

JACKSON TEECE

2017073 D02 001 MR

Date: 04/08/2020

Randwick City Council
30 Frances Street, Randwick NSW 2031

23 BELMORE ROAD, RANDWICK NSW 2021

THE STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

REF: Development Application No: **DA/331/2019**

Determination date: 11/06/2020

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please see below responses to previous council comments, and the reasons for determination. We believe that all the points raised by council have been addressed with the latest design amendments. This letter should be read in conjunction with the revised DA set.

Council – 14 points noted on council RFI – Relevant History - 11/06/20:

1. Extent of building height not accurate based on survey drawing.
 - Height plane checked against survey and is correct as shown on section DA-400
2. Minimal floor to ceiling heights.
 - Floor to ceiling heights overall have been revised to a minimum of 2700mm floor to ceiling for habitable areas in rooms. Room 3.22 achieves 2700mm over kitchen with a raked ceiling reducing to approx. 2500mm at glazing to balcony.
3. Inadequate written request to vary the building height standard.
 - Planner had previously addressed the height standard amendment request – now not necessary as the amended design complies with the height limit.

Jackson Teece
Architecture

Ground Floor Lot 1 Pier 8-9, 23 Hickson Road
Walsh Bay New South Wales 2000 Australia
Telephone +61 2 9290 2722
Facsimile +61 2 9290 1150
Email sydney@jacksonteece.com
www.jacksonteece.com

Jackson Teece Chesterman Willis Pty Ltd trading as Jackson Teece
ABN 15 083 837 290
Nominated Architects: Damian Barker (8192), John Gow (6790), Daniel Hudson (8315)

JACKSON TEECE

4. Incorrect GFA calculation that excludes part of the development resulting in a variation to the FSR standard and no written request to vary the standard submitted.
 - GFA calculations have been updated according to the amended design (reduced GFA due to deletion of the top level facing Belmore Road). The resulting FSR is now within the maximum allowable for the site.
5. The bulk and scale is not in accordance with the established character of the area.
 - Bulk and scale have been amended (deletion of the top level facing Belmore Road) and are in keeping with area character.
6. The bulk and scale and complex massing will negatively impact upon and dominate the qualities of the contributory buildings and the heritage conservation area.
 - Complex massing revised to be simpler and more sympathetic with Belmore Rd heritage street character. Bell Lane remains as per previous design.
7. Drawings unclear, including existing and proposed shadows, and elevations provided in isometric view.
 - Drawing made clearer – elevations are correct as they are drawn orthogonally to the street boundary (not isometric), with markers correctly shown on plans.
8. The west-facing, first floor communal room does not receive compliant solar access. It was noted that the second floor does receive more solar access and therefore a reconfiguration was requested.
 - Reconfiguration with new large terrace on L03. L01 communal room has been retained as per heritage advice.
9. Inefficient building layout, with the central staircase receiving solar access, but not the rooms.
 - The building layout is based around a central light void with landscaping, maximising solar access for courtyard rooms, given the narrow infill site configuration. Stairs have been simplified and made more efficient.
10. Non-compliant size of communal open space resulting in poor residential amenity.
 - Large communal open space added on L03 – for improved amenity and solar access.
11. Inappropriate building materials that are not sympathetic to the heritage conservation area.
 - Building materials have been amended / simplified to the Belmore Rd heritage portion. The simpler materials and building form allows more emphasis to the heritage elements along Belmore Road. Bell Lane remains unchanged.
12. Non-compliant car parking.
 - Parking now includes 2 motorbike spaces in line with council advice.
13. Environmental health concerns with non-compliant layout of restaurant.
 - Ground floor tenancy layout removed – subject to a separate DA
14. Environmental health concerns with western rooms that will not achieve acoustic compliance with windows open, and lack of details in the submitted acoustic report regarding the existing operation of the ground floor restaurant and required plant and machinery.
 - Rooms achieve 10.39m separation L01; 9.275m separation L02; Open on L03. Acoustic report to address ground floor tenancy (future separate DA) and plant room.

JACKSON TEECE

Council Refusal Reasons (11/06/20):

1. A written request to vary Clause 4.4 floor space ratio pursuant to the RLEP was not submitted and therefore consent cannot be granted.
 - FSR request not required. FSR is under the maximum allowed for the site.
2. The variation to Clause 4.3 height of buildings pursuant to the RLEP is not supported given the applicant's written request has not adequately demonstrated those matters that are required to be demonstrated in accordance with Clause 4.6 (3) and the variation is not within the public interest in accordance with Clause 4.6 (4).
 - Variation for height limit LEP 4.3 is now not applicable – 12m height plane is correct and shown on section DA-400. Building remains under height plane.
3. The variation to Clause 30 (1) (h) pursuant to the ARH SEPP is not supported because the variation is not within the public interest in accordance with Clause 4.6 (4) pursuant to the RLEP.
 - 2 motorbike spaces included as per council advice, plus adequate bicycle spaces. This is consistent with council advice, and does not contravene RLEP Clause 4.6 (4)
4. The development is not in accordance with Clause 30A character of the local area pursuant to the ARH SEPP.
 - Amendments have been made to address and emphasise the character of the local area – particularly Belmore Rd. These amendments should adequately address this Clause. Height, form and materials simplified and reduced to minimise visual impact, and emphasise local area heritage elements.
5. The development does not comply with the ARH SEPP and RDCP in relation to minimum area of communal open space, solar access to communal living room and orientation of boarding rooms, resulting in poor residential amenity.
 - Retention of heritage room as communal room retains heritage elements, rather than converting to a boarding room – this includes accepting the solar access to the room and balcony. Communal open space dramatically increased to L03. Orientation of boarding rooms is resolved as much as possible given the site width and orientation. Maximum solar amenity provided by the open void to the landscaping below and improved by deleting the top level – resident amenity will be maximised.
6. The development is not in accordance with Clause 5.10 heritage conservation pursuant to the RLEP given it will adversely impact the heritage qualities of the contributory buildings and the Randwick Junction Heritage Conservation Area.
 - As noted, further amendments have been made to make the building form smaller, simpler and more orthogonal on the important Belmore Rd heritage character, which will further reduce visibility to the street scape. Heritage elements will be enhanced rather than compromised with this development.

Yours faithfully Mark Rostron.



Jackson Teece