

## **Meeting Notes**

Subject: RLPP briefing

Date: 12 November 2020

RLPP Attendees: Marcia Doheny (Chair), Bec Ho, Eugene Sarich, Michael Leavey

Council staff: Sandra Bailey, Myra Malek, Rebecca Lockart, Madeline Thomas, Jason

Chanphakeo

**Declarations of Interest** 

Nil

**Item 1: LDA2020/0089 – 68 Blaxland Road, Ryde (Royal Hotel)** - Alterations to an existing hotel, as well as the extension of trading hours from 2am to 4am, Monday to Saturday.

Panel question: How does the internal void work?

Assessing Officer: It is almost a chimney that would technically be open to allow for ventilation & smoking. Council did not agree with acoustic report though. Neighbours already experiencing impacts, and this will exacerbate it.

Acoustic testing was not able to be done due to COVID but is taking place soon due to court case. Not sure where in the building the extension of hours applies.

Comes down to amenity impacts on neighbours, we don't want precedent in area of this type of extension. Also, NSW Police did not support the proposal and there is insufficient information submitted.

Panel question: Why not approve works but not the hours?

Council: The applicant will likely not be satisfied with that outcome.

Panel question: regarding the mention of precedent in reasons of determination.

Assessing Officer: NSW Police comments will explain the reasoning behind this in more detail. This, in addition to the other reasons, forms enough explanation for refusal.

Precedent is not taken on its own as a reason for refusal but together with the other points mentioned in the report.

Panel discussion: Is the Increased risk of crime a valid planning argument?

Precedent is not taken as such and NSW Police review looks into the other aspects of the proposal.

Council circulated the NSW Police comments in relation to this application and the modification application which is currently subject to a LEC appeal.

**Item 2: LDA2020/0135 – 25 Clanwilliam Street, Eastwood** - Demolition, new two storey dual occupancy (attached), front fence and strata subdivision.

There was an agreeance between the Panel and Council that the application had undergone significant design change in order to be compatible with the character of the area, and that the proposal was now consistent with the character of the area.

Brief discussion regarding the addition of Conditions 1(a) and 1(b) to clarify aspects of the front fence and landscape plan - refer to Determination & Statement of Reasons.