

Appendix 1

Urban Design Report

Prepared by DEM – architects/urban designers

EAST QUARTER STAGE 3 93 Forest Road Hurstville

URBAN DESIGN REPORT



Project no. 4282-04

DEM (Aust) Pty Ltd Level 8 15 Help Street Chatswood NSW 2067 T: (02) 8966 6000 F: (02) 8966 6111





ISSUE REGISTER

Date	Reason for Issue	Prepared by	Checked by	Signed
19.09.14	Final Report	JH	JP	M.

Any reports, drawings, advice or information included or referenced that is prepared and/or provided by any other party, including the Client/Principal, is the sole representation of the party who prepared the report, drawings, advice or information and does not constitute a representation by DEM (Aust) Pty Limited. DEM expressly takes no responsibility for any documents, advice or other material prepared by any other party.



CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	. 1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Eastern Bookend Precinct – Hurstville City Centre	1
2.0	Previous DA (Nov2013) Design Issues	. 2
2.1	Design Review Panel Comments	2
3.0	Revised Urban Design Approach	. 3
3.1	Street Hierarchy – Revised Design Approach	4
3.2	Pedestrian Access- Revised Design Approach	5
3.3	Street Activation – Revised Design Approach	6
4.0	Revised Building Design Approach	. 7
4.1	Design Evolution	7
4.2	Building F – New Design Approach	8
4.3	Building X – New Design Approach	9

4.4	Shadow Diagrams – New Design Approach					
5.0	New Landscape Design Approach					
5.1	Public Open Space					
5.2	Communal / Public Open Space – Lower Ground Floo					
5.3	Communal / Public Open Space - Upper Ground Floc					
5.4	Communal Open Space – Roof Terraces					
6.0	Conclusion					
Appendix A						
1.1						



10
11
14

1.0 Introduction

DEM (Aust) Pty Ltd has been engaged by East Quarter Hurstville Pty Ltd (EQH) to undertake a detailed Urban Design analysis and thorough examination of the site and the previously submitted DA design (November 2013) to determine the site's capacity to accommodate additional height and density.

Our review has determined the following key site attributes which lend the site and its location to a different Urban Design approach to the site's development.

The East Quarter Site has been nominated in Hurstville Council's Draft DCP No.2 as an important "Bookend" site which forms an important part of the eastern gateway to the Hurstville Town Centre.

The site fronts the western side of Kempt Field one of Hurstville's major public open space areas and is positioned within short walking distance of two major rail stations

This urban design report has been prepared to support the Planning Proposal for the site requesting a variation to the planning controls for the East Quarter Hurstville development.

The report evaluates the site in relation to the public realm, building massing and scale, pedestrian and vehicular connectivity and adjoining recreational open space.

1.1 Background

- The Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney 2031 identifies the Hurstville City Centre as a "Major Centre".
- As the East Quarter site is located within one kilometre of the Hurstville City Centre, it is included within Hurstville Major Centre.
- East Quarter is located within the Eastern Bookend Precinct as defined by Draft DCP No. 2 - Hurstville City Centre.
- East Quarter is located within approximately 600m of Hurstville Railway Station (which equates approximately to an eight minute walk) and 250 -300m of Allawah Railway Station (which equates approximately to a three minute walk).
- 1.2 Eastern Bookend Precinct Hurstville City Centre
 - The Eastern Bookend Precinct will provide a sense of entry and the eastern gateway to the city.
 - The precinct provides the opportunity to achieve high density residential development within a short walking distance of Allawah Railway Station.
 - This mixed use gateway precinct incorporates Forest Road which provides a regional traffic corridor linking the Hurstville City Centre to the southern side of the rail line via Durham and Lily Streets.
 - The East Quarter site is adjacent to Kempt Field Park which is a major recreation open space destination for the Hurstville City Centre.
 - The precinct is designated to accomodate a higher intensity of built form.
 - East Quarter provides the opportunity to introduce landmark architecture to create points of interest along the axis of Forest Road.





LEGEND



HURSTVILLE CITY CENTRE BOUNDARY

EASTERN BOOKEND PRECINCT



EAST QUARTER

2.0 Previous DA (Nov2013) Design Issues

2.1 Design Review Panel Comments

A number of issues were raised by the St George Design Review Panel on 30 January 2014 in relation to DA2013/0385 submitted for East Quarter Stage 3. The issues were incorporated in the DA report prepared by Hurstville City Council's Senior Development Assessment Officer which recommended refusal of the DA.

Comments and issues raised by the Design Review Panel (DRP) included the following:

1. Context

- Substantial areas of on-grade carparking detracted from the quality of the public domain.
- Visual impact and overshadowing impact to residential areas to the south of the railway line are critical considerations.
- Building F did not satisfactorily respond to its context.

2. Scale

- The scale of Building F was unacceptable.

3. Built Form

- The addition of 6 levels to Building F was not acceptable _ due to potential negative impacts including:
 - Compromising the landmark presence of Building E on the axis of Forest Road.
 - Additional overshadowing of the park, public domain _ and residential development on the south side of Railway Parade.
 - Potential increase in wind and impact on the amenity of public spaces.
 - Increased demand for parking onsite reducing the potential for deep soil planting.
 - Strong adverse visual impact particularly when seen _ from the south.
 - Increasing scale and appearance of built form as seen from Kempt Field.

4. Density

- The DRP noted the proposed increase of density over the entire site from the current approved site density of 2.88:1 to 3.19:1 (noting that the current LEP density is 2.5:1)

5. Resource, Energy and Water Efficiency

- Consideration should be given to inclusion of major ESD initiatives.
- 6. Landscape
- The streetscape and ground level offer little open space amenity.
- A significant level change occurs adjacent to Kempt Field.
- There is no provision of deep soil.
- 7. Amenity
- Retail configuration requires resolution.
- Communal rooftop spaces should work effectively.
- Carparking to the north of Building F creates an inactive street edge.
- Proposed south facing communal open spaces at level 18 of Building F are in shade.
- Balconies of Building F to be more equitable in size.
- 8. Safety and Security
- Lobbies of Building F, at the at the back of the building, are potentially insecure.
- 9. Aesthetics
- Façade treatments of Building F do not alleviate the aesthetic impacts of such a large, bulky building.
- Public domain appears treated as residual space.







3.0 Revised Urban Design Approach



FIGURE 4-1: REVISED URBAN DESIGN APPROACH



As part of our Urban Design analysis and site investigations undertaken DEM has reviewed the issues raised by Council in relation to the previous DA design (November 2013). Our review has identified that a revised design approach could be adopted for the site which would largely address Council's concerns and which would lead to a higher quality and more vibrant urban outcome.

The key aspects of the revised design approach that we have identified are as follows:

 The revised design incorporates major pedestrian east/west linkages along Durham Street and Jack Brabham Drive. These new linkages provide safe and well activated pedestrian routes from both the Hurstville Town Centre and from within the site to Kemp Field and Allawah Railway Station for the public, local commuters and residents.

An active street plaza space is located along Durham Street adjacent to Building X.

The previously proposed service road link road is now deleted and replaced with an additional open space area as an extension of the central plaza constructed in Stage 2. This creates the a major pedestrian link between Durham Street and Jack Brabham Drive.

Communal / public open space is provided through a combination of roof top terraces and a new centrally located landscape podium area created between Buildings F and X.

Refer to Appendix A for a more detailed description of design improvements suggested as part of the revised Urban Design approach for the site.

LEGEND



PRIMARY PUBLIC PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

MAIN VEHICULAR CIRCULATION

GREENSPACE / GREENSPACE LINK

RETAIL FRONTAGE

RESIDENTIAL LOBBY

3.1 Street Hierarchy – Revised Design Approach





 Forest Road and Durham Streets incorporate wide footpaths to allow for high volumes of pedestrian movement.

Landscaped open spaces fronting these key roads provide an enhanced streetscape as well as seating / milling / transition spaces for adjoining retail including a supermarket.

Jack Brabham Drive functions as a Second Order Street extention to Treacy Street. The Drive, in association with PJ Road and Hill Street, which are nominated as Third Order Streets in Draft DCP No. 2, funnel pedestrian movement to and from Forest Drive and to Kempt Field.

LEGEND

Street hierarchy in accordance with Draft DCP No. 2 Hurstville City Centre



FIRST ORDER STREET

SECOND ORDER STREET





Revised / proposed street hierarchy FIRST ORDER STREET

SECOND ORDER STREET

3.2 Pedestrian Access– Revised Design Approach





- The proposed scheme provides a pedestrian link in a north-south direction across the site between Forest Road and Jack Brabham Drive.
- The pedestrian link is through landscaped public open space activated by retail.
- All on-grade carparking and roadways are separate to the open space and pedestrian link.
- A secondary north-south pedestrian link is created long the internal link road interfacing with the Kempt Field frontage of the site which is enhanced via the introduction of active retail and residential uses fronting this linkage.
- Jack Brabham Drive, via Hill Street, provides an extention to the cycle path network shown in Draft DCP No.2. and a potential connection to Kempt Field and Allawah Railway Station.
- The pedestrian linkage along Jack Brabham Drive is enhanced via the introduction of active retail and residential uses fronting this linkage.Road gradienets have been structured to allow for this pedestrian linkage to extent into Kempt Field and potentailly onto to the nearby Allawah Rail Station.

Pedestrian access in accordance with Draft DCP No. 2 Hurstville City Centre



YCLE PATHS



Proposed pedestrian access CYCLE PATHS

NEW PEDESTRIAN LINK

NEW PEDESTRIAN LINK

3.3 Street Activation – Revised Design Approach



FIGURE 4-3-1: REVISED DESIGN APPROACH - STREET ACTIVATION



Small and large scale retail facilities provide activated frontages along Forest Road and Durham Street as well as the central public open space within the development.

Jack Brabham Drive is activated by retail as well as residential lobbies.

- The central pedestrain plaza area is extended to link into Jack Brabham Drive and activated by additional retail spaces.

The western side of the internal link road adjacent to the Kemp Field is to be activated with retail and residential uses.

LEGEND



BUILD TO BOUNDARY 70% MIN. (active frontage, predominantly retail, commercial)

BUILD TO BOUNDARY 30%-70% MAX. (active lobbies, foyers)

RETAIL ACTIVATED FRONTAGE

Street activation in accordance with Draft DCP No. 2 Hurstville City Centre



SECONDARY RETAIL ACTIVATED FRONTAGE

Proposed street activation

BUILD TO BOUNDARY 30%-70% MAX. (active lobbies, foyers)



RETAIL (specialty)

RETAIL (supermarket

6

4.0 Revised Building Design Approach

4.1 Design Evolution



FIGURE 4-1-1: PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DA DESIGN: VIEW FROM SOUTH



FIGURE 4-1-3: PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DA DESIGN: VIEW FROM NORTH-EAST



FIGURE 4-1-5: PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DA DESIGN: AERIAL VIEW OF BUILDING X AND F





FIGURE 4-1-2: NEW DESIGN APPROACH: VIEW FROM SOUTH



FIGURE 4-1-4: NEW DESIGN APPROACH: VIEW FROM NORTH-EAST



FIGURE 4-1-6: NEW DESIGN APPROACH: AERIAL VIEW OF BUILDING X AND F



As part of our detailed Urban Design analysis of the site the following potential design enhancements have been identifed for the proposed built form. Council's primary concerns with the previously submitted DA design (November 2013) focused on the bulk and scale of Building F and the lack of useable open landscape space within the site. Building X design was considered largely satisfactory.

Accordingly, we have identified the following key improvements that could be made to the previous design to address most of Council's concerns:

 The large scale of the original building form can be reduced by introducing a break within the building massing to create the appearance of two separated smaller scale buildings.

The building mass can be lowered and stepped away from the existing adjacent Building E which is the high point of the development to provide a more sympathetic relationship between the two buildings and create a more interesting skyline.

Introduction of terraced roof gardens would soften the building's massing and provide further useable open space and amenity for residents.

Improved entry definition on southern (street address) and northern (plaza address) frontages of Building F would improve building legibility and activation.

Creation of a central landscaped plaza between Building F and X would screen off undesirable service functions, eliminate pedestrian / vehicular conflicts and provide significant additional public / communal open space amenity.

Creation of clear and legible activated pedestrian linkages through and around the site and the potential for pedestrian linkages to extend into Kempt Field and to the nearby Allawah Railway Station would significantly increase and enhance pedestrian activation through the site and around the surrounding precinct.

4.2 Building F – New Design Approach



FIGURE 4-2-1: AERIAL VIEW FROM SOUTH



FIGURE 4-2-2: AERIAL VIEW OF NORTH ELEVATION







FIGURE 4-2-4: VIEW OF BUILDING F FROM SOUTH-EAST



- Building F can be substantially re-designed to address Council's concerns and SEPP compliance.

 The overall building mass can be split and broken into smaller scaled elements to step down and increase separation from Building E on the western portion of upper floors to significantly reduce the overall visual dominance of the proposed built form and to provide a far greater level of modulation, articulation and interest to the proposed skyline.

The Building F design can be revised to significantly improve the building entries of Building F by articulating building entries more clearly in the building's external design and massing and by providing substantially more street level retail activation around the main residential lobbies along the southern side of the ground floor of Building F fronting Jack Brabham Drive. This significantly enhances street activation and passive surveillance opportunities around these lobbies.

Refer to Appendix A for a more detailed description of design improvements suggested as part of the revised Urban Design approach for the site.

4.3 Building X – New Design Approach



FIGURE 4-1-1: AERIAL VIEW FROM NORTH-EAST



FIGURE 4-1-2: VIEW OF BUILDINGS X AND F FROM NORTH-EAST



FIGURE 4-1-3: EAST ELEVATIONS OF BUILDINGS X AND F



FIGURE 4-1-4: AERIAL VIEW OF BUILDING X AND F



- Building X remains similar as per former DA's which was generally supported by Council. Only minor additional plant space has been added within the roof void space to facilitate building services.

Building depths for Buildings X and F can be designed to facilitate natural ventilation, natural daylight and solar access into apartments and common lobby spaces.

_

Refer to Appendix A for a more detailed description of design improvements suggested as part of the revised Urban Design approach for the site.

4.4 Shadow Diagrams – New Design Approach









JUNE 21 – 11AM

JUNE 21 – 9AM



JUNE 21 – 12PM



JUNE 21 – 1PM



JUNE 21 – 2PM



- The western end of building F can be been lowered to reduce overshadowing impacts to residential properties on the southern side of the railway line.
- Building separation in the form of an elevated roof terrace can be introduced between the east wing and west wing of Buidling F from Level 11 up which would further reduce overshading impacts to those properties located on the southern side of the railway.
- There is no overshadowing of Kempt Field.
- Refer to Steve King report for detailed shadow analysis.



JUNE 21 – 3PM

5.0 New Landscape Design Approach

5.1 Public Open Space



We have identifed the following enhancements that could be made to the previous DA landscape design (November 2103):

- The revised landscape design approach can provide significantly more landscaped open space and landscape treatments increasing public and private realm amenity.
- An active street plaza space is located along Durham Street adjacent to Building X. The plaza incorporates raised planters with tree, shrub and groundcover planting and provides areas for seating, milling and gathering.
- The plaza also provides a forecourt to adjoining buildings, accommodating a valety of pedestrian movement, and enhances the streetscape.





- The retail edge and wide pedestrian plaza space contribute to the provision of an activated pedestrian linkage from Hurstville Town Centre to Kemp Field and Allawah Railway Station.

Street level retail is provided around the main residential lobbies along the southern side Building F fronting Jack Brabham Drive. This significantly enhances street activation and passive surveillance opportunities around the lobbies which addresses Council's concerns.

The open space is to be defined and unified by a consistent use of materials, finishes and design approach.

5.2 Communal / Public Open Space – Lower Ground Floor









DEM (Aust) Pty Ltd



- Open space provides a forecourt to Building X residential entry.
- Planted terraces and stairs form a transition between the lower ground level and podium open spaces.
- The terraces provide visual interest through the use of defined structural forms and accent planting.
- Seating is incorporated on planter walls and as sculptural elements within the open space.
- The deletion of the previously proposed service road link road between Buildings X and F creates the opportunity for significant additional open space area as an extension of the central plaza constructed in Stage 2.

5.3 Communal / Public Open Space – Upper Ground Floor









DEM (Aust) Pty Ltd

EAST QUARTER STAGE 3 - URBAN DESIGN REPORT



- The revised proposal incorporates significantly more podium landscape treatments than the former design providing increased open space amenity for residents.
- A significant new open space zone is provided between. Buildings X and F.
- The landscape podium provides the opportunity to house all on grade car parking spaces and loading docks within a screened off undercroft area which eleminates the potential for noise nusiance and removes pedestrian / service vehicle conflicts.
- Paving treatments, seating and planters are arranged in a geometric pattern to provide spatial definition and a unique identity.
- Planters incorporate tree, shrub and groundcover planting.
- The upgraded landscpe design approach provides enhanced open space and visual amenity for both residents and the public.

5.4 Communal Open Space – Roof Terraces





- The separation and stepping down of the Building F form allows for the introduction of terraced roof gardens which soften the building's massing and provide further useable
- Communal open spaces are provided through number of roof top terraces, as well as the central podium area.
- All communal open space areas are directly accessible
- Raised planters provide screening, visual interest and assist in delineation of seating and outdoor eating areas.

6.0 Conclusion

The detailed Urban Design analysis and through examination of the site carried out as part of this report clearly indicates the site's capacity to accommodate the additional height and density suggested.

This report outlines the following design improvements possible for the final implementation of Stage 3 of the East Quarter Hurstville development:

- an improved public realm;
- safer and more legible pedestrian and vehicular connectivity both around and within the site;
- the potential to facilitate future desirable pedestrian linkages and activity into Kempt Field and to the nearby Allawah Railway Station;
- an increase of approximately 2110 m² of usesble open space providing improved amenity for residents and the public;
- reduced building bulk and massing that minimises visual and overshadowing impact to the surrounding neighbourhood; and
- the creation of residential apartments which are compliant with the provisons of the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code.

In addition, the proposal meets the objectives of the Eastern Bookend Precinct, as described in Draft DCP No.2, and positively contributes to the Hurstville City Centre.

It is believed that in light of the findings of our Urban Design analysis and thorough site investigations that there is justification for amendment of the LEP planning controls in relation to height and FSR to enable delivery of this project.



Appendix A

Plans, Built Form Analysis and SEPP No. 65 Preliminary Schedule of Compliance







New Master Plan Lower Ground Floor

scale 11-08-14 1:500

drwg no. arsk0202 proj no

rev no.

-07

4282-04

planning, urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, interior design level 8 15 help street chatswood nsw 2067 t: (02) 8966 6000 f: (02) 8966 6111 e: sydney@dem.com.au





ation of the party who prepared the report drawings, adv does not constitute a representation by **dem** (aust) pty) pty limited expressly takes no responsibility for any or other material prepared by any other party. C copyright of dem (aust) pty limited abn 92 085 486 844. plotted: 13/08/2014 plotted by: etang

New Master Plan Typical Residential Floor

date scale 11-08-14 1:500 arsk0204

4282-04 -03

planning, urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, interior design level 8 15 help street chatswood nsw 2067 t: (02) 8966 6000 f: (02) 8966 6111 e: sydney@dem.com.au

Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

dem





Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development **Preliminary Schedule of Compliance**

Date: 18th Sept 2014 Revision: A

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb Building F = 18.2m - 19.95m Building X = Yes. No Maximum 18m (glass line to **Proposed building depths remain similar or better** than those proposed in the previous design as follows: 14.5m - 23.5m considered Building glass line). Wider buildings Typical Floors: Building F = 16 - 20m / Building X = 10.5 - 23m acceptable Depth must demonstrate how given that Upper Floors: Building F = 11 - 20m / Building X = 8.5 - 18m daylight and satisfactory daylight and The building footprints deliberately vary in depth either side of the 18m standard. Building depths have been natural designed to facilitate natural ventilation, natural daylight and solar acess into apartments and common lobby natural ventilation are ventilation spaces. (Refer Steve King Report for a more detailed description of specific compliance matters) achieved are satisfactory For Building up to 4 Between F & E = 17.8m at all levels Acceptable Building Separation has generally been improved as follows: Yes storevs/12m: -12m between Building Between F & X = 24.6 - 36.8m Between X habitable rms/balconies: -& A = 12.335m - 12.635m (levels 1. 2. 3 Building separation between Building F and Building E is increased to 18.5m from Levels 1 to 15 & Separation 9.0m between and 5), 16.635m (level 6) 43.5m (level 7) increased 21.5m from levels 16 and 17 & increased to 30m on Level 18 habitable/balconies and non-Internal Building X = 14m (levels 1, 2, 3 & habitable rms; -6.0m 5), 36m (level 6) Although the . Building separation between Building F and Building X remains the same at 24.6 – 36.8m. between non-habitable development does not strictly meet the rooms. 5 to 8 storeys/25m: building separation requirements Building separation between Building X and Building A remains the same at 12.5 – 36.0m 18m between habitable specified in the code, windows and rooms/balconies to habitable balconies between the buildings have rms/balconies -13m between been offset to minimise amenity impacts. habitable rooms/balconies to Sufficient solar access and privacy is still non-habitable rms -9m maintained. The separation is therefore between non habitable rms acceptable. to non habitable rooms 9 storeys and above -24m between habitable rms/balconies to habitable rms/balconies -18m between habitable rooms/balconies to non-habitable rms -12m between non habitable rms to non habitable rms

Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb The proposed street setbacks are The Kempt Field internal Street setbacks have been improved as follows: Yes Use different setback Yes consistent with the envisaged character Street Building F Kempt Field Street setbacks increased by 0.5-2.0m to 11.5 - 19.0m. controls to differentiate for the edge of the Hurstville Town setbacks Building X Kempt Field Street setbacks increased by 0.0-16.5m to 13.5 - 35.0m. between urban and Centre. Other **Building F street setbacks remain the same** as the previous design proposal. suburban character areas. 5m -9m range is typical in Building X street setbacks have been marginally reduced as the ground floor footprint has been enlarged marginally to accommodate and provide flexibility for larger retail operators and anchor tenants which create suburban areas the opportunity for greater retail activation along the streetscape. Durham street setback has been marginally reduced by 1.5-2.2m but still provides a substantial active street plaza space with a 7.8-15.0m width for the entire frontage of Building X. The revised street edge configuration provides ample space for substantial street tree planting and north facing public seating/ dining/landscape area opportunities. The better activated retail edge and wide pedestrian plaza space provide an ideal opportunity for a safe and well activated major pedestrian linkage from the Hurstville Town Centre to Kempt Field and the nearby Allawah Railway Station. Accordingly the proposed street setbacks are still consistent with the envisaged character for the edge of the Hurstville Town Centre. The site setbacks are representative of Relate side setbacks to Yes Both building's side and rear setbacks remain similar to previous design proposal Yes the character envisaged for the location Side / rear existing streetscape patterns setbacks

Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance



 dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report

DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design				New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses		
Rule of Thumb	Standard	Former DA Proposal Council Comments	Complies	New Concept Proposal	Complies	
Floor Space Ratio (FSR)	To ensure that the developments is in keeping with the optimum capacity of the site and the local area. FSR is not specified in the Design Code	The proposed development significantly exceeds the maximum floor space ratio of 2.5:1 for the site. While it is noted that the development approved to date already exceeds the FSR control with a total FSR of 2.77:1, the current proposal for Stage 3 pushes the overall FSR up to 3.19:1. Further, the FSR for Stage 3 alone increases from 2.24:1 to 3.24:1. This departure from the control is excessive, and results in a development of such bulk and scale that it is inconsistent with the edge of the town centre location.	No	The East Quarter Site has been nominated in Council's Draft DCP No.2 as an important "Bookend" site which forms an important part of the Eastern Gateway to the Hurstville Town Centre. The site fronts the western side of Kempt Field one of Hurstville's major public open space areas and is positioned within short walking distance of two major rail stations. As such this site is ideally positioned to accommodate increased density. Building X proposes a similar Floor Space to the former DA s which was generally supported by Council. Only minor additional plant space has been added within the new service / parking undercroft & roof void space to facilitate building servicing. Building F Floor Space has been decreased by 3390m² as a result of a substantial re-design to address Council's concerns. The overall building mass has been split and reduced to step down and increase separation from Building E on the west to significantly reduce the overall visual dominance of the proposed built form & to provide a far greater level of modulation, articulation and interest to the proposed skyline. The western end of Building F has been lowered in scale to reduce overshadowing impacts to residential properties on the southern side of the railway. Na result of the proposed Building F re-design those properties to the south of the railway line which were previously affected now maintained a minimum of 3 hours solar access onto their living area and private open spaces during the winter period. The urban form analysis has produced two buildings with excellent design and good building performance. The resultant FSR is likely to be as follow, From the previous DA submission the overall FSR for the development has been reduced from 3.19:1 to 3.10:1 . From the previous DA submission the FSR for Stage 3 of the development has been reduced from 3.11:1 to 2.92:1 . A separate planning proposal will be submitted to seek amendments on FSR in line with the objectives stated in Council's Urban Design Report for further detailed Urba	Yes - Detailed Urban Design Analysis demonstrates that the suggested Floor Space sought leads to building of a high standard which perform well and that the site is capable of accommodati ng additional FSR.	

Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

1

 dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report

DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design				New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses		
Rule of Thumb	Standard	Former DA Proposal Council Comments	Complies	New Concept Proposal	Complies	
Deep Soil Zones	A minimum of 25% of the open space area of a site should be a deep soil zone	No significant deep soil zones are provided across the site. As per the comments of the Design Review Panel above this is not acceptable.	No	 The revised design proposal proposes a similar level of deep soil provision to the previous DA approvals on the site. The revised proposal does however provide significantly more useable landscaped podium area (Approx. 1720 m²) which provides a superior level of public and private realm amenity for the residential, retail and public open space components of the development. Strict compliance with this rule of thumb is considered unnecessary as the landscape and open space amenity provided in the overall development is of a high quality and worthy of support. The following factors support this merit based proposition: the site's Hurstville Town Centre location within a high density mixed use zone ; the fact that the Hurstville Town Centre DCP does not require a minimum deep soil planting provision; the fact that the rule of thumb states that exceptions can be made in urban areas where sites are built out; the site's close proximity to Kempt Field which is one of Hurstville's major open space parklands; the fact the current design exceeds the rule of thumb provisions for landscape and communal open space provision resulting in a high quality landscape and open space development outcome. 	N/A – Given the Site's urban Town Centre location, strict compliance with deep soil provisions in SEPP 65 is no warranted.	
Fences and walls	Clearly delineate the public and private domain	Section 5.12 of the Urban Design Report prepared by Annand Associates Urban Design, dated 15 November 2013 indicates fences and walls are proposed along the boundaries of the site adjoining the railway line to the south and Kempt Field to the north. Fences and walls are also proposed within the vicinity of Building X. No elevations or detail has been provided to determine the treatment of such structures particularly as they relate to the public domain.	No	The revised design significantly improves the development's interface with Kempt Field by lowering the south-eastern corner of the development and by creating two major pedestrian grade connections to the park at the north-eastern and south-eastern corners of the site. This reduces the need for a 4.0m grade separated pedestrian connection at the centre of the site and a continuous retaining wall along the majority of the Kempt Field frontage. The revised design also creates the opportunity for major pedestrian east/west linkages along Durham Street and Jack Brabham Drive. These new linkages provide convenient, safe and well activated pedestrian routes from both the Hurstville Town Centre and from within the site to Kempt Field and the nearby Allawah Railway Station for the public, local commuters and residents. Details of fences and walls will be provided in the new DA submission but there is no evidence to suggest that full compliance with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design.	Yes – details to be provided with revised DA	

Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development **Preliminary Schedule of Compliance**

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies New Concept Proposal Complies Comments Thumb See comments by Design Review Panel The revised proposal provides significantly more public / private open space and landscape treatments No Landscape design should Yes (Approx. 2110m² more) which provides a superior level of public and private realm amenity for the above. Landscape optimise useability, privacy, residential, retail and public open space components of the development. Design social opportunity, equitable Refer to DEM's Urban Design Report for detail on new landscape concept design and additional open space access and respect areas provided. neighbour's amenity Building F – 255sqm of communal open 37.9 % of Communal Open Space is provided across the entire development by the revised design proposal No Yes Communal open space space is located on Level 18 of the which exceeds the rule of thumb and Council's Draft LEP/DCP requirement. Open should be generally 25% of building. This area of communal open Communal Open Space for residential apartments has been increased to a total of 3410m² for Building F Space the site area space is south facing and generally not and 2090m² for Building X. These spaces are provided via a combination of roof top terraces and as part of supported by the Design Review Panel as the new centrally located landscape podium area created in between Buildings F and X. All communal open discussed above. Building X – podium space areas for these building will be directly accessible for common lift / stair lobbies and meet minimum level communal open space is provided. solar acess requirements. Min private open space for as are two roof top terraces with access apartment at ground The revised design proposal provides at total 2110 m² more public / private open space and landscape off level 6. Ground level communal space treatments which provides a superior level of public and private realm amenity for the residential, retail and level/podium is 25sqm. Min - extensive areas of communal open public open space components of the development. space are provided at ground level preferred dimension in one including landscaped areas in front A new significantly expanded communal open space zone is introduced via a new podium level in between direction is 4 metres Building X adjacent to the street frontage Building X which expands the previously proposed 'Wedge Park' by 910m² and transforms it into a far more and also in front of Building F. Whilst usable and attractive public and private open space area. these areas are provided across the site. The previously proposed service road link road is now deleted and replaced with an additional 1200m² of they offer limited functionality for open space area as an extension of the central plaza constructed in Stage 2. This also creates the opportunity recreational use. for a major pedestrian only major cross site linkage from Durham Street to Jack Brabham Drive. Building F -where the units at first floor As identified in the DEM's Urban Design report the revised design also creates the opportunity for major level have access to the podium, balconies pedestrian east/west linkages along Durham Street and Jack Brabham Drive. These new linkages provide of 86sgm and 158sgm are provided.

convenient, safe and well activated pedestrian routes from both the Hurstville Town Centre and from within the site to Kempt Field and the nearby Allawah Railway Station for the public, local commuters and residents. podium in Building X has been dedicated In addition the revised design creates the opportunity to extend the Jack Brabham Drive pedestrian/cyclist Yes access into Kempt Field park and to Allawah Railway Station. allocated to each individual unit. Each unit

> The overall communal open space provided across the entire East Quarter Development is over and above the minimum requirements.

Refer to DEM's Urban Design Report for further info.

in this instance is considered an acceptable design outcome

Building X – the open space above the

as communal open space rather than

at this level will still achieve private open

space more akin to a balcony in size. The

use of the area as a communal open space



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

Jara

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb Satisfactory The orientation of both Building F and X remains generally unchanged Position and orientate Yes Yes Orientation buildings to maximise solar access Insufficient information provided. See The revised proposal provides significantly more public / private open space and landscape treatments No Yes Design for optimum discussion by the Design Review Panel (Approx. 2110m² more) which provides a superior level of public and private realm amenity for the Planting conditions for plant growth above residential, retail and public open space components of the development. on Details of podium landscape treatments will be provided in the new DA submission but there is no evidence structures to suggest that full compliance with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design. Refer to DEM's Urban Design Report for new landscape design concept. Details will be provided in the new DA submission. Satisfactorv The stormwater management design or both Building F and X remains unchanged and will be provided in the Reduce the volume impact of Yes Yes new DA submission but there is no evidence to suggest that full compliance with Council's codes and Storm water stormwater on infrastructure objectives cannot be met in the revised design. Management by retaining it on site See comments provided by the Design Building X remains the same and considered to be satisfactory. No Undertake a formal crime Yes Review Panel above. The location of the Safety The revised design significantly improves the safety of Building F entries by providing substantially more prevention assessment of lobbies and pedestrian entrances at the street level retail activation around the main residential lobbies along the southern side of ground floor of the development rear of building F are of particular concern Building F fronting Jack Brabham drive. This significantly enhances street activation and passive surveillance in relation to safety and security as they opportunities around these lobbies which addresses Council's concerns. are concealed from the primary In addition as identified in the DEM's Urban Design report the revised design also creates the opportunity for pedestrian areas of the site. Building X is a major through site link from Durham Street to Jack Brabham Drive as well as major secondary pedestrian satisfactory. A formal crime prevention east/west linkage along Jack Brabham Drive. This new linkage provides convenient, safe and well activated assessment has not been provided with pedestrian routes from both the Hurstville Town Centre and from within the site to Kemp Field and the the development application. However an nearby Allawah Railway Station for the public, local commuters and residents hence significantly activating assessment is undertaken later in this the Jack Brabham Drive streetscape. report under Hurstville Development Control Plan No.2. Further to this the revised design creates the opportunity to extend the Jack Brabham Drive pedestrian/cyclist access into Kempt Field park and to Allawah Railway Station. Visual Satisfactory The visual privacy aspects of the design for both Building F and X remains unchanged Yes Provide reasonable levels of Yes Privacy visual privacy



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

1.....

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report

DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb Building The entrances to Building F are located on Building X remains the same and considered to be satisfactory. No Create entrance which Yes the south side of the building opposite the Entry The revised design significantly improves the building entries of Building F by articulating building entries provides a desirable Illawarra railway line. They are particularly more clearly in the building's external design and massing and by providing substantially more street level residential identity for poor from a pedestrian perspective in that retail activation around the main residential lobbies along the southern side of ground floor of Building F they do not visually connect to the development fronting Jack Brabham drive. This significantly enhances street activation and passive surveillance primary pedestrian areas within the site. opportunities around these lobbies which addresses Council's concerns. It is considered that at the very least, the In addition as identified in the DEM's Urban Design report the revised design also creates the opportunity for pedestrian entrances to Building F should a major through site link from Durham Street to Jack Brabham Drive as well as major secondary pedestrian be located on the northern side of the east/west linkage along Jack Brabham Drive. This new linkage provides convenient, safe and well activated façade adjacent to the wedge park and at pedestrian routes from both the Hurstville Town Centre and from within the site to Kempt Field and the grade parking area. Building X is well nearby Allawah Railway Station for the public, local commuters and residents hence significantly activating designed with defined entrances on all the Jack Brabham Drive streetscape. frontages Further to this the revised design creates the opportunity to extend the Jack Brabham Drive pedestrian/cyclist access into Kempt Field park and to Allawah Railway Station. The revised design improves both the street level and basement level parking configuration which results in Provide adequate car parking The at grade car parking dominates the No Yes a significant increase to the provision of unencumbered landscape open space for the development. for the building and integrate site and limits opportunities for the Parking parking with the design of provision of landscaping. See comments The new landscape podium between buildings F & X provides the opportunity to house all on grade car the building by the Design Review Panel above in parking spaces and loading docks within a screened off undercroft area. This frees up more area for open relation to the design of the car parking spaces and landscaping which can be used by the residents and the public. areas. The northern facade treatment at Refer to DEM's Urban Design Report for new and improved pedestrian and vehicle movement approaches. the ground floor level of Building F which Refer Traffic Report for detailed traffic planning analysis. results from the above ground enclosed parking area is unsatisfactory. The facade treatment fails to activate the frontage of the building and has a poor relationship with the adjoining pedestrian areas.



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development **Preliminary Schedule of Compliance**

Date: 18th Sept 2014 Revision: A

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report

DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design				New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses	
Rule of Thumb	Standard	Former DA Proposal Council Comments	Complies	New Concept Proposal	Complies
Pedestrian Access	Promote residential flat development that is well connected to street and contributes to accessibility. Barrier free access to at least 20% of units	Building F is poorly connected to the street from a pedestrian perspective. While it is noted that Jack Brabham Drive will run along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the building entrances, pedestrian entry into the site is more likely to occur from Forest Road or Durham Street. In this regard, the building entrances are not readily identified from the public domain. Building X is satisfactory. 100% of apartments have barrier free access via a lift to all floors.	No	 Building X remains the same and considered to be satisfactory. The revised design significantly improves the building entries of Building F by articulating building entries more clearly in the building's external design and massing and by providing substantially more street level retail activation around the main residential lobbies along the southern side of ground floor of Building F fronting Jack Brabham drive which is an activated public roadway. This significantly enhances street activation and passive surveillance opportunities around these lobbies which addresses Council's concerns. In addition as identified in the DEM's Urban Design report the revised design also creates the opportunity for a major through site link from Durham Street to Jack Brabham Drive as well as major secondary pedestrian east/west linkage along Jack Brabham Drive. This new linkage provides convenient, safe and well activated pedestrian routes from both the Hurstville Town Centre and from within the site to Kempt Field and the nearby Allawah Railway Station for the public, local commuters and residents hence significantly activating the Jack Brabham Drive streetscape. Further to this the revised design creates the opportunity to extend the Jack Brabham Drive pedestrian/cyclist access into Kempt Field park and to Allawah Railway Station which makes the entry locations off the southern frontage more logical. 	Yes
Vehicle Access	Limit width of driveways to 6 metres. Integrate adequate car parking and servicing access without compromising character	Generally satisfactory.	Yes	The vehicle access design for both Building F and X has been improved. Refer Traffic Report for detailed traffic planning analysis.	Yes
Apartment Layout	Maximum depth from window of single aspect apartment 8.0m -The back of a kitchen should be no more than 8 metres from a window. Width of cross-over apartments more than 15m deep should be a minimum of 4m	Building F Single aspect unit depth -8m to 10m Kitchens – 10m or less Crossover units - >4m wide Building X Single aspect unit depth maximum 9m but generally 8m and considered acceptable. Kitchens – maximum 8m Crossover units - > 4m wide	Yes	Building X remains the same and is considered to be satisfactory. The revised design provides an improved appartment configuration for building F. There are more corner and cross ventilated units introduced from Level 11 up on Building F, which further enhances and improves residential amenity and apartment choice.	Yes

P:\4282-04-EQHLEP\03Authorities\03-02Councils\SEPP65-PreliminaryScheduleOfCompliance-ForPPSubmission.doc



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

-1---

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb To provide a diversity of Satisfactory Yes The apartment mix remains similar for both building F and Building X. Yes apartment types, which cater Apartment for different household Mix requirements now and in the future Primary balconies to be a Building F – a number of units within No Building X remains the same and is considered to be satisfactory. Yes minimum of 2 metres in Building F have primary balconies with a Balconies depth partial width of 1.6m. This significantly Balconies in Building F have been redesigned completely to comply with minimum standards and now all limits the functionality of the private open provide min 2m in depth and 8 sqm in size. space and is not considered satisfactory. Building X – satisfactory Residential buildings/floors -Building F Ground floor retail – 4m All No, but The Ceiling Heights for both Building F and X remains unchanged. Acceptable minimum 3.3m for ground residential floors -2.7m Building X Ground Ceiling acceptable and first floor -minimum floor retail - 4m All residential floors -Heights 2.7m for habitable rooms for 2.7m Both buildings technically do not all other residential floors comply with the requirements of the minimum 2.25m for non RFDC as the floor to ceiling height of the habitable rooms first floor level is only 2.7m rather than 3.3m due to its residential use. Even so this is considered acceptable Satisfactorv Building X remains the same and is considered to be satisfactory. Provide apartment layouts Yes Yes Flexibility which can accommodate the The revised design provides an improved appartment configuration for building F. There are more corner changing use of rooms and cross ventilated units introduced from Level 11 up on Building F, which further enhances and improves residential amenity and apartment choice and which provide a much more flexible apartment arrangement. N/A high rise development N/A Optimise the number of The revised design creates a large upper ground landscaped podium area which provides the opportunity for Yes Ground ground floor apartments ground level units which enhance pedestrian level activation and surveillance. Each upper ground unit will Floor with separate entries. Ensure have its own direct access to landscape private and public podium level areas. apartments ground floor apartments have access to private open space



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

1

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb Building F - max 9 units proposed from No Maximum 8 units to be The internal circulation arrangement for both Building F and X remains similar. Yes - meets one corridor Building X -max 10 units Internal accessible from a double the amenity proposed from one corridor In the revised design internal lobbies / corridors in both buildings are not fully enclosed and are provided Circulation loaded corridor intent of the with large breakout/ glazed areas which effectively split the lobbies into two areas and allow infiltration of rule of thumb natural light and ventilation into common lobby and corridor areas. In addition many common lobbies / corridors provide direct acess to roof top landscaped communal terraces which provides an excellent level of activation, surveillance and security of these spaces. In the case of Building X lobbies are configured so that a maximum of 10 units is services either side of a fully glazed and open lobby breakout area which provides a superior level of internal and external amenity for residents. In the case of Building F lobbies are configured so that all common corridors have access to natural light and ventilation at one end of the space thus avoiding the need for artificial lighting and ventilation to these areas which provides a superior level of internal amenity for residents. Insufficient information provided to Storage provision will be provided in the new DA submission but there is no evidence to suggest that full To provide adequate storage No Yes – details adequately determine compliance. The compliance with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design. Storage for every day household to be provide submitted Schedule of Compliance for items within easy access of with the new Building F indicates that 75% of units contain internal storage facilities to meet the apartment 1br = 6m³ 2br DA the RFDC requirements. All units are $= 8m^3 3br = 10m^3$ required to provide sufficient storage in accordance with the RFDC. No variations in this regard will be supported Generally acceptable. Protect acoustic privacy of Yes The acoustic privacy treatments for both Building F and X remains similar and there is no evidence to suggest Yes Acoustic residents in apartments and that full compliance with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design. Privacy in private open spaces



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance



dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb The Solar Access and Natural Ventilation Yes Min 70% of units receive min Building X remains the same and is considered to be satisfactory. Yes report prepared by Steve King and dated Daylight 3 hours of solar access For 15 November 2013 provides the Building F Solar access to has been marginally reduced due to the introduction of the building slot from dense urban environments following: Building F 63% receive more level 11 upwards but this has resulted in a significantly better overall external building massing, improved No – but than 3 hours sunlight 10.6% receive more 2m may be acceptable overshadowing impact to properties on the south side of the railway line and a greater level of x-ventilated than 2 hours sunlight Total - 73.6%. acceptable units is now achieved. Building X 54.2% receive more than 3 given the hours sunlight 20.4% receive more than 2 72.0% of units receive more than 2-3 hours sunlight orientation of hours sunlight Total – 74.6% the site and Max 10% units southerly The revised design reduces the amount of south facing units by 16 to an overall total of 44 units (16.9%). Building F - 21% (60 units) are south No the quality of facing Building X – 17% (20 units) are Given the predominantly north-south orientation of the site and the fact that southerly oriented apartments aspect south facing views / actually have some of best outlook and views from the site strict compliance with this rule of thumb is not outlook to warranted and the level of compliance provided in this case is justifiable on merit grounds. the south. Refer Steven King report for detailed compliance. The Solar Access and Natural Ventilation Yes Building X remains the same and is considered to be satisfactory. Yes 60% of residential units report prepared by Steve King and dated 15 Natural should be naturally cross November 2013 provides the following: The revised design significantly improves the provision of x-ventilated units by creating an additional 12 Ventilation Building F 33.5% (95 units) are cross ventilated. -25% of kitchens dual aspect apartments above level 10. Building F provides 63.2% (165 units) which are considered to receive ventilated 28.5% (81 units) above level 10 should have access to natural which are considered to receive adequate adequate ventilation and met the RFDC performance objectives. (refer Steven King Report for detailed ventilation ventilation Total – 62% Building X 71.2% (84 compliance summary) units) are cross ventilated Total - 62% Yes – refer Building F – 10% (30 units) Building X – 8% Building F - Naturally ventilated kitchens - Complies: (10 units) Steven King 25% (65 units) of kitchens are naturally ventilated. Note: The Statement of Compliance provided report for for Building X indicates that 25% of kitchens No Building X – Naturally ventilated kitchens – Complies: detailed are naturally ventilated as they are up against the external wall of the buildings. It is compliance 25% (30 units) of kitchens are naturally ventilated. noted that this calculation includes kitchens summary with windows that open to the common corridors of the building. These are not considered to be adequately ventilated and pose a potential amenity issue in terms of odours and noise

Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

1

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses Former DA Proposal Council Rule of Standard Complies **New Concept Proposal** Complies Comments Thumb The façade to Building X is acceptable. Building F external massing and façade design has been substantially re-designed /improved to address Yes Facades must define and Yes – **Council's concerns.** The overall building mass has been split and broken into smaller scaled elements to step Facades The facade to Building F, particularly the enhance the public domain redesign down and increase separation from Building E on the western portion of upper floors to significantly reduce No northern elevation at ground floor level and desired street character the overall visual dominance of the proposed built form and to provide a far greater level of modulation, meets the relates poorly to the wedge park and articulation and interest to the proposed skyline. The western end of building F has been lowered in scale to objectives of semi-public domain. The facade reduce overshadowing impacts to residential properties on the southern side of the railway line to an comprises a blank wall at ground floor Council Draft acceptable level. The building separation introduced between east wing and west wing of Building F from level which extends for a length of LEP / DCP Level 11 up further reduces overshading impacts to those properties located on the southern side of the approximately 46m in order to screen the railwav. car park. The facade fails to provide any controls form of activation and results in a Blank walls at ground and pedestrian grade levels have bee eliminated and replaced with active disconnect between the building and the retail/residential frontages and terraced landscaped treatments. wedge park. The revised design significantly improves the legibility of building entries of Building F by articulating building entries more clearly in the building's external design and massing and by providing substantially more street level retail activation around the main residential lobbies along the southern side of ground floor of Building F fronting Jack Brabham drive which is an activated public roadway. This significantly enhances street activation and passive surveillance opportunities around these lobbies which addresses Council's concerns. Further design development and refinement of the building's external design will be undertaken as part of the new DA submission. Satisfactory Provide quality roof designs Yes Building X remains the same and is considered to be satisfactory. Yes Roof which contribute to the The Building F roof has been redesigned and significantly improved as noted above and is now considered design overall design satisfactory. Further design development and refinement of the building's external design will be undertaken as part of the new DA submission. See the Design Review Panel comments Details will be provided in the new DA submission but there is no evidence to suggest that full compliance Reduce reliance on artificial No Yes – details above with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design. Energy heating and cooling to be provide efficiency with the new DA



Built Form Analysis & SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development Preliminary Schedule of Compliance

Revision: A Date: 18th Sept 2014

dem

Revised Design Responses to DA2013/0385 Hurstville Council Development Assessment Report

DRP & DA Assessment Comments on Former DA Design				New Master Plan and Concept Design Responses	
Rule of Thumb	Standard	Former DA Proposal Council Comments	Complies	New Concept Proposal	Complies
Waste Managem ent	Supply waste management plans as part of the development application	Council's Manager of Environmental Services has reviewed the application and identified that waste storage areas for the development are of an insufficient size to meet the needs of the development	No	Details will be provided in the new DA submission but there is no evidence to suggest that full compliance with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design.	Yes – details to be provide with the new DA
Water conservati on	Rainwater is not to be collected from roofs coated with lead-or bitumen-based paints, or from asbestos- cement roofs. Normal guttering is sufficient for water collections provided that it is kept clear of leaves and debris.	Satisfactory	Yes	Details will be provided in the new DA submission but there is no evidence to suggest that full compliance with Council's codes and objectives cannot be met in the revised design.	Yes – details to be provide with the new DA

