

COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened at 10am.

IN ATTENDANCE

Steve Kourepis	Director, Town Planning
Shahram Mehdizadgan	Senior Executive Town Planner
Patrick Ogisi	Town Planner
Sarah Jenkins	Town Planning Coordinator

ALSO PRESENT

Eddy Wong	Neighbour (18 Crown Street)
Michael and Kara-Lee Ziviani	Neighbours (14 William Street)
Karen Lee-Wallace and John Wallace	Neighbours (5 Sherwin Street)
Mark Armstrong	Architect

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

2.1 11 WILLIAM STREET, HENLEY

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Karen and John raised the concern about shadow diagrams and the lack of separate drawings for 5 and 5a Sherwin Street.

Karen also raised that there was no mention of the impact on privacy of the back window in the report.

Mark queried the privacy issues on the western wall raised in the report and also the solar access/shadowing issues.

He also had concerns with the tenacity comments. Need some feedback on where would be an acceptable setback to build the upper level.

RESOLVED on the MOTION of Director, Town Planning Kourepis, seconded Shahram Mehdizadgan

The development application DA2022/0239 for the demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a new 2-level dwelling with a basement garage and swimming pool at 11 William Street, Henley is not supported, and should be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development does not satisfy the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 as it does not satisfy the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone in regard to it being incompatible with the high levels of amenity provided a low density residential environment.

2. The proposed development does not satisfy the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 as it fails to demonstrate compliance with the provisions of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 with respect to the following matters:
 - Section *Part 3.5* as the proposal having an unsatisfactory outcome on the visual and acoustic privacy of the adjoining residential development in the west.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 3.3.2(a) of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 as it results in excessive bulk and scale, which negatively impacts the surrounding properties and their visual amenity.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 3.3.2(b) of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 as it is inconsistent with the desired character of the surrounding area.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 3.3.2(c) of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 because it does not maintain or enhance the domestic scale, form or variety which are characteristic of the surrounding residential area.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 3.3.2(d) of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 due to the visual impacts and obstruction of views that will result from the approval of this development application.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 3.5.3 of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 due to the unacceptable impacts to the visual privacy of the neighbouring properties.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 3.5.4 of the Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 due to the unacceptable acoustic impacts the development would have on the neighbouring properties.
3. The proposed development does not satisfy the provisions of Section 4.15(1)(e) approval of the development is not in the public interest as it would set an undesirable precedent, given the circumstances of the case, for similar inappropriate development.