

**From:** [Heather Warton](mailto:Heather.Warton@phall@lederergroup.com.au)  
**To:** ["phall@lederergroup.com.au"](mailto:phall@lederergroup.com.au)  
**Cc:** ["Adam Coburn"](mailto:Adam.Coburn@buchangroup.com.au); [Joseph Bell](mailto:Joseph.Bell@buchangroup.com.au); ["Michael.Hay@buchangroup.com.au"](mailto:Michael.Hay@buchangroup.com.au)  
**Subject:** Follow up from Meeting with Commission re SSD 9813 Donnison Street Gosford  
**Date:** Friday, 4 September 2020 4:31:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Dear Patrick

Thank you and your consultants for attending the meeting with the Commission yesterday regarding the Donnison Street Gosford concept and Stage 1 SSD Application 9813. As discussed, the Panel requests some further information/clarification regarding the proposal:

1.
  - a. The proposed concept envelope drawings (prepared by Buchan dated 2 June 2020) updated to show the actual dimensions of the proposed envelopes not just 'minimum' or 'maximum' dimensions. This includes attention to the discrepancy that the minimum dimension shown between Tower 1 and Tower 2 of 'Min 24m' is larger than the 'Min 24m' dimension shown between Tower 3 and Tower 4.
  - b. The finished RLs of the ground levels at the corners of each podium, and the finished RLs at the centre of the North-South link where it intersects with the East-West link, and the RL at the street entrances to the links.
  - c. On a separate diagram in plan form (similar to DA-02) the proposed maximum building heights (envelope height) in metres above *Ground Level (Existing)* (which is referred to in the definition of *building height* in the Dictionary of the GSEPP) . This should be the highest level on each podia and tower (measured from the lowest ground level existing corresponding in that part of the site). Could the RLs of existing ground levels at the corners of each podium also be shown.

The height 'zones' as shown in the Height of Building Map in the Gosford City Centre SEPP 2018 (GSEPP) should also be shown on this diagram. From this the Panel should be able to identify the maximum height in metres of the proposal in each height 'zone' as referenced in clauses 4.4 of the GSEPP (the Panel is also aware that c l 8.4(4) is applicable).

- d. On a separate diagram, could the FSR zones from the FSR Map in the GSEPP also be shown, with the area of each 'zone' shown with the footprint of the building overlaid. The approximate GFA of the Reference Scheme buildings as they sit within each FSR zone should be shown, with the podium GFA shown separately from the tower GFA. This was not mentioned in the meeting, but is also required. There is some reference to this in the RTS, but it only refers to the GFA in the towers and the actual area of the 'FSR' zone is not shown.
- e. An expansion of the Yield Table for the Reference Scheme that was provided in the email from Joseph Bell to the Department dated 9 July 2020 (July 2020 Email). This should show the podium and the tower of each building separately, floor by floor, and also by

use. From the table, it should be able to be clear as to the amount of GFA in the podium of for example Building 1, separated in to the retail and commercial GFA; the total residential GFA; and the GFA on any one floor should also be clear.

It was not noted in the meeting, but could you also define 'NSA' in the Table provided in the July Email. If NSA is the same as Gross Building Area (GBA - the floor area of the built form including non GFA areas such as balconies), then it would be useful to show this as well, as it is assumed that this has been used to calculate the 'fill' of the envelope.

- f. Following on from e. the 'volumetric fill' of each envelope, which it is understood means is the sum area of the built form level by level, compared to the envelope size needs to be established. Some information has been provided in the EIS and follow up requests from the Department, but factual fill per tower for example is not clear. The envelope size was shown for each Tower in the July Email, but not the size of each podium. The volumetric fill of the podium needs to be shown separately from that of each tower, the average between the two not being relevant. The 'building efficiency' being the amount of GFA in each part of the building compared to the envelope should then be able to be ascertained from the table referred to in e. above.

2. Envelope diagrams showing a compliant scheme, using the same building forms and siting proposed in the Reference Scheme and Concept Envelopes. This is to be 'compliant' with regards to the heights shown in the GSEPP HOB Maps, and separately a compliant scheme with regards to the FSR Map in the GSEPP.

Additional matters:

3. In addition to the above material (mostly) discussed at the meeting, could you confirm the number of storeys in each building in each podium and in each tower, in the Reference Scheme and in the Concept Envelope.

4. Could you also provide a eastern and western internal elevation for the Concept Envelopes for the North-South link and the East-West link, similar to the elevations taken from the street boundaries.

5. There was discussion at the Site meeting that there would be fill taken from the eastern end of the Site, to 'fill up the hole' left when the existing building was demolished. This fill was to be used to form a temporary surface car parking area. If this is to occur as part of the Stage 1 DA for which approval is sought could you advise if this forms part of this application. This was raised at the meeting with the Department that was also held yesterday, but the Department advised that they were unaware that any excavation or filling was proposed (other than for the services relocation). Could you please clarify what earth works are proposed (the relevant drawings) and advise how the proposed temporary car park will be constructed.

6. Similarly, the issue of the need for above ground car parking was raised, including with at the Meeting held with the Central Coast Council (also held in the afternoon, yesterday). The Council indicated that there were possibly two existing levels of basement underground (already excavated) that could be used for future below ground car parking. Assuming this is the case,

could you please provide:

a. clarification as to why future proposed earthworks will be required to fill the site once the building has been demolished; and

b. justification for the proposed permanent multi level above ground car parking, - including any geotechnical advice (eg: high water table) which may support this.

7. Could you also ask *urbaine architectural* to confirm that the VIA provided with the Application complies with the Land and Environment Court guidelines for the preparation of photomontages.

If there are any questions, please contact me via email or on my mobile number previously provided.

If this information could be provided by COB Tuesday 8 September (and if extra time is required for some of the new items, could you let me know the required time frame)

Thanks and regards

Heather

### Heather Warton

Senior Planning Consultant

Office of the Independent Planning Commission NSW

Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000

E: [heather.warton@ipcn.nsw.gov.au](mailto:heather.warton@ipcn.nsw.gov.au) | p: +61 2 9383 2121 | f: 9383 2133 | [www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au](http://www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au)



## New South Wales Government Independent Planning Commission

### Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorised to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

FOLLOW US ON:



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.