

Leichhardt Municipal Council



ORDINARY MEETING

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
ITEMS 18A, 35, 36

27 MAY 2008

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN OF THE FOLLOWING **SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS** FOR THE **ORDINARY MEETING** OF THE LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, LEICHHARDT TOWN HALL, 107 NORTON STREET, LEICHHARDT, ON **TUESDAY, 27 MAY 2008**.

Peter Head
GENERAL MANAGER

26 MAY 2008

BUSINESS:

ITEM 18A	M2008/28 – 120 JOHNSTON STREET, ANNANDALE	3
ITEM 35	BALMAIN TIGERS REZONING APPLICATION: LEP	8
ITEM 36	THE ROZELLE/SUMMER HILL/DULWICH HILL GOODS LINE: CALL FOR A GREENWAY CORRIDOR AND LIGHT RAIL NOT AN M4 EAST MOTORWAY	9

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

REPORT

DIVISION: ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: **ITEM 18A SECTION 96 APPLICATION - M/2008/28 120
JOHNSTON STREET, ANNANDALE**

AUTHOR & TITLE: KAREN JONES, MANAGER ASSESSMENTS

FILE REF: DA/2006/781/6

DATE: 3 August 2018

WORD PROCESSING REF: G:\BP\Agendas\2008
agendas\May\Supp270508bk2.doc

DIRECTOR'S SUMMARY - ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications: Nil

Policy Implications: Nil

Strategic Plan Objective: Place where we live

Staffing Implications: Nil

Notifications: Nil

Other Implications: Nil

1. **Purpose of Report**

To respond to a resolution from the Building and Development Council meeting held on 13 May 2008 concerning a Section 96 modification to Development Application No. D/2006/781. At this meeting, it was resolved:

That the item be deferred to the next Ordinary meeting to obtain a report from an independent structural engineering advising on whether it is possible to retain the buttresses as well as overcoming structural engineering difficulties.

2. **Background**

Development Application D/2006/781 was approved by Council on 21 August 2007 and gave deferred commencement approval for demolition of the southern wall of the existing church and the church hall and rectory garage, alterations and additions to enlarge the existing church, including worship areas, office areas, Sunday school rooms, preparation areas, a new entry structure to Johnston Street and associated works.

The Section 96 modification seeks to alter an internal design amendment condition (imposed by Council) relating to the demolition of the southern wall in order to overcome structural engineering difficulties with implementing this condition.

Council considered the Section 96 Application at the Building and Development Council meeting held on 13 May 2008 where it was resolved:

That the item be deferred to the next Ordinary meeting to obtain a report from an independent structural engineering advising on whether it is possible to retain the buttresses as well as overcoming structural engineering difficulties.

Council has since received a report from an independent structural engineer which is attached to this report.

2. **Recommendations**

That Council as the consent authority pursuant to Section 96 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 modify Development Consent No. D/2006/781 in the following way:

1. Condition 1 be amended in the following way:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details set out in the following table and on the application form and on any supporting information received with the application except as amended by the conditions specified hereunder.

Document	Prepared by	Number	Rev	Date
Architecturals	Ian Foster & Associates	ACC.DA01 DA-04, DA05, DA06, DA07, DA08, DA09 & DAEF	B	Stamped by Council 10 August 2007
Hydraulic Services	Ilias Design Group	STW-01	B	Plans dated 1 December 2006
Hydraulic Services	Ilias Design Group	STW-02	C	Plans dated 20 December 2006
As amended by the following plans approved by M/2008/28				
Sections	Ian Foster & Associates	ACC.DA-10	A	October 2007
Ground floor plan	Ian Foster & Associates	ACC.DA-04	C	December 2006
1:20 Wall Sections Southern Naïve Wall	Ian Foster & Associates	ACC.DA-11	A	October 2007

2. Condition 2(c) be deleted.

3. **Report**

Structural Engineers Report

Following Council's resolution from the Building and Development Council meeting held on 13 May 2008, Council employed the services of an independent structural engineer.

The structural engineer was given a copy of the previous Council report, Statement of Environmental Effects, the applicant's Structural Engineers report and a copy of the submitted plans. The structural engineer was asked the following questions:

1. *Is it possible to retain the buttresses without compromising the usability of the hall? The applicant is claiming that if the buttresses are to be kept then the size of the beam to support the existing roof would result in a floor to ceiling height of 1.7m which is unacceptable for a church.*
2. *The accuracy of the applicant's claims about the buttresses and the methods that would be required to retain them while still demolishing the remaining portion of the southern wall.*
3. *If there are any alternate options available for the retention of the buttresses.*

The report prepared by the independent structural engineer is attached to this report. However, a summary of the main points is provided below:

- The retention of the external brick buttresses at either end of the southern wall appears to be feasible structurally but the critical issue appears to be to retain sufficient brickwork or alternative supporting structure to support the ends of the proposed southern wall beam or truss.
- There are structural problems with retaining the existing wall above truss support corbel height and only allowing new support below this level. This would require significant reduction in head room below the support beam. Consequently the applicants request seems reasonably well founded.
- Council have asked if there are alternative options for the retention of the eastern and western buttresses. However, the primary question is whether there are alternatives to retain the upper section of the church south wall above corbel level.

It is possible to erect a support structure completely outside the line of the south wall that could support the south wall. This structure would have to resolve considerable eccentricities resulting in significant bulk in both the structure and the support points, which would require new columns constructed outside the line of the south wall.

Whilst this is an option that could maintain headroom and keep the upper fabric of the south wall it is not considered an elegant solution and would only recommend it if the fabric of the south wall was considered to be of such high heritage significance that it should be retained.

- With regard to the extent of the southern wall that is demolished, retention of structural grounds of sufficient wall at either end to provide stability to the east and west walls is favoured. This would be subject to detailed analysis but might not necessitate the retention of one full bay at each end.
- The structural engineers concludes by stating that:

I am of the opinion that the easternmost and westernmost buttresses can be retained. I am of the opinion that the structural solution proposed by the applicant (i.e. a truss with the based of the truss at corbel height) is a preferred structural solution with considerable advantages over putting the truss or beam at the lower level.

Clarification on the Relocation of Windows

Subsequent to the Building and Development Council meeting, clarification concerning the relocation of the stained glass windows located within the southern wall was requested.

The plans approved with the original Development Application show that the existing stained glass windows located in the southern wall are to be relocated.

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

NOTICE OF MOTION

DIVISION:	MOTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN
SUBJECT:	ITEM 35 BALMAIN TIGERS REZONING APPLICATION: LEP
FILE REF:	F08/
DATE:	3 August 2018
WORD PROCESSING REF:	G:\BP\Agendas\2008 agendas\May\Supp270508bk2.doc

Councillor Porteous

Background

There is a lot of concern in the Community that Balmain Tigers Management have had greater access to Senior Planning and Management staff, and to Councillors, through additional briefings and meetings at which objectors were excluded.

The residents objecting to the Rezoning Application would like to also receive the courtesy of at least one meeting with the Senior Planning staff and Councillors, and to be allowed to ask questions in an informal meeting and to brief Councillors of their objections to the rezoning. They request that this take place prior to the ExtraOrdinary meeting.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Convene a meeting with all resident objectors who wish to attend with the presence of Senior Planning and Management staff and Councillors prior to the ExtraOrdinary Meeting;
2. Staff prepare a 3:0:1 model for consideration alongside the 3:9:1 model which can be considered by Councillors at the ExtraOrdinary Meeting.

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

NOTICE OF MOTION

DIVISION:	MOTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN
SUBJECT:	ITEM 36 THE ROZELLE/SUMMER HILL/DULWICH HILL GOODS LINE: CALL FOR A GREENWAY CORRIDOR AND LIGHT RAIL NOT AN M4EAST MOTORWAY
FILE REF:	F08/
DATE:	3 August 2018
WORD PROCESSING REF:	G:\BP\Agendas\2008 agendas\May\Supp270508bk2.doc

Cr R. Porteous

The group known as Friends of Greater Sydney, which include members such as Bovis Lend Lease, Caltex, Macquarie Infrastructure, RTA and Planning NSW, appear to be earmarking the disused freight line from Rozelle through to Lilyfield, Leichhardt and on to Summer Hill and Dulwich Hill for a surface motorway connected to toll roads in Sydney's South.

Friends of the Greenway and Eco Transit propose that the Rozelle Bay / Summer Hill goods line become an extension for light rail from Lilyfield to Dulwich Hill and then through to White Bay. The goods line is also key to the expansion of the Greenway corridor for walkers, cyclists and wildlife.

The Sustainable Transport Policy endorsed at The Nature Conservation Council of NSW's Annual Conference, October 2002 stated that "the CBD public transport must be improved by the construction of the CBD light rail extension prior to the cross-city tunnel. The feasibility study of light rail extension to Ashfield must be completed. Promotion of light rail as transport in other parts of inner Sydney including the Bay Light Express proposal must be a priority over road capacity increases."

The NSW government could take this opportunity to consider the extension of light rail services, including into the Balmain peninsula where a large catchment of public transport users are tired of watching already full buses pass them by.

Any expansion of the M4 tollway and Port Botany motorway into our municipality will turn Leichhardt, Lilyfield and Annandale into suburbs poisoned by unfiltered emissions from the M4East motorway tunnel's vehicle exhaust vents. It will generate higher traffic congestion and rat running in our residential streets and will further jeopardise the urgent need for a much greater investment in public transport in the Inner West.

We need environmentally sustainable, liveable Inner West villages, with a useable Greenway corridor and serious investigation into this light rail proposal from Lilyfield to Dulwich Hill, not polluting monster motorways.

Refer Friends of the Greenway at www.greenway.org.au and Eco Transit at www.ecotransit.org.au

RECOMMENDATION

It is therefore moved that Leichhardt Council:

That Council give in principal support for the Eco Transit / Greenways project as a sustainable transport proposal for the Inner West.

That Council invite Eco Transit and Friends of Greenway to provide a presentation to Council (Councillors, Council officers in Planning, Infrastructure and Traffic) as soon as possible and before the next Ordinary meeting on the Greenway / Light Rail proposal.

That following the presentation to Council a report be brought to the June Ordinary meeting on the merits of the proposal and how Council can incorporate the proposal into its land use planning discussions. The report also looks at how Council can improve its capacity to advocate successfully for sustainable public transport with the State and Federal Governments and looks to endorse the Eco Transit / Greenways project.

That all Council notice boards and libraries display and stock copies of the EcoTransit Newsletter May 2008.

The Council provide a link to the Greenway and Eco Transit web pages from our Council's website front page.

That Council provide information in accordance with the EcoTransit News publication May 2008 and seek community comment on light rail and the Greenway project, via our newspaper column and in the next council newsletter.

That Council also write to surrounding Councils, the LGSA, SSROC, the NSW Premier, The Hon. Anthony Albanese and our other local Federal and State elected representatives, seeking their commitment to the Greenway project (where applicable) and their support that the disused goods line from Rozelle to Dulwich Hill will not be ear-marked for a motorway.

That, should Council still be a financial member of the 10,000 Friends of Greater Sydney that it withdraw its membership and call on all other Councils to similarly withdraw.