

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING

Meeting Report and Recommendations

Meeting Date: 25 July 2018

Location: Council Chambers, City of Canada Bay Council

Panel members	Conrad Johnston (Chairperson)
	Tony Caro
	Peter McGregor
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Judy Clark (Planning Consultant assisting Council) Paul Dewar
Guests	N/A
Declaration of interest	Nil

Business Item and Meeting Report

Item number	1
Planning Proposal	PP2018/0002
Property address	1-9 Marquet Street and 4 Mary Street, Rhodes
Proposal	Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of a mixed use development comprising a 36 storey tower including a 3 storey podium to deliver 340 units and 343 square metres of public open space on the corner of Marquet and Mary Streets.
Applicant or applicant's representative in attendance to address to the Design Review Panel	Koichi Takada (Architect) Andrew Chung (Architect) Alan Zhang (Architect) David Furlong (Town Planner) I Prosperity Representatives (Owner) Belinda, Charles, and Lynne
Background	The site was inspected by the Panel on 25 July 2018

Background

The Panel was provided with the documentation and plans lodged to support the Planning Proposal including a report by Plan Urban that outlined the background planning history, and that was further elaborated on by the applicant's town planner at the meeting. The Panel was also briefed by Council staff about the planning history of the site which the Panel understands is quite extensive and complex, including the modelling of several different building design options.

Notwithstanding this background and history, the Panel is an independent group whose role is to provide design advice to Council which is unfettered by other Council applicant negotiations and processes.

The Panel notes the architect's comments at the meeting that certain detailed design issues are not fully resolved as this is a Planning Proposal (not a DA) and are still "a work in progress".

The Panel also acknowledges the fact this is a Planning Proposal, and in this context it is not within the scope of this report to provide detailed comments about internal unit planning, as would be the case if this were a DA.

Key Issues and Recommendations

Whilst the Panel understands that the applicant has put forward a Planning Proposal to achieve a significantly higher height and FSR than would be available through the current LEP planning controls or by applying the more generous controls in the Rhodes Station Precinct Master Plan, the urban design and residential/public amenity impacts associated with the height, massing and setbacks are significant. In the Panel's opinion, this suggests that the building envelope envisaged by the Planning Proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site.

More specifically, the Panel notes the following concerns and issues with the Planning Proposal:

1. Overshadowing

1.1 Adjacent and Nearby Residential Properties

Overshadowing of existing residential buildings to the south and cumulative impacts of the shadows cast by the proposed building together with existing and approved buildings have not been adequately documented. The current shadow diagrams (in plan) are incomplete and inadequate. Any argument that the proposal does not further reduce mid-winter sun between 12noon and 2pm needs to be clearly demonstrated if that is the argument being put forward.

The Panel recommends that parametric solar (sun-eye) viewpoint analysis drawings showing solar access to facades of all affected buildings and open space (Union Square and Peg Paterson Park) at 15 minute intervals between 9am and 3pm mid-winter and equinox are prepared so that Council is able to make a proper assessment.

These drawings should also include a comparison of the planning proposal's solar impact compared with the masterplan envelope. It is the opinion of the Panel that proposed new building forms should not increase solar impacts on the surrounding residential properties as compared to the masterplan envelopes, and that as a minimum ADG solar access is maintained to affected nearby properties.

1.2 Union Square

The Panel considers that additional overshadowing of Union Square is an unacceptable outcome in circumstances where the scale, mass and siting of the proposed building are significantly non-compliant with the planning controls within the Rhodes Station Precinct Masterplan and Rhodes West DCP. The argument that a heliostat is a suitable substitute/offset for natural light and sunlight is questionable. The cumulative impacts of allowing this type of device to proliferate on multiple sites in the precinct is not demonstrated. A more compliant building form could be manipulated and sculpted to achieve a better

outcome in terms of preserving reasonable sunlight access to this important central public domain element in an increasingly dense precinct.

2. New Public Open Space Proposal

2.1 Undercroft

The inclusion of a south facing area of 343 square metres on the corner of Mary and Marquet Streets would provide low amenity as a public space due to its undercroft location, lack of sun (south facing) and unresolved integration with the podium of the building. The Panel considers that this proposed open space is an unacceptable offset for loss of sun to Union Square on urban design grounds, and that it is extremely unlikely to be successful as a community space.

3. Building Separation and Setbacks

3.1 Separation

The Panel notes that the residential tower does not comply with ADG boundary setbacks (8 metres in lieu of 12 metres) or building separation (18 metres in lieu of 24 metres). Further, the argument put forward to reduce the ADG minimum setbacks because the objectives of the setback are met by inclusion of north facing plant rooms and privacy devices is unconvincing.

The Panel further notes that the ADG sets standards for building separation based on the capacity to achieve meaningful landscaping and access to natural light between buildings, as well as visual privacy. In addition to this it is noted that the guideline metrics are *minimum* recommendations, and in the broader Rhodes environment there is precedent and hence an arguable case for tower separation distances that exceed these minimums.

The Panel is of the opinion that the reduced northern setback of the tower also contributes to further overshadowing of Union Square when compared to a master plan compliant setback. It is therefore recommended that the northern setback be considered in relation to its additional solar impacts to Union Square, to ensure that acceptable sunlight access (particularly between March and October) is achieved in this significant public space.

3.2 Street Setback

With this scale of development, the Panel considers the minimum setback of 1 metre to Mary Street is insufficient, (especially for a building of this unforeseen height, without a podium) and that 3 metres requirement under the Masterplan should be provided as a minimum.

4. Building Height and Design

4.1 Architectural Expression

The Panel notes that the tower design is based on a symmetrical lozenge plan-form and queries whether this is the best response to views, over-shadowing and building siting constraints.

Due to the extensive inclusion of wintergardens rather than balconies the building expression appears more commercial than residential in character. The extensive use of glass will result in a high solar load for the building's long east and west facades.

4.2 Height

The provision within the Rhodes Station Precinct Master Plan for the highest buildings along the ridge adjacent to Walker Street/Rhodes Railway Station stepping down towards the foreshore to the west is already underway and has merit as an appropriate response to topography in this dense urban environment. The height differential between the proposal and the building to the east is 10 metres, which is an insufficient differentiation to be read as a meaningful gradation in the height of urban form at this scale of development.

4.3 Wind

The Wind Study refers to impacts that need to be addressed and these matters need careful consideration in the final design as they will impact on the design and form of the already compromised public spaces below.

5. Other Matters

The Panel notes that expert reports accompanying the Planning Proposal indicate that additional development over and above original modelling for the Rhodes Station Precinct will contribute to a developing problem of road and rail capacity.