

Design Review Panel

Georges River Council

REPORT OF THE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 6 April 2017 at Georges River Council - Kogarah Office

Panel Members – Mr Brian McDonald, Mr Peter Annand, Ms Caitriona O'Dowd

ITEM 4

Date of Panel Assessment:	6 April 2017
Applicant:	Georges River Council and TPG
Architect:	N/A
Property Address:	37-41 Treacy Street Hurstville
Description:	Planning Proposal to amend HLEP2012
No. of Buildings:	One (1)
No. of Storeys:	Sixteen (16)
No. of Units:	One hundred and eighty (180)
Consent Authority Responsible:	Georges River Council (Hurstville)
Application No.:	PP2015/0006 (SF16/244)
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	None

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	Comments
Context and Neighbouring Character Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is the key natural and built features of an area, their relationship and the character they create when combined. It also includes social, economic, health and environmental conditions. Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of an area's existing or future character. Well designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood. Consideration of local context is important for all sites, including sites in established areas, those undergoing change or identified for change.	The Design Review Panel has previously examined the proposal on this site and an independent urban design consultant has reported on the current concept. The proposal fits comfortably within the evolving pattern of development both in terms of height and FSR, and site configuration. The Panel notes that attention has been given to the extent of the overshadowing of properties on the south side of the railway line and in terms of the overall height and a setback of the top four (4) floors from the rear elevation. The Panel recommends that the proponent investigates constraints that may arise from the proximity of the site to the rail corridor with the Rail authorities to ensure there are no setback requirements contrary to the building footprint and tree planting proposed.
Built Form and Scale Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings. Good design also achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type, articulation and the manipulation of building elements. Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.	Appropriate for the evolving pattern of development.

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	Comments
Density Good design achieves a high level of amenity for residents and each apartment, resulting in a density appropriate to the site and its context. Appropriate densities are consistent with the area's existing or projected population. Appropriate densities can be sustained by existing or proposed infrastructure, public transport, access to jobs, community facilities and the environment.	The proposed FSR of 7.2:1 appears to be consistent with the density of adjoining development in Treacy Street. This is subject to confirmation of shadow impact limits on sites across the railway line.
Sustainability Good design combines positive environmental, social and economic outcomes. Good sustainable design includes use of natural cross ventilation and sunlight for the amenity and liveability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling reducing reliance on technology and operation costs. Other elements include recycling and reuse of materials and waste, use of sustainable materials and deep soil zones for groundwater recharge and vegetation.	To be addressed at DA stage.

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	Comments
Landscape Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in attractive developments with good amenity. A positive image and contextual fit of well designed developments is achieved by contributing to the landscape character of the streetscape and neighbourhood. Good landscape design enhances the development's environmental performance by retaining positive natural features which contribute to the local context, co-ordinating water and soil management, solar access, micro-climate, tree canopy, habitat values and preserving green networks. Good landscape design optimises useability, privacy and opportunities for social interaction, equitable access, respect for neighbours' amenity and provides for practical establishment and long term management.	The proposed deep soil zone landscaping is subject to determining requirements for development adjacent to the rail corridor. The Panel does support planting of trees in this area that achieve a scale that is commensurate with the scale of the building with a high canopy. The Panel supports the two (2) storey communal open spaces at Level 3. These spaces are however possibly vulnerable to overshadowing by future developments on the north side of Treacy Street. To ensure there is some communal open space provided with solar access all year around a component should be considered at roof level. As part of the DA process shadow diagrams showing in depth potential overshadowing of the communal space on Level 3 will be submitted to Council.
Amenity Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive living environments and resident well being. Good amenity combines appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.	To be resolved at DA stage. The Panel recommends the provision of a continuous street awning to Treacy Street.

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	Comments
Safety Good design optimises safety and security within the development and the public domain. It provides for quality public and private spaces that are clearly defined and fit for the intended purpose. Opportunities to maximise passive surveillance of public and communal areas promote safety. A positive relationship between public and private spaces is achieved through clearly defined secure access points and well lit and visible areas that are easily maintained and appropriate to the location and purpose.	To be resolved at DA stage.
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction Good design achieves a mix of apartment sizes, providing housing choice for different demographics, living needs and household budgets. Well designed apartment developments respond to social context by providing housing and facilities to suit the existing and future social mix. Good design involves practical and flexible features, including different types of communal spaces for a broad range of people and providing opportunities for social interaction among residents.	Able to comply with ADG and Council controls. Adaptable dwellings to be included in the development at DA stage.
Aesthetics Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the internal layout and structure. Good design uses a variety of materials, colours and textures. The visual appearance of a well designed apartment development responds to the existing or future local context, particularly desirable elements and repetitions of the streetscape.	To be resolved at DA stage.

RECOMMENDATION

- The Panel supports the application subject to the changes described above. The Panel looks forward to seeing the proposal at the DA stage.



Hurstville
City Council



St George Design Review Panel

Hurstville City Council | Kogarah City Council | Rockdale City Council

REPORT OF THE ST GEORGE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 7 April 2016 at Hurstville City Council

Panel Members – Ms Deena Ridenour, Prof Peter Webber, Ms Libby Gallagher

ITEM 4

Date of Panel Assessment:	7 April 2016
Applicant:	Hurstville City Council
Architect:	N/A
Property Address:	37-41 Treacy St Hurstville
Description:	Planning proposal
No. of Buildings:	N/A
No. of Storeys:	N/A
No. of Units:	N/A
Consent Authority Responsible:	Hurstville City Council
Application No.:	SF16/244
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	None

Introduction

The subject site is in the ownership of Council and under the current LEP controls height is limited to 15m and FSR to 3.0:1. The adjoining site to the east has recently been approved for a redevelopment at a density and height considerably in excess of these controls. The site is currently used for public car parking containing ninety (90) spaces. Council seeks to have the site re-zoned to a higher density while still providing for the same number of public parking spaces on site. The planning proposal is under independent assessment in accordance with Council's policy.

The planning proposal is to amend the HLEP2012 to re-zone the site to:

- Re-zone the site to B4 Mixed Use
- Amend the FSR to achieve a maximum of 7:1
- Amend the height of the buildings map to permit a height of 53m.
- Amend the Active Street Frontages map to require activation of the street frontage on Treacy Street.

Comments

Whilst it is apparent that some increase in height and density would be appropriate on the site, no information has been provided as to whether the increased height and density could be achieved while still satisfying urban design quality and amenity impacts. The applicant's consultants advised that some background work had been prepared in relation to these issues but no information was available at the meeting. The Panel is extremely concerned that the planning proposal could go to the next stage and potentially be misleading in relation to the density that could be achieved. The following information would be essential for the proposal to be assessed:

- Broader precinct and appropriate built form given the change from the planned future context to the emerging future context. The documents illustrate a tall slab building with party walls to the two (2) adjoining sites, although the consultant advised that this was not indicative of the form proposed. Consideration of the broader context should demonstrate what would be an appropriate outcome.
- Relationship to the approved development to the east and the potential development to the west.
- Demonstration that the desired FSR and height can be achieved on the site and comply with ADG recommendations.
- The site is tapering in depth. It may not be able to accommodate a similar yield or building typology to that approved on the adjoining site. This could have a significant impact on the floor space capacity of the site within the height proposed.
- It is very important for any development on this site to provide an appropriate landscape interface to the rail corridor, which will be viewed by many thousands of travelers every day. Setbacks, deep soil provision and appropriate landscape interface to the rail corridor should be included within the site and FSR testing. This should capture and satisfy any Rail Authority requirements.
- Additional mid-winter overshadowing of residential areas on the opposite side of the railway line is indicated in the consultant's report. It is highly questionable whether this is acceptable. Cumulative impacts across the urban block should be considered including the development potential on the adjacent site to the west.
- Response to topography and the sites location at the high point on the ridge. Any development on the subject site will be more prominent within the town centre and surrounding context than the approval to the east. The proposal should indicate if

there are any localised flooding and drainage issues that may impact on built form/heights

- The indicative material presented suggests a continuous wall of tall buildings, although this was stated not to be the intended building form. It would certainly be unacceptable in relation to its visual impact, particularly from the residential areas to the south. The proposal notes that it is in keeping with the height strategy on the Dickson Rothchild study. This study includes taller building separated by space not a wall of development. Separated buildings would have less visual and overshadowing impact than a wall. The proposal needs to test a variety of potential forms.
- Demonstration that a high quality public domain and streetscape interface can be achieved within proposed setbacks, with satisfactory resolution of deep soil, basement, parking provision (which is directly related to FSR and density proposals).

A separate but related issue is the future of the *adjoining sites to the west*. It would be illogical and inequitable for these not to be included in the present Planning Proposal. If they are not included it would seem inevitable that the same laborious process of re-zoning will need to be repeated. It is apparent that a more efficient and potentially better urban design outcome would result if they are part of the current proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

- Built form options are needed that demonstrate a response to all of these issues prior to going to Gateway in order to not only determine the appropriate urban outcome for the site but to give Council certainty to what should actually be achieved on the site in relation to height and density.
- The site constraints and opportunities are apparent, and it would be relatively simple for an experienced urban designer to explore and recommend appropriate potential building forms which would also satisfy ADG requirements.
- Include the adjoining sites to the west in the present Planning Proposal.