

RECORD OF THE PRE-PLANNING PROPOSAL LODGEMENT MEETING

Date/Time of meeting: 11.00am, 27 May 2020

PROPERTY:

845 Pacific Highway, Chatswood

Description of Proposal:

Amend *Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012* for the site as follows:

- Increase FSR to No maximum
- Increase building height to RL 246.8m

Applicant/Proponent details:

Christophe Charkos (Urbis)
Tony Zhang (Vantager)
John Ho (Vantager)
Simon Parsons (PTW)
Alex Lin (PTW)
George Chen (PTW)
Alex Longley (Arcadia)
Mackenzie Brinums (GTA)
Colby Crane (Urbis)
Alisha Filmer (Urbis)
Princess Ventura (Urbis)
Ryan Condon (Urbis)

Council officers:

Ian Arnott (Planning Manager)
Norma Shankie-Williams (Strategic Planning Team Leader)
Craig O'Brien (Strategic Planner)
Wil Robertson (Urban Design Specialist)
Andrew Gillies (Strategic Transport Planner)
Gordon Farrelly (Traffic and Transport Team Leader)

Current *WLEP 2012* controls

Current Zoning: B3 - Commercial Core
Road widening: No
Current Max. Height of Building: 60 metres
Current Max. Floor Space Ratio: 5:1

Conservation Area: No
 Local Heritage Item: No
 Flood Prone Area: No
 Bushfire Prone Area: No

Description of the Pre- Planning Proposal Concept Plan

- Existing site 2,074m².
- Demolition of existing development.
- Concept design showing a commercial development, involving :
 - One commercial tower of 38 storeys.
 - A total floor space of 23.89:1 (49,551m² GFA).
 - Which includes 851m² of retail
 - Floor plates varying between 1,037m² GFA on Ground Level, to 1,436m² GFA on Level 36.
 - Approximately 8 levels of basement parking, containing 353 car spaces, with access off Day Street.
 - Basement level loading dock, with vehicle turntable, accessed off Day Street.
 - Tower provides ground level setbacks as follows:
 4m setback to Pacific Highway, zero setback to Day Street, zero setback to Council park, and 13.6m setback to Railway St.
 - Above Railway Street Setback, building moves over the Ground level setback at an angle towards the Railway Street boundary, with Levels 17 to 36 located on the Railway Street boundary.
- Voluntary Planning Agreement not detailed by proponent.
- Design Review Panel preferred by proponent over a Design Competition.

Key issues for Consideration and officer comments

1. Relationship to strategic planning framework

The Planning Proposal will require justification with sufficient detail to demonstrate:

- consistency with the *Greater Sydney Region Plan* and the *North District Plan* and;
- consistency with local strategic planning documents - in particular the *Chatswood CBD Planning and Urban Design Strategy* (the *Strategy*).
- Consistency with directions from DPIE in regards the *Strategy*.

Officer comments:

- The strategic merit in exploring a significant commercial development on this site is recognized.
- The site is located close to public transport being approximately 250m from Chatswood Transport Interchange.

2. Commercial use

Retail is proposed on the ground and lower ground, with a commercial office tower above.

Officer comments:

- The proposal is consistent with the *Strategy* in regards land use.

3. Design

The documentation specifies a landmark office building.

Officers Comments:

- A combined architectural and landscape design statement is to be presented at Planning Proposal stage – reflective of the comments in these Notes.
 - Such a consolidated design statement is to explain how the proposal makes a positive contribution to both the Chatswood CBD and the public domain from north, south, east and west.
 - Assess the appearance of each elevation in context.
 - Explain the design progression to final concept.
 - Use terminology that accurately reflects what is proposed (only use campus if appropriate).

4. Scale and Form of Development

The scale of the proposed development illustrated in the concept plans submitted demonstrates a significant increase in height, density and scale – which in part is consistent with the *Strategy* and in part seeks exemptions from some controls included in the *Strategy* due to site specific arguments.

Officer comments:

- The scale and form of new commercial development should achieve the slender tower objective stipulated in the *Strategy*.
- The slender tower objective will be assessed from all sides of any proposed residential tower, with particular reference in this case to the western elevation.
- The width of the western elevation should be minimized to address the slender tower objective when viewed from the west.
- The maximum height and floor space contained in the *Strategy* is not necessarily achievable on every site, and will depend on addressing site constraints, surrounding context and other aspects of the *Strategy*.
- The requested height permitted should include lift over runs and any other structures at roof level.
- The floor plate size is to be consistent with the slender tower objective.
- As part of any justification of variations to the *Strategy*, analysis should be provided of floor plate sizes, and where it becomes uneconomic for the subject proposal. Any findings should be factored into the concept design.
- Reductions to floor plate size on upper levels should be examined to result in a more slender tower form.
- Measures such as articulation, textures and shading should be utilized on each elevation to improve the concept design.

5. Setbacks at Ground level and upper levels

It is noted that one compliant setback is provided in accordance with the *Strategy*, being at ground level to the Pacific Highway. Variations are requested to all other setbacks – including Railway Street.

Officer comments:

- Council supports the Ground level 4m setback provided to the Pacific Highway.
- The lack of a street wall and setback to the Pacific Highway is not consistent with the *Strategy* and remains a concern to be addressed.
- Deep soil planting is supported to the Pacific Highway frontage in accordance with the *Strategy* – impacting Basement 1.
 - A strong green presence is sought along the Pacific Highway boundary involving substantial trees (discussed below under landscape).
- In regards *Strategy* setbacks, the Council supports minimal structural intrusion (both at ground and above) – with an exception being awnings where necessary.
- The setbacks and landscaping to all elevations in the *Strategy* are intended to provide a satisfactory articulated building form that is stepped in from the base.
- In regards the Railway Street ground level setback provided, clear detail / analysis is to be provided in a Planning Proposal of the relationship with the building that extends above to the Railway St boundary.
 - This should include a review of the usability and public benefit of this space with the building above and the relationship of this design with Railway Street and the development opposite at 11 and 9 Railway St.
- In regards the Railway St ground level setback, an engineering report is to be provided confirming that no structures are required for the purposes of engineering support that would intrude into this setback area.
- Deep soil planting is supported to the Railway Street frontage – impacting Basement 1.
 - A significant green landscaped area is sought along the Railway St boundary involving substantial trees (discussed below under landscape).
 - In the *Strategy*, for setbacks more than 3m, deep soil planting for trees is required (it is noted that the *Strategy* ground level setback required for Railway St is 4m).

6. Landscaping

It is noted that differences have been shown, in regards the Ground level, between the architectural concept plan and landscape plan.

Officer Comments:

These comments should be read in conjunction with Point 5 above and references to deep soil planting.

- After the 1.5m grass verge, and 3m shared path along the Pacific Highway (which excludes utilities and any other obstruction), the remainder of the 4m front setback should be characterized by tree planting in accordance with the *Strategy*.
 - This should include the corners of the Pacific Highway / Railway Street and the Pacific Highway / Day Street.
 - Walls and elevated terraces should be provided outside of this green setback space.
 - The provision of trees on the eastern side of the shared path is to be designed to ensure no conflict with any awning provision.
- The landscaped character of 11 and 9 Railway Street should be emulated along the Railway Street setback area and this area should feature trees of a similar scale. In regards the Pacific Highway / Railway Street corner, and the Railway Street setback area, trees and vegetation are supported as opposed to walls.
- The linking of green landscaping to the Council public park is supported.
- Trees outside of the subject site are to be retained. A report is to be provided which addresses how these trees are to be protected and impacts minimized.

- Changes in levels and usability of the open space areas are to be clearly explained and shown on plan.
- Any Planning Proposal should demonstrate 20% of the site area provided as soft landscaping in accordance with the *Strategy* and the objective of greening the city. This should be shown on plan and maximized at Ground Level.
- The Planning Proposal should detail arrangements for access to publicly accessible areas.

7. Publicly accessible open space

The *Strategy* does encourage provision of publicly accessible open space.

Officer comments:

- Ground level publicly accessible open space as proposed is supported (Note: refer above to comments on structure above this area).

8. Access and Parking

One vehicle entry point in and out to basement parking is shown from Day Street, servicing all cars and loading / unloading vehicles.

Compliance with Council's *DCP* car parking provisions is proposed.

Officer Comments:

- Proposed traffic arrangements should consider public domain and the broader traffic network. Analysis to be provided at Planning Proposal stage.
 - Key intersections are Pacific Highway / Railway Street, Day Street / Railway Street, and Pacific Highway / Victoria Avenue.
- Concern is raised that separate cars and service vehicle access is not provided. Explore separation with both access points from Day St.
- Concern is raised in relation to the angle of the vehicle access as shown. The preference of the Traffic Section is for it to be perpendicular to Day Street.
- Vehicles including trucks accessing the site should be able to enter and leave in a forward direction. A physical solution rather than a mechanized solution is preferred. Any mechanized solution is required to be justified.
- All loading and unloading must be accommodated within the site and not on the Pacific Highway, Railway Street, Day Street or any other street.
- A reduced car parking provision, given that the site is close to Chatswood Transport Interchange, would be favoured. Car parking rates under consideration for the Chatswood CBD are provided for reference (see attachment).
- The proposal should include car share space(s) provision.
- Walls or obstructions should not be located adjacent the shared pathway as this obstructs efficient and safe use of shared pathway (having impact for cyclists). Vegetation should have regard to sight lines – appropriate vegetation to be planted.
- Cycle access should be planned from the shared path on the Pacific Highway to the subject site – particular reference is made to Day St.
- Provision of bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities at least as per Council's existing controls in Chapter C4 of *Willoughby DCP* is encouraged. An even higher provision of facilities as per the Cycling Aspects of *Austroads Guides* is recommended.

9. Heritage

Officers Comments:

- A heritage report should be provided at Planning Proposal stage addressing the impact of the proposal on heritage conservation areas in the locality, in particular the Blue Gum Heritage Conservation Area (to the west), Findlay and Wyvern Avenues Heritage Conservation Areas (to the north west) and North Chatswood Conservation Area (to the east).

10. Design Excellence

It is noted that the proponent has a stated preference for a Design Review Panel over a Design Excellence Competition.

Officers Comments:

- Council reaffirmed that, in accordance with the *Strategy*, a Design Excellence Competition would be required for a Planning Proposal of this scale on this site.

11. Street activation

Comments:

- Street activation is supported on each frontage provided it reflects the comments in these notes.

12. Public Art

Public art is shown on the plans and identified in documentation 'To be confirmed.'

Officer comments:

- A public art contribution will be required. In most cases this is to be put into a consolidated council public art fund, with locations and works to be identified by Council. In this particular case Council may be prepared to accept public art on the site, towards the Pacific Highway / Railway Street corner.
- In the future discussion of public art, Council may seek public art that relates to the existing public art on 11 and 9 Railway St.

13. VPA

Proponent states that Council does not seek value capture above 10:1 on this site.

Officer Comments:

- Council is actively pursuing a planning agreement policy in the Chatswood CBD and invites the proponent to consider entering into a draft planning agreement with Council towards costs associated with providing infrastructure works within the Chatswood CBD, such as involving public domain, streetscape, recreation, parks and cultural events – all to be determined by Council in line with a community infrastructure contributions schedule.

14. Draft DCP controls

The pre-Planning Proposal discussion tabled a concept design.

Officer comments

- Although only at concept stage the comments raised in this document should be reflected in potential *DCP* controls to ensure the principles used in developing the concept design are enforceable should the Planning Proposal proceed.
- The Planning Proposal lodged should therefore be accompanied by a schedule of

draft *DCP* provisions to apply to the site.

15. Timing

It is understood that a Planning Proposal will be submitted in mid to late 2020.

Following Planning Proposal submission, comprehensive internal consultations will be undertaken, further meetings with the proponent may be required, as well as amendments as considered necessary, prior to the submission of a report to Council to determine whether the Planning Proposal should proceed to Gateway and exhibition.

Forms, Fees & Checklists including Electronic Application requirements

<http://www.willoughby.nsw.gov.au/Development/fees-forms---checklists/>

Planning Legislation & Guidelines

<http://www.willoughby.nsw.gov.au/Development/planrules/>

e-Planning Portal (Application Tracking)

<https://eplanning.willoughby.nsw.gov.au/pages/xc.track/searchapplication.aspx>

Pre-Planning Proposal lodgement Meetings

<http://www.willoughby.nsw.gov.au/Development/do-i-need-approval/pre-lodgement-meetings/>

We thank you for attending the pre-lodgement meeting and assembling your proposal for Council's consideration. Council officers have used their best endeavours to assist you, but please be aware that other issues may arise during the processing of the planning proposal.

NO UNDERTAKING OR GUARANTEE CAN BE GIVEN THAT YOUR PLANNING PROPOSAL WILL BE APPROVED TO PROCEED TO A GATEWAY DETERMINATION WHEN IT IS LODGED.

