1-3 Lord Street, Botany Urban Design Review

Planning Proposal - September 2018







SITE SHOWN IN RED

Aerial Photo

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018





BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review

September 2018



FSR Map

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018

-

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers



1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers





Site Plan

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers 1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018





Access and Activation



1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018





Revised Envelope Setbacks – Ground Floor

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd

architects | project managers





Revised Envelope Setbacks – Upper Floors



BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers





Proposed Envelopes

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018



PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AREAS

Floor	Height	Use	Area
Basement 1	(3m)	Car parking	N/A
Ground	4.0m	Commercial/Warehouse Lobby Retail/Cafe	522sqm 100sqm 99sqm
Level 1	3.6m	Commercial	1350sqm
Level 2	3.6m	Commercial	1250sqm
Level 3	3.6m	Commercial	1150sqm
Roof	1.7m	Plant/Overrun	
Total	16.5m		4471sqm

3.6M FLOOR-TO-FLOOR



KEY DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

Site Area	2555sqm
Existing FSR (LEP)	1:1
Proposed FSR	1.75:1
Proposed GFA - Ground Floor Commercial/Warehouse - Ground Floor Commercial Lobby - Ground Floor Café/Retail/Ancillary - Level 1 Commercial - Level 2 Commercial - Level 3 Commercial	4471sqm 522sqm 100sqm 99sqm 1350sqm 1250sqm 1150sqm
Existing Height Limit (DCP)	10m
Proposed Height Limit	16.5m
Zone B7 Business Park	No change proposed.
Parking Requirement- Ground Floor Commercial1:40- Ground Floor Café/Retail1:28- Upper Floor Commercial1:55	85 Spaces 13 4 68
Proposed Basement 1 Parking	74 spaces
Proposed Ground Level Parking	18 spaces
Proposed Total Parking	92 Spaces

Note: Refer to Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment for information on parking requirements

Development Schedule





Siting:

This site offers a unique opportunity to address the corner of Lord St and Botany Rd, and as a backdrop to St Matthews Church and the Church Grounds, this site also serves as a visual cue as an entry or gateway to the Botany village area.

Urban Context:

The corner is initially met with a view of St Matthew's Church, which was constructed in 1862 and is adorned with manicured lawn space and large palm trees. The church is now also flanked by a newly built multipurpose centre and provides a historic and important landmark for Botany, but renders the site somewhat closed off and is relatively inactive for a prominent corner site.

Activation:

The proposed development seeks to activate along its western edge, providing an outdoor space that will bring with it lighting, access, pedestrian amenity, and enhanced visibility and security. This also creates the opportunity to connect with the church grounds whilst maintaining security to the site.

Urban Design:

A building on this site will firstly provide a contemporary urban backdrop to the historical church site, and become a defacto street corner, with the church and church grounds in the foreground.

The building's mass will be somewhat linear, providing comfortable setbacks along the long edges of the site and will seek to minimise the overshadowing profile for the neighbouring residential property.

Views and Amenity:

Key views from the site sweep from west to north-east, capturing aspects across the district and the airport, and further across to the CBD.

Whilst privacy will be maintained on the southern side, district views will be prominent to the east and west sides.

Development Opportunities

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers



Concentrate mass to Lord Street:

- Maintain a street address and presence along Lord Street
- Articulate built form to address adjoining functions, including the active street edge.
- Minimise visual, overshadowing, and privacy impacts on the residential development at rear.
- Introduce a commercial aesthetic to the edge of the B7 zone, addressing a convergence of uses.

Reinstate the corner of Botany Road and Lord Street:

- The enormous setbacks of the church do not adequately define the street corner.
- The corner of Lord St and Botany Road are prominent in that they identify the entry to the Botany Village area.
- Create a backdrop to the church, and a bookend to Lord Street and the Business Park precinct.

Address historical church site:

- Create new pedestrian access zone along the western boundary of the site, adjoining the church.
- Activate new pedestrian access zone to reinvigorate the corner and the Church grounds
- Provide community amenity (such as commuter bicycle parking) with direct access from the newly created pedestrian access zone.
- Provide commercial entry and address off new pedestrian access zone.



Design Principles

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers



BuiltConsult Pty Ltd

architects | project managers

- Overall mass is broken into 3 main elements: | northern element | infill glazing element | southern element |
- The entry element interrupts the infill glazing element to provide a prominent address and identity, and identify pedestrian activation.
- The articulation of mass closest to the neighbouring residential property is stepped to provide appropriate solar access.



Indicative Western Façade Composition



Indicative View from Botany Road

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018





EXISTING 1000

Shadow Analysis – June 21, 0900-1000

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review September 2018

Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.





EXISTING 1200

PROPOSED 1200

Shadow Analysis – June 21, 1100-1200



Note: Proposed building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.





Note: Proposed building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Shadow Analysis – June 21, 1300-1400









EXISTING 1500

PROPOSED 1500

Note: Proposed building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.



Shadow Analysis – June 21, 1500







Comments:

- Revised envelope to address overshadowing of neighbouring residential properties.
- Stepped envelope adopted.
- Envelope depicts the area in which a 1.75:1 FSR will be achieved.
- DCP required and architectural façade and building articulations are not demonstrable.
- Fenestrations and external features may protrude in some areas.

Revised Envelope





Comments:

- Existing building
- Proposed Envelope (upper floors)

- Proposed Envelope (ground floor)
- Proposed Envelope (plant/rooftop)

Revised Envelope and Existing Building Envelope





Comments:



- Proposed Envelope (upper floors)
- Proposed Envelope (ground floor)
- Proposed Envelope (plant/rooftop)
- The indicative building mass shown is capable of achieving an FSR of 1.75:1.

Note: Some elements such as entries or colonnade spaces (non-GFA spaces) may protrude through the envelope to provide amenity through building articulation. Whilst shown here as solid masses, these elements may be transparent, permeable, and/or trafficable.

Revised Envelope and Revised Indicative Building Envelope







Revised Envelope Setbacks – Ground Floor

1-3 Lord St Botany – Envelope and Shadow Commentary

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers

16 August 2018





Revised Envelope Setbacks – Upper Floors

1-3 Lord St Botany – Envelope and Shadow Commentary

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers

16 August 2018



Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 0900





Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 0900





Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 1000





Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 1000





Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 1100





Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 1100





Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 1200





Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 1200





Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 1300





Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 1300





Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 1400




Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 1400

1-3 Lord St Botany – Envelope and Shadow Commentary 16 August 2018





Existing Building Envelope – June 21, 1500

1-3 Lord St Botany – Envelope and Shadow Commentary 16 August 2018





Note: Building design, architecture, and articulation shown indicatively only.

Revised Indicative Building Envelope – June 21, 1500

1-3 Lord St Botany – Envelope and Shadow Commentary 16 August 2018





City Plan Strategy & Development P/L ABN 58 133 501 774

8 November 2018

Our Ref: P18-161

Jeremy Dwyer Mecone Level 12, 179 Elizabeth St Sydney NSW 2000 jdwyer@mecone.com.au

Dear Jeremy,

RE: REPONSE TO IDENTIFIED URBAN DESIGN AND HERITAGE ISSUES RELATING TO PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR 1-3 LORD STREET BOTANY

This correspondence is in response to recent comments and recommendations received from Bayside Council (Council) on 31 October 2018 and 1 November 2018 in relation to identified urban design and heritage issues associated with the Planning Proposal (PP) for 1-3 Lord Street, Botany.

Further to Council's review and assessment of the PP, Council has requested the following refinements and additional information relating to the PP:

1. Additional eye levels perspectives

Council has requested additional perspectives to illustrate the intended future development of the site in a manner, which demonstrate an appropriate level of impact with relation to the neighboring the St Mathew's Anglican Church (heritage Item I71) as viewed from Botany Road. These have been prepared and are provided as Attachment A.

2. Amendments to the draft site-specific Development Control Plan

Various minor amendments to the draft site-specific Development Control Plan, which seek to strengthen various aspects of the future development of the of the site including matters relating to activation, articulation and finish. These amendments have been undertaken and are provided as Attachment B.

3. Increase the setback to the western boundary of the subject site adjacent to the church by 3m.

Recommendations by Council's urban designer and heritage consultant seek to increase the proposed setback to the western boundary of the subject site by an additional 3 metres to provide a minimum separation of 9 metres between the church and a future built form on the subject site. It is understood that this is recommendation seeks to minimise perceived impacts in relation to the curtilage of the adjacent heritage item. Previous heritage advice provided to City Plan by Council's heritage consultant in August 2018 also advises that a non-traditional building envelope represented by the indicative overhang may lead to an unsympathetic building form.

At this strategic stage of the planning process the PP and supporting urban design concept is not intended to represent an actual detailed built form outcome. It is intended to provide a framework via which a range of built form outcomes could potentially be achieved. The built form concepts supporting the PP seek to



demonstrate the impact of proposed building massing in a configuration that would be achievable through application of the proposed height and FSR controls. Taking into account the floor space needs of commercial/industrial land uses that are proposed to be occupied within the building, the PP will not preclude the development of a building where the upper level overhang is supported by columns to create a colonnade rather than a cantilever. This would provide a more traditional 'cloistered' relationship between a future built form on the site and to the adjacent church grounds.

Removing the colonnade and increasing the upper levels setbacks will result in a loss of amenity as it will remove any relief from weather and sun. Further, there would be negligible gains in terms of overshadowing or privacy. More importantly, the views through the laneway are not perceivably enhanced by the additional setback.

The PP, supported by a site specific DCP, seeks to facilitate a new development that will be oriented and designed to provide an appropriate visual relationship with and high-quality backdrop to the church. The building setbacks have been carefully arranged to facilitate a more congruent visual connection between the two buildings. The proposed setback to the western boundary of the subject site is consistent with the existing building on the site. However, a built form developed in accordance with the PP and proposed site specific DCP will result in a substantial improvement to the current situation in terms of built form quality and interrelationship between development on the subject site and the adjacent church and church grounds.

The PP seeks to achieve the following specific outcomes in relation to the church and is curtilage. These outcomes are consistent with the objectives and controls as set out in section 3B.3.2 Curtilage under the Botany Bay Development Control Plan 2013.

- To protect and enhance the key viewpoint to the church from Botany Road.
- To facilitate the visual prominence of the church from the Botany Road frontage through form and materials.
- To improve the visual quality of the backdrop the church and the relationship between the built form on the site and the lawn area surrounding the church building.

The proposed site specific DCP will facilitate high quality development on the site that maintains the prominence of the church. The DCP will ensure that a future built form appropriately responds to its contextual setting to ensure that, at detailed design at the DA stage, matters including the articulation of building frontage in relation to the church grounds.

Eye level perspective images provided in Attachment A provide a comparison between the proposed setback and the recommended 9m building to building separation. As can be seen from these images:

- increasing the setback to the church boundary by 3 metres will not be visually discernable from the key vantage point at the corner of Botany Road and Lord Street;
- increasing the setback by an additional 3m would not result in any discernable improvement in the visual relationship between the two buildings;
- the view to the church is largely disrupted by trees and a large sign, however it is recognised that these trees are deciduous and the view towards the church is less obstructed in winter months;
- notwithstanding the impact of vegetation on the view towards the church, the church spire would be read above the building on the subject site in either circumstance; and
- with appropriate consideration for building materiality as provided for within the draft site-specific DCP, the diagrams at Attachment A demonstrate that the visual prominence of the church will be maintained, and indeed improved.



We highlight the following technical matters associated with accommodating a future built form of the intended nature and orientation on the subject site:

- The western façade is intended to be the primary point of entry and address for pedestrian movements and an additional setback to the upper floors will leave the ground level with minimal cover from an overhang or colonnade. The result is a net loss of amenity for pedestrians traversing the activated western edge.
- As demonstrated on the 'Revised Envelope Setbacks Upper Floors' page of the Urban Design Review: the current 6m minimum building to building separation relates to the nave of the church, which extends closest to the subject site, but only has a width of approximately 6m, constituting approximately one third of the Church building's eastern facade. The rear of the nave is not visible from Botany Road and is not significantly visible from Lord Street.
- The church transept constitutes a greater proportion of the Church building's eastern façade (approximately two thirds), and has an aggregate width of approximately 9m. The north-western side of the transept is visible from Botany Rd and is already set back a further 2.9m (approximately) from the boundary to the subject site, which equates to approximately 9 metres of separation distance between a future built form on the site and the majority of the church building.

Figure 1 is a photographic image extracted from Google maps and demonstrates that the nave is not visible from the majority of the Lord Street frontage. This is further supported by Figure 2.



Figure 1 Visibility of nave from Lord Street



Figure 2 illustrates that the church nave is only visible from approximately a third of the church's frontage with Lord Street. As such the proximity of the nave is not considered to be a significant visual factor in relation to establishing an appropriate relationship between the two adjacent buildings between these sites.



Figure 2 Angle of visibility towards the church nave (note that the aerial photo predates the development of additional building adjacent to the southern boundary of the church site)

A setback greater than that proposed will result in a significant reduction in Floor Space Ratio of approximately 0.2:1. Considering that the PP seeks to facilitate a development form that includes basement car parking, this will significantly erode the feasibility of a future development form on the site, and will undermine the entire intent of the PP. The discernable urban design and heritage benefits of the recommended 9 metres separation distance are negligible in comparison to the significant impacts that increased setbacks would have on feasibility and clear floor space to accommodate commercial/industrial uses.

We note that the church is set back significantly from the street within its lot boundary. This should not disadvantage the development potential of adjacent land parcels. This is especially the case in a B7 Business Park zone, which is generally characterised by larger format buildings. The setback proposed to the western boundary of the subject site exceed the side setback requirements set out in Table 1 of Section 6.3.5 Setbacks under the of the BBDCP 2013. In circumstances where Council believes there are possible



streetscape issues where, a minimum side set back of 3m is required and this PP makes allowance for a minimum 4m setback to the boundary. In addition, other recent additions to the curtilage of the church (i.e. the community building) demonstrate the suitability of buildings being within the immediate setting of the church.

Due to the reasons outlined above, the Applicant requests that Council proceed with the PP based on the setback currently proposed.

Yours Sincerely,

H. Deegan.

Helen Deegan Director | PLANNING



City Plan Strategy & Development P/L ABN 58 133 501 774

Attachment B: Additional Eye Level Perspectives and Setback Comparisons









9m SETBACK ENVELOPE

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers View from Corner of Botany Rd and Lord St

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review

05 November 2018



BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers

View of proposed new pedestrian access laneway - Aerial

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review 05 November 2018







View of proposed new pedestrian access laneway – Street level

1-3 Lord St Botany – Urban Design Review ^{05 November 2018}

PROPOSED ENVELOPE

9m SETBACK ENVELOPE

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION





STREET VIEW FROM CORNER OF LORD ST AND BOTANY RD

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION





COMPARATIVE IMAGE

PROPOSED ENVELOPE

9m SETBACK ENVELOPE

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

BuiltConsult Pty Ltd architects | project managers