

HARRISON-BENNETT PRECINCT

Minutes of General Meeting

held on Thursday, 3 July 2025 at 6 pm by **ZOOM**

Attendance	17 attendees 7 apologies: JA, JS, CC, JT, HL, RK, GT
Previous Meeting Minutes and SOA	Minutes of 5 June 2025 meeting were confirmed by PA and seconded by DY. SOA was not received in time for the meeting.
Convenor Actions	Summary of Traffic issues were shared with Cr Keen and Cr Carr. Precinct Submission on Draft Delivery Program 2025-2029 and Operational Plan 2025-26 was lodged to Council.
Review of recent Council meetings	<p>Extraordinary Council Meeting - 30 June 2025 - Adoption of Draft Delivery Program 2025–2029 and Operational Plan 2025–26</p> <p>At its meeting on 30 June 2025, Council adopted the Draft Delivery Program 2025–2029 and Operational Plan 2025–26 by a vote of 7–3. In favour: Cr Antonini, Mayor Baker, Cr Beregi, Cr Holding, Cr Hoy, Cr Santer, and Cr Welch. Against: Cr Carr, Cr Keen, and Cr Spenceley.</p> <p>The Harrison Bennett Precinct had lodged a submission expressing concern over the inclusion in the Delivery Program of the Informing Strategies (and projects within the Informing Strategies), that are unfunded and uncoded. These projects had relied on the approval of the Special Rate Variation (SRV) lodged by Council to IPART in February 2025, which was rejected in full by IPART in May 2025. The Precinct submission also noted that 78% of community respondents during SRV consultation rejected the Informing Strategies, yet they are still being presented by Council in the Delivery Program as reflecting community priorities and needs. The Precinct recommended consideration be given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Informing Strategies should be removed from the Delivery Program and Council should re-consult with the community regarding priorities, providing full transparency of the costs of each individual project. The Delivery Program could be amended at a later date to incorporate projects that have demonstrated community support and confirmed funding.• If community support is obtained for particular projects and additional rates revenue is required to pay for them, Council should consider applying to IPART for a time-limited levy to fund them, rather than pursuing a permanent SRV that escalates in perpetuity. This would seem to be a more financially transparent and appropriate way to fund discrete projects. <p>The Precinct submission also raised concerns that inclusion of unfunded activities appears inconsistent with section 404 of the Local Government Act, which requires activities in the Delivery Program to be within the resources available under Council's resourcing strategy.</p> <p>It was noted that similar concerns were raised by other Precincts.</p> <p>Despite these concerns, Council proceeded (via a vote of 7:3) with adoption of the Delivery Program inclusive of the Informing Strategies.</p>

<p>Development</p>	<p>Planning Proposal (PP-2023-699) 183-185 Military Road, Neutral Bay:</p> <p>This PP seeks to increase the maximum building height from 16m to 43m and apply a 2:1 non-residential floor space ratio.</p> <p>History</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous DA (approved October 2019) for a 6-storey mixed-use building with 26 units has lapsed. • Rezoning review lodged 21 December 2023 to allow a 12-storey tower. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered by the Sydney North Planning Panel (SNPP) on 14 May 2024, which recommended progression to Gateway Determination, subject to conditions. • Gateway approval granted by DPHI on 11 April 2025. <p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive Height: The 12-storey proposal is inconsistent with the Neutral Bay Village Planning Study (NBVPS), which sets a maximum of 6 storeys for the site. Both DPHI and Equitibuild (the applicant) have incorrectly referenced 8 storeys as the NBVPS vision. It also appears that prior approval decisions have been based on incomplete and/or incorrect information as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Sydney North Planning Panel recommendation for the Planning Proposal to proceed to Gateway Determination was made on 14 May 2024, before finalisation of the NBVPS on 27 May 2024. This means that the Panel made their recommendation based on incomplete information; ○ Based on the DPHI Gateway Assessment documentation, Gateway approval granted by DPHI appears to be based on an inaccurate understanding that the NBVPS defines 8 storeys as the strategic vision for the site (when the correct parameter is 6 storeys). <p>Given the above, height should be revisited to ensure procedural fairness.</p> • Solar Access: Proposal must ensure that solar access is not compromised for the dwellings on Yeo Street or the future public plaza. DCP requirements should be rigorously enforced. • Traffic: Local congestion is already an issue and becoming increasingly unmanageable. The developer's traffic study (dated Nov 2022) is outdated and does not account for cumulative impacts. A new cumulative traffic assessment should be required. • Affordable Housing: Proposal provides only 5% affordable housing while seeking a 169% height bonus. This is well below the 10% minimum required for a 20% bonus under the Infill Affordable Housing Provisions of the Housing SEPP (2021). This sets a poor precedent. <p>Motion: Unanimously agreed that the Precinct will lodge a submission raising these concerns.</p> <p>Amending DA 154/2025 – 53–55 Yeo Street</p> <p>Original DA 334/22 (approved 8 Nov 2023): 4-storey residential flat building with 11 units and a 2-level basement for 18 cars via Rangers Lane.</p> <p>New Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional 2 storeys with 2 x 4-bedroom units and 3 extra car spaces.
---------------------------	---

- New FSR: 1.76:1; Height: 20.5m, utilising LMR policy. Complies with LMR height and FSR.

Issues Discussed:

- **Setbacks:** Western side setbacks do not comply:
L1–3 should be 4.5m (currently 3m)
L4–6 should be 6m (currently 4.5m)

Also reopens setbacks previously approved by the Land and Environment Court, with a bulkier building and reduced setbacks now proposed.

- **Building Separation:** Inadequate separation between buildings.
- **Heritage Impacts:** Adjacent to a conservation area and numerous heritage listed items. The additional bulk and flat roof design are inconsistent with DCP 13.4 heritage controls (O1 and P1) and DCP 1.4.7.



- **Solar Access:** Additional storeys likely to reduce solar access for the property to the west, Rangers Lane, and in particular the properties to the south.
- **Traffic and Pedestrian Safety on Rangers Lane (one-way narrow lane):** Increased activity from 13 dwellings and 21 car spaces poses safety risks. Developer should be required to fund upgrades to Rangers Lane (e.g. improved signage, install mirrors, restrict vehicle size, road markings to make Rangers Lane a Pedestrian Shared Zone)

Motion: Unanimously agreed that the Precinct will make a submission addressing the above issues.

DA: 174/2025/1: 3 Iredale Avenue, Cremorne Point

An attendee brought to the Precinct's attention that a new DA has recently been lodged. It is understood that this DA involves the construction of a car hardstand and driveway crossover. Meeting attendees were unsure of the definition of a "driveway crossover". Issues were raised regarding potential impacts on Council land. It was suggested that it would be beneficial for council officers to view the site to inform their assessment. Further investigation is required to understand this DA

Action request: NSC to clarify terminology.

Traffic Impact Assessment Methodology

Traffic Impact Assessment Methodology

The community has significant concerns about increasing traffic congestion in Neutral Bay, Cremorne, and surrounding suburbs as a result of cumulative impacts of recent and proposed developments, as well as future developments arising from the recently introduced Low and Mid-Rise policy. Under the current planning

	<p>framework, developers regularly submit traffic impact assessments that ignore the cumulative effect of other approved or proposed developments nearby. This produces inaccurate conclusions and undermines the credibility of the assessment process. The community is rightly concerned that without intervention, our local area will suffer increasingly unmanageable congestion and a significant deterioration in local amenity, including safety issues.</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Unanimously agreed that the Precinct will explore and advocate for changes to local planning rules to mandate cumulative traffic assessments.</p>
STAR Committees	<p>STAR Committees</p> <p>The Community Strategic Plan (endorsed by Council on 23 June 2025) includes the establishment of Strategic Advisory Reference (STAR) Committees. According to Council, their role will be to provide expert input into implementation of the Community Strategic Plan and Delivery Program.</p> <p>These will replace former Streetscape Committees and numerous Reference Groups.</p> <p>Issues Raised</p> <p>At the Council meeting of 23 June 2025, Cr Carr expressed concern about the lack of detail on how members will be selected, how the committees will operate, and how the committees will be funded. Cr Carr proposed that a paper providing this information be presented to Councillors before endorsement.</p> <p>Despite these concerns, Council adopted the Community Strategic Plan including the establishment of the STAR Committees by a 7–3 vote. In favour: Cr Antonini, Mayor Baker, Cr Beregi, Cr Holding, Cr Hoy, Cr Santer, and Cr Welch. Against: Cr Carr, Cr Keen, and Cr Spenceley.</p> <p>Meeting attendees queried, where does Heritage and Streetscape sit within these committees?</p> <p><u>Action Request:</u> That NSC provides clarification.</p>
NSW Heritage Strategy	<p>NSW Heritage Strategy</p> <p>Meeting attendees discussed the NSW Government's Draft NSW Heritage Strategy and noted that submissions are due by 13 July 2025. https://www.haveyoursay.nsw.gov.au/nsw-heritage-strategy</p> <p>Discussion points and observations:</p> <p>Role of local heritage in the broader NSW heritage landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local heritage forms the foundation of the broader NSW heritage landscape. • Local heritage's contribution to identity and belonging, community wellbeing, tourism, environmental sustainability, and the economy should be recognised. • Although statutory responsibility lies with local government, local heritage is of state-level public interest. • The State Government could provide increased support to Councils to assist with heritage protection. <p>The need for more frequent LGA-wide heritage reviews</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern was raised about the lack of regular, comprehensive heritage reviews at the LGA level. • Councils can lack sufficient funding, time, and specialist expertise, and may not prioritise heritage reviews - leading to delays of 20–30 years between reviews. • As a result, significant heritage items may remain unlisted and unprotected despite increasing rarity due to development pressure. • Local LGA wide-heritage reviews should be conducted at least every 10 years. • State Government support (technical and financial) could help councils deliver regular, robust reviews. <p>Supporting owners of heritage listed items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater community education is needed to promote the cultural, environmental, and economic value of heritage. • Streamlined approval processes for minor works that do not affect heritage significance would be beneficial. • Financial incentives (e.g. grants or subsidies) should be provided to assist owners with maintenance and conservation of heritage-listed properties. <p>Heritage protection amidst State Government densification push</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visual and historical significance of heritage items relies heavily on their curtilage and surrounding streetscape. • The NSW Government’s densification push (e.g. through the LMR policy) is likely to undermine heritage settings, even where listed items are excluded. • Local DCP provisions to protect curtilage and adjacent amenity are often discretionary and may be insufficient. • Example: The DA for 53–55 Yeo Street, Cremorne, adjacent to six heritage-listed items, should maintain curtilage and contribute to a cohesive streetscape. • State-level design guidance to protect heritage context would be beneficial. <p>Motion: That the Precinct make a submission and that Precinct members be encouraged to make their own submissions.</p>
Streetscape	No issues reported
Meeting close	The meeting concluded at 8.24 pm.
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be held on Thursday 7 August 2025.