

Tesrol Submission – Suggested points for response to NSW Planning.

- **Background.**

The draft Gosford LEP (DLEP) is the culmination of much effort by Gosford Council and NSW Planning to provide a single consistent base for future planning determinations. The Department of Planning has issued various planning circulars and directions to guide preparation of the new LEP standard template.

The DLEP has utilised the Peninsula Urban Directions Study (PUDS) and the Central Coast Regional Strategy as the basis for future planning on the Woy Woy Peninsula. In these documents and the DLEP, Ettalong Beach and Umina are classified as **village centres** with specific built form requirements.

Additionally, the new Gosford Draft Development Control Plan (DDCP) brings together all existing DCP's in one document.

The community, developers and the NSW Government is fed-up with the previous ad-hoc planning system with numerous spot re-zonings and a complete lack of clarity/consistency. The new DLEP is intended to bring certainty to all parties.

This submission uses the recommendations set out in the DLEP (and the DDCP) as the appropriate planning guidelines against which the Tesrol Application should be judged.

- **Building Heights**

The Stage 1 building proposed has a building height of 31.3 metres including rooftop plant etc.

The DLEP restricts building heights for this site to 17 metres. Current building regulations restrict height to maximum 3 or 4 floors.

The proposal exceeds the DLEP maximum by 84%. Even if the rooftop plant is disregarded, at 28.6 metres, the proposal exceeds the DLEP by 68%.

Approval of such variances would completely undermine the DLEP and the community's expectation that the new DLEP will provide certainty for all parties.

- **Building Scale**

The Stage 1 building development fails to achieve a scale conducive to the desired character of Ettalong envisaged in the DDCP.

- the northern face of the building fronting Memorial Avenue is 7 storeys with no step back in height. It will not provide a pedestrian scale face to Memorial Avenue.

- the rear of the building is a continuous 7 storey facade, not unlike the rear elevation of the Ettalong Beach Club. The Ettalong Beach Club north elevation is so unacceptable Gosford Council used it as a reason to support a high-rise building on the old Ettalong Beach Club site to "cover up" this view. The northern elevation prevents all view sharing to the water from properties to the northern side of the CBD.

- the western facade to the proposed side lane provides no set back in heights at its northern end: it is not on a pedestrian scale.

- it is unclear what the floor space ratio is for the stage 1 building site. The application states that the FSR for the total development is 1.94:1 but does not give separate FSRs for the two developments. It is believed the FSR for the stage 1 site would exceed the limits set out in the new DLEP.

The bulk and scale of the proposed development is excessive and fails to meet the desired character and building scale/form for Ettalong set out in the DDCP.

- **Central Coast Design Review Panel (CCDRP)**

- the current plans have not been presented to the Central Coast Design Review Panel for their views. Earlier plans submitted by the applicant were found to be "clearly an excessive overdevelopment and.... would not set a good example for the future built form character of Ettalong [and] should be substantially lower in height, bulk and density..."

- the current plans still represent an excessive over-development of the Site and have not been recommended by the CCDRP.

- **Economic Benefits**

- the economic benefits referred to in the proposal refer to earlier expectations that a fast ferry service to Sydney would commence from Ettalong. This proposal has now been withdrawn and fuel/climate change matters will probably prevent it being resurrected in the future.

- development of the Ettalong Beach Club was promised as a salvation for the Ettalong commercial centre but this has not proved to be the case. Employment levels at the new club are less than the old club.

- it is therefore difficult to be certain what economic benefits the proposed development would bring.

- nevertheless, there must be real concern that the considerable additional retail space proposed in this application will be difficult for Ettalong to absorb. A number of retail premises have been unoccupied for a considerable time in Ettalong and the development of Woolworth/Aldi supermarkets in Umina will put additional pressure on the Ettalong commercial centre. Retail café/restaurant outlets in the proposed development will also put considerable pressure on existing CBD cafes/restaurants.

- **Traffic**

- when the Ettalong Beach Reserve Plan of Management was approved in 2007 the consultant who prepared the plan recommended that “a traffic study and parking management study be urgently undertaken”. It is believed such a study has not been undertaken.

- the loss of a large number of car parking spaces as a result of the proposed development requires Council to address parking requirements in Ettalong. The proposal does not address this matter.

- **Flood Prone Zone**

- the proposed development is in a 50 year flood hazard zone and will also be impacted by the NSW Government/ Gosford Council acceptance of rising sea level parameters of 90cms by 2100.

- the implications for this development of flooding/sea level rises are not addressed in the submission.

- **Summary**

- in relation to planning guidelines as set out in PUDS, CCRS and, more importantly, the new Gosford DLEP this proposal should be refused. It is excessive in height, bulk and density. Approval of this proposal would seriously undermine NSW’s Planning strategy based on new LEPs designed to deliver planning clarity and certainty to the community and to developers.

- the proposal should be refused.