background* item iii, the report states:

'...It is noted that one (2) revision of architectural plans, engineering plans and SEE were required and two (3) revisions of the landscape plan and waste management plan were required, of which the waste management plan has not being supported by the Waste Management Officer on this occasion.'

This is a typographical error, should read as follows (highlight in bold to show amended wording):

*...It is noted that **two (2)** revisions of architectural plans, engineering plans and SEE were required and **three (3)** revisions of the landscape plan and waste management plan were required, of which the waste management plan has not being supported by the Waste Management Officer on this occasion.'*

- b)** It has been noted that on *page 188* under title *State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017* last paragraph, states:

'...Subject to conditions (Conditions 2.3(b), 5.18, 5.19 and 6.20) the proposal is satisfactory in relation to SEPP (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017 and Clause 6.6.1.2 of the GDCP 2013.'

This is a typographical error, should read as follows (highlight in bold to show amended wording):

*'...Subject to conditions (Conditions **2.9(b), 4.17; 5.6; 5.16, 6.3; 6.12 and 6.13**) the proposal is satisfactory in relation to SEPP (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017 and Clause 6.6.1.2 of the GDCP 2013.'*

- c)** It has been noted that on *page 193* under title *Clause 7.2 Flood planning* last paragraph, the report states:

'...Council's Engineer is supportive of the proposal subject to conditions (Condition 2.1, 2.11, 4.13 and 4.20), and is satisfied that the proposed development is not likely to have a significant impact on flood levels.'

This is a typographical error, should read as follows (highlight in bold to show amended wording):

*'...Council's Engineer is supportive of the proposal subject to conditions (**Condition 2.1, 2.11 and 4.8**), and is satisfied that the proposed development is not likely to have a significant impact on flood levels.'*

- d)** It has been noted that on *page 198* under title *Drainage* last paragraph, the report states:

'The hydraulics for the development has been reviewed by Council's Traffic Engineer and is supportive of the proposal subject to conditions of consent.'

This is a typographical error, should read as follows (highlight in bold to show amended wording):

*'...The hydraulics for the development has been reviewed by Council's **Development** Engineer and is supportive of the proposal subject to conditions of consent.'*

- e) It has been noted that on *page 38* under title *Waste Management* second last paragraph, the report states:

'In this instance, the solid waste outcome provides for a maximum of 19m of approved kerbside presentation within Adelaide Street positioned between the street trees (refer to figure 24) for the servicing of shared 360L mobile waste bins serviced weekly.'

This is a typographical error, should read as follows (highlight in bold to show amended wording):

*'In this instance, the solid waste outcome provides for a maximum of 19m of approved kerbside presentation within Adelaide Street positioned between the street trees (**refer to figure 27**) for the servicing of shared 360L mobile waste bins serviced weekly.'*

- f) It has been noted that on *page 201* under title *Waste Management* last paragraph, the report states:

'It is noted Council's Waste Officer has assessed the proposal and is Not Supportive of the merit-based assessment, notwithstanding has provided the Planning Officer appropriate conditions to include in the conditions of consent. Refer to Conditions 1.3; 6.1-6.5.'

This is a typographical error, should read as follows (highlight in bold to show amended wording):

*'It is noted Council's Waste Officer has assessed the proposal and is Not Supportive of the merit-based assessment, notwithstanding has provided the Planning Officer appropriate conditions to include in the conditions of consent. Refer to **Conditions 1.3; 3.5; 6.7; 6.14-6.18.**'*