

| Principle | Council Pre Lodgement Comments | Action | Response | Outcome |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 3. Built Form | | | | |
| <p>Good design achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose, in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type and the manipulation of building elements.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>It is noted that the proposed built form generally reflects that of the original application which was supported previously by Council.</p> <p>However, it is noted that the proposal will result in an increase in building height to the Rowe St building which may result in a built form that results in increased negative amenity impacts within the proposal and upon adjoining properties. In this respect, of particular concern is the potential for increased overshadowing, and loss of amenity for units within the proposal due to reduced floor to ceiling heights.</p> <p>Generally, the built form for the building on 20 First Av reflects the context of the adjoining buildings.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that any forthcoming development application details in depth how the proposal adequately complies with the requirements of this principle.</p> | To be demonstrated by proponent | <p>Extra Floors have been designed in the same form as the previously approved building.</p> <p>Extra floors have been designed to provide substantially the same shadowing and overlooking profile as the approved building. Specifically this provides the same solar access as the approved buildings to existing residential flat buildings in First Ave</p> | Complies |
| 4. Density | | | | |
| <p>Good design has a density appropriate for a site and its context, in terms of floor space yields (or number of units or residents).</p> <p>Appropriate densities are sustainable and consistent with the existing density in an area or, in precincts undergoing a transition, are consistent with the stated desired future density.</p> <p>Sustainable densities respond to the regional context,</p> | <p>It is noted that the proposal will result in an increase in the total number of dwellings present on the site to what was originally approved without an increase in the communal open space area. Also of concern is that western portion of the site Rowe St Building in only serviced by 1 lift core, with 11 units on each floor. This exceeds the requirements provided within SEPP 65 which may be indicative of an unsuitable density within the subject building.</p> <p>With regards to the wider site context it has not been suitably demonstrated that the bulk of the resultant building will not unreasonably overshadow the adjoining and adjacent properties. Council will not support an</p> | To be demonstrated by proponent | <p>The RFDC guideline of 8 units per lift applies to single core buildings with the objective to minimizing the disruption caused by peak use and breakdowns.</p> <p>This design provides multiple cores with alternative access ways between each to address these objectives.</p> <p>See comments with regard to bulk scale and overshadowing above</p> | Complies |

| Principle | Council Pre Lodgement Comments | Action | Response | Outcome |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| availability of infrastructure, public transport, community facilities and environmental quality. | <p>application that results in a building that does not provide an adequate amenity for adjoining and adjacent properties and future residents.</p> <p>With respect to the First Av Building, the density proposed reflects the density of the adjoining residential flat buildings.</p> <p>Given the above, any forthcoming development application must clearly demonstrate that the amenity of adjoining and adjacent properties will be retained and that adequate amenity will be provided for future residents.</p> | | | |
| 5. Resource, energy and water efficiency | | | | |
| <p>Good design makes efficient use of natural resources, energy and water throughout its full life cycle, including construction.</p> <p>Sustainability is integral to the design process. Aspects include demolition of existing structures, recycling of materials, selection of appropriate and sustainable materials, adaptability and reuse of buildings, layouts and built form, passive solar design principles, efficient appliances and mechanical services, soil zones for vegetation and reuse of water.</p> | <p>Given the preliminary nature of the documentation submitted to Council it cannot be determined whether compliance will be achieved with the requirements of this part.</p> <p>In this respect, it is noted that any forthcoming development application must be accompanied by a BASIX Certificate, Waste Management Plan and details as to how stormwater will be managed on the subject site.</p> | To be demonstrated by proponent | <p>The attached spreadsheet demonstrates compliance with solar access and cross ventilation guidelines in RFDC.</p> <p>Waste management plan is attached.</p> <p>Basix certification is attached</p> | Complies |

| Principle | Council Pre Lodgement Comments | Action | Response | Outcome |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 7. Amenity | | | | |
| Good design provides amenity through the physical, spatial and environmental quality of a development. Optimising amenity requires appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas, outlook and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility. | <p>With regards to this principle, it is noted that of particular concern is the potential for direct overshadowing of adjoining and adjacent properties as well as units within the development. Also of concern is the potential for reduced floor to ceiling heights which will result in reduced amenity for future residents.</p> <p>In this respect it is strongly recommended that any forthcoming application demonstrate adequate amenity for adjoining and adjacent properties as well as future residents through the preservation of adequate solar access and minimum floor to ceiling heights.</p> | To be demonstrated by proponent | <p>Refer to above comments re overshadowing of adjoining properties</p> <p>It is proposed that loft units will have ceiling heights reduced to 2400mm in bedrooms. The loft units are designed to meet the RFDC “rules of thumb” that 50% of the unit (ie all the living areas) have ceiling heights of 2700mm. In fact the proposed heights of living areas in the loft units exceeds 2700mm and more than meets the objectives in the RFDC</p> <p><i>. To increase the sense of space in apartments and provide well proportioned rooms. . To promote the penetration of daylight into the depths of the apartment. . To contribute to flexibility of use. . To achieve quality interior spaces while considering the external building form requirements.</i></p> | Complies |
| 8. Safety and Security | | | | |
| Good design optimises safety and security, both internal to the development and for the public domain. This is achieved by maximising overlooking of public and communal spaces while maintaining internal privacy, avoiding dark and non-visible areas, maximising activity on streets, providing clear, safe access points, providing quality public spaces that cater for desired recreational uses, providing lighting appropriate to the location and desired activities, | <p>Access to the residential component in the Rowe Street development is either via the basement or two separate entries along Rowe Street. These entries are adequately identified on the Rowe Street elevation. The restriction of access to these areas is to be detailed in any forthcoming application.</p> <p>Security and safety to the communal open will be provided through the overlooking of the space by units and by part of the internal corridors being adjacent to the communal open space.</p> <p>Pedestrian access to the development on First Av is via a pathway along the eastern boundary to the entry that is located in the middle of the building as well as via the basement.</p> | Crime Risk Assessment to be provided by proponent | <p>The design does not provide dark non visible areas and generally provides opportunities for casual surveillance for all external thoroughfares and communal open space areas.</p> <p>All access points to the building off Rowe Street are directly off the pavement and well lit. Access from First Ave will be well lit and directly overlooked by 9 dwellings. The communal open space will be well lit, is designed to be open without any concealed areas and is directly overlooked by several units.</p> | Complies |

| Principle | Council Pre Lodgement Comments | Action | Response | Outcome |
|--|---|-----------|---|----------|
| and clear definition between public and private spaces. | <p>The development has also incorporated pedestrian access through the buildings. An access ramp is provided at the rear of First Av to the rear of the ground floor level. This will allow a connection through the building to Rowe St. Pedestrian access is to the communal open space on Rowe St. No details have been provided regarding the lighting of these areas.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above it is noted that any forthcoming application must be accompanied by a formal Crime Risk Assessment.</p> | | | |
| 10. Aesthetics | | | | |
| Quality aesthetics require the appropriate composition of building elements, textures, materials and colours and reflect the use, internal design and structure of the development. Aesthetics should respond to the environment and context, particularly to desirable elements of the existing streetscape or, in precincts undergoing transition, contribute to the desired future character of the area. | <p>With regards to this principle it is noted that the UDRP raised specific concerns regarding the overall design of the proposal.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposal in its current form adequately addresses the requirements of this principle.</p> | No | <p>There was a fundamental disagreement between the architect and the UDRP with regards to the conceptual design of the building. The UDRP thought that two parallel residential blocks running from east to west across the block with communal open space between was more appropriate.</p> <p>The architect considered this conceptual approach to be flawed because it increased the overshadowing and overlooking to the existing residential flats to the south of the site facing First Ave, increased the amount of communal open space that would be in shade in mid winter and compromised the positioning of the residential foyer directly off the street front for the rear block.</p> <p>The proposed design addresses these design issues in a more comprehensive manner. The design of the building is in context with existing building in the street, contributes positively to the desired future character of the area and is the same in appearance as the design previously approved by Council</p> | Complies |

Principle 1 Context

The design responds to the desired future character of this precinct as envisaged by *RLEP 2010* and Part 4.1 of *RDCP 2010*, which became effective on 30 June 2010, and the Eastwood Centre Planning Study and Master Plan. This recently enacted planning regime was adopted following an extensive community consultation process which included the local community, relevant public authorities and landowners.

The proposal will be compatible and consistent with the desired future built form character of development in this locality.

The proposal will not lead to the removal of any significant natural or landscape features

The proposal complies with this Principle

Principle 2 Scale

The proposal is consistent with the height and planning controls contained in *RLEP 2010*, Part 4.1 of *RDCP 2010* and the Eastwood Centre Planning Study and Master Plan and is to be of a height, bulk and scale contemplated for the appropriate development of this area under the terms of those plans.

The proposal complies with this Principle

Principle 6 Landscape

The application proposes the same landscaped area and design approved by Council in the previous application. Whilst there are 17 extra units proposed by this application, the communal open space is centrally located to and easily accessible by all units, provides an extensive, sunny outdoor space for both active and passive recreation and each of the extra units is provides with large open terraces for private open space.

The proposal will be compatible and consistent with the desired future built form environment in this locality and will be satisfactorily integrated into that environment.

The proposal will significantly improve the scenic quality of the area.

The nature and extent of landscaping is commensurate with that anticipated in a mixed-use residential/commercial development in this area.

The proposal complies with this Principle

Principle 9 Social Dimensions

The proposal will:

- provide additional housing opportunities;
- widen the range of affordable housing choice in this locality;
- create employment opportunities during both the construction and operational phases of the development; and
- increase housing densities in proximity of services, facilities and public transport.

The proposal provides for additional housing opportunities, meeting the goals of the *Metropolitan Strategy* relating to urban consolidation and urban containment, and achieves this desirable social outcome without any adverse environmental impact

The proposal complies with this Principle

Residential Flat Design Code

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|----------|
| Part 01 – Local Context | | | | |
| Building Height | Where there is an existing floor space ratio (FSR), test height controls against it to ensure a good fit. | N/A It should be noted that whilst an FSR is shown on Council's FSR Map, pursuant to cl4.4A(2) of RLEP 2010, no FSR applies. | | |
| | Test heights against the number of storeys and the minimum ceiling heights required for the desired building use. | Complies RLEP 2010 provides a maximum height of 15.5m for the Rowe St portion of the site and 11.5m for the First Av portion of the site. All building heights are measured from existing ground level. Whilst the submitted plans indicate that the proposal fully complies with the respective controls, given the height of the building, the existing topography and the number of storeys proposed, it is possible that the proposal will breach the maximum height limit. Any application that results in a breach of the height limits will not be supported by Council. With regards to the above it is noted that the RFDC provides minimum floor to ceiling heights that must be adhered to by any future development. It is | A detailed drawing showing calculation of building height has been submitted with the application | Complies |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|----------|
| | | <p>important to note that the RFDC specifically makes reference to finished ceiling and floor levels. Council is unlikely to support variations to these minimum requirements.</p> <p>Any forthcoming application must demonstrate total compliance with this control. In this respect, the proponent is to provide detailed sections across the length and width of the Rowe St building. These sections are to detail the building, existing ground level and 15.5m height limit at 10m spacing.</p> | | |
| Building Separation | <p>Design and test building separation controls in plan and section. The suggested separation provided within the RFDC is as follows:</p> <p><i>‘...up to four storeys/12 metres</i> <i>- 12 metres between habitable rooms/balconies</i> <i>- 9 metres between habitable/balconies and non-habitable rooms</i> <i>- 6 metres between non-habitable rooms</i></p> <p><i>five to eight storeys/up to 25 metres</i> <i>- 18 metres between habitable rooms/balconies</i> <i>- 13 metres between habitable rooms/balconies and non-habitable rooms</i> <i>- 9 metres between non-habitable rooms....’</i></p> | <p>Does not Comply It is noted that building separation applies across internal courtyards and to adjoining and adjacent properties.</p> <p>The approximate separation for the proposed buildings to adjoining buildings are as follows:</p> <p>Rowe St Building Eastern Buildings = 0m first two storeys, 3m-6m thereafter Western Buildings = 0m first two storeys, 3m-6m thereafter 14 First Av = 15.4m 16 First Av = 13.4m 22 First Av = 9m Internal Setbacks = 12m</p> <p>First Av Building Eastern Buildings = 3.1m Western Buildings = 10.7m Rowe St Building = 7m</p> <p>The building separation proposed fails to meet the</p> | <p>Setback non compliances are limited to the residential flat building fronting First Ave. These setbacks are in context with the existing RFB's on adjacent sites and as this building is unchanged from the previous application has been considered appropriate by council.</p> | Complies |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|----------|
| | | <p>requirements of the RFDC. However, it is noted that the proposal provides separation similar to that originally supported by Council on the previous application.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the proposed building separations do not wholly comply with the requirements of the RFDC. Justification for the proposed areas of non-compliance must be detailed in any forthcoming development application.</p> | | |
| | Test building separation controls for daylight access to buildings and open spaces. | <p>To be demonstrated by proponent</p> <p>It is noted that the documentation submitted to Council has not included shadow diagrams and as such it cannot be accurately determined that the proposal will allow for adequate solar access to the open space area, all units within the development and properties.</p> <p>Clear demonstrated compliance with the requirements of this section is particularly important given the extent of the proposed non-compliances.</p> <p>Accordingly, any forthcoming application is to clearly demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this part.</p> | Refer to attached spreadsheet | Complies |
| Street Setbacks | Identify the desired streetscape character, the common setback of buildings in the street, the accommodation of street tree planting and the height of buildings and daylight access controls. | <p>Does not comply</p> <p>DCP 2010 Part 4.1 allows for a setback to Rowe St of 0m for the first 2 storeys and a 3m setback thereafter, including balconies. The development does not comply with this requirement as lift and passageways provide a 0m setback across all levels</p> <p>In addition to the above, DCP 2010 Part 3.4</p> | Refer to comments above re setback to First Ave | Complies |
| | Test street setbacks with building envelopes and street sections. | | | |
| | Test controls for their impact on the scale, proportion and shape of building facades | | | |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| | | <p>provides a minimum street setback to First Av of 12.5m. The proposal allows for 5m only, which is generally in-line with adjoining buildings.</p> <p>The original application supported the proposed non-compliance on the basis that for the Rowe St building it contributed positively to the vertical articulation of the development, whilst for the First Av building it reflected the current streetscape.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, given that the proposal constitutes a new application and will be assessed accordingly, justification for the proposed non-compliance is to be included in any forthcoming application.</p> | | |
| Side & Rear Setbacks | Relate side setbacks to existing streetscape patterns. | <p>Does not comply</p> <p>The minimum side and rear setbacks for the proposal are provided by DCP 2010. In this respect, DCP 2010 Part 4.1 provides a side and rear setback for the Rowe St building of 0m for the first two storeys and 3m for each storey thereafter, including balconies. The proposal complies with this requirement.</p> <p>With regards to the First Av building, DCP 2010 Part 3.4 provides a rear and side setback of 7.5m. The proposal allows for 0m to 2m to the western boundary and 3.3m to the eastern boundary. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of this part. The proposed side and rear setbacks are similar to that established by adjoining and adjacent properties.</p> <p>Whilst the original application proposed similar setbacks and was supported by Council, it should be noted that the application will constitute a new</p> | <p>Setback non compliance is limited to the separation between the two residential components within this application, one facing First Ave and one facing Rowe Street with regard to the setback to the existing northern boundary of the First Ave site.</p> <p>This setback is in context with buildings on the adjoining sites, does not contribute to overlooking and overshadowing of areas of private or communal open space on neighbouring buildings and maintains separation within the development that is consistent with RFDC guidelines.</p> | Meets the Objectives |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| | | application and accordingly, should provide detailed justification for all areas of non-compliance. | | |
| Floor Space Ratio | Test the desired built form outcome against proposed floor space ratio to ensure consistency with building height-building footprint the three dimensional building envelope open space requirements. | N/A It should be noted that whilst an FSR is shown on Council's FSR Map, pursuant to cl4.4A(2) of RLEP 2010, no FSR applies. | | |
| Part 02 – Site Design | | | | |
| Deep Soil Zones (DSZ) | A minimum of 25% of the open space area of a site should be a deep soil zone; more is desirable. Exceptions may be made in urban areas where sites are built out and there is no capacity for water infiltration. In these instances, Stormwater treatment measures must be integrated with the design of the residential flat building. | <p>Does not comply</p> <p>The Rowe St Building provides DSZ well below the level required under the RFDC. The proposal allows for approximately 5% of the Rowe St site as DSZ. It is noted that the original application provided similar amounts of DSZ and was supported by Council on the basis that the resultant development was consistent with the permitted setbacks.</p> <p>The First Av site has incorporated approximately 15% deep soil zones. As this is a remnant site within an urban area, the RFDC does permit an exception to this requirement where the development incorporates stormwater treatment measures. No information regarding the proposed stormwater treatment has been provided to Council. However, it is noted that the original application provided similar amounts of DSZ and was supported previously.</p> <p>As demonstrated above, it can be seen that the proposal does not provide the minimum required amounts of DSZ provided by this part of the RFDC. Whilst these amounts of DSZ were supported</p> | <p>The Rowe Street portion of the site is in a business zone and is already 100% covered by building or hardstand paving. This proposal increases the amount of deep soil area and proposes that this deep soil area be located along the southern boundary adjacent existing RFB's to facilitate the retention of existing trees on these sites and to provide screen planting along these boundaries.</p> <p>The proposed deep soil areas to the building on First Ave is consistent with the existing RFB's on adjoining sites.</p> | Meets the objectives |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| | | <p>previously, it should be noted that the proposal will constitute a new application. Accordingly, any forthcoming application must incorporate justification for the proposed areas of non-compliance.</p> | | |
| Open Space | <p>The area of communal open space required should generally be at least between 25% and 30% of the site area. Larger sites and brownfield sites may have potential for more than 30%.</p> | <p>Does not comply</p> <p>The Rowe Street building has provided communal open space that constitutes 19.3% of the total site area. In this respect, given the proposed shortfall of communal open space, ample private open space must be provided to all dwellings. The submitted plans fail to clearly identify that all units have access to private open space areas. The proponents have advised that this is in error and that balcony areas have been provided but have not been clearly identified on the plans.</p> <p>All units are to have balcony areas and this is to be detailed on any forthcoming documentation.</p> <p>Assuming that the balcony areas not shown hatched are provided, the proposed spaces appear to ensure that adequate private space as well as communal open space will be provided for the occupants.</p> <p>The First Av building has not incorporated any communal open space however the communal open space in the Rowe St building would be available for the future occupants of the First Av building to use. Access to this space is via either a pathway which incorporates stairs at the rear of the buildings or via a pathway into the building and then a lift. Even if the occupants of this building do not use the communal open space, residential</p> | <p>The application proposes three storeys of residential units above the communal open space. The RFDC control envisages rises in storeys of up to 12 with regard to this benchmark of 25%-30% of site area.</p> <p>The proposal provides 710 sqm of communal open space which is 16.1% of site area of which 610 sqm is provided in a consolidated and central area that is easily accessible from all the units.</p> <p>The amount of communal open space is in excess of 10 sqm per unit.</p> <p>The units have been provided with a total of 1113sqm or 25.7% of site area in private open space .</p> | Meets the Objectives |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|-------------------------------|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | <p>amenity will still be maintained due to the balconies on each unit in the First Av building.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposal provides for a substantial increase in the total number of units on site, with no corresponding increase in the total amount of communal open space. The potential additional burden on the communal open space is to be considered by the proponent.</p> <p>Also of concern is the potential for continued access to the communal open space area by the First Av residents. It is noted that access to the communal open space areas by residents will occur through limited access areas. The proponents are to demonstrate how access to this area will be maintained and provided.</p> | | |
| | Where developments are unable to achieve the recommended communal open space, such as those in dense urban areas, they must demonstrate that residential amenity is provided in the form of increased private open space and/or in a contribution to public open space. | <p>Does not comply</p> <p>Should the above identified shortfall in communal open space be pursued, the proponents should endeavor to provide balconies of suitable size and scope for each individual apartment. In this respect, at a minimum, the balcony areas should exceed the minimum requirements for the detailed under the balcony section of the RFDC.</p> <p>Clear demonstration of the generous size of the balcony areas is to be provided.</p> | See above | Meets the Objectives |
| Planting on Structures | In terms of soil provision there is no minimum standard that can be applied to all situations as the requirements vary with the size of plants and trees at maturity. The following are recommended as minimum standards for a range of plant | <p>To be demonstrated by proponent</p> <p>Given the level of details provided, the total depth of all areas for planting cannot be determined.</p> <p>It is noted that there is a central courtyard area that appears to include planting. Demonstrated</p> | Refer Landscape plan | Complies |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|--|-------------|----------|
| | <p>sizes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large trees such as figs (canopy diameter of up to 16m at maturity) - minimum soil volume 150m³ - minimum soil depth 1.3m - minimum soil area 10m x 10m area or equivalent ▪ Medium trees (8.0m canopy diameter at maturity) - minimum soil volume 35m³ - minimum soil depth 1.0m - approximate soil area 6.0m x 6.0m or equivalent ▪ Small trees (4.0m canopy diameter at maturity) - minimum soil volume 9.0m³ - minimum soil depth 800mm - approximate soil area 3.5m x 3.5m or equivalent ▪ Shrubs - minimum soil depths 500 - 600mm ▪ Ground cover - minimum soil depths 300 - 450mm ▪ Turf - minimum soil depths 100-300mm. ▪ Any subsurface drainage requirements are in addition to the minimum soil depths quoted above. | compliance with the requirements of this section is to be provided in any forthcoming development application. | | |
| Safety | Carry out a formal crime risk assessment for all residential developments of more than 20 new dwellings. | <p>To be provided by proponent</p> <p>No formal Crime Risk Assessment has been provided by the applicant and would need to be included with any forthcoming development application.</p> | Refer Above | Complies |
| Visual Amenity | Refer to Building Separation minimum standards | <p>Does not comply</p> <p>Whilst the proposal does not comply with the minimum building separation requirements for adjoining and adjacent properties, little information</p> | | |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|---|--|----------------------|----------|
| | | <p>has been provided as to how visual amenity will be maintained between dwellings.</p> <p>In this respect, it is noted that the First Av building has balcony and windows orientated to the side boundaries which may result in reduced visual amenity for existing and future residents. Also of concern, is the potential for overlooking from the Rowe St Building to properties located to the south of building. Demonstrated compliance with the requirements of this section is to be provided with any forthcoming application.</p> <p>It is noted that the proponent has orientated windows and open space areas in such a way to negate the potential for unreasonable direct overlooking.</p> | | |
| Pedestrian Access | Identify the access requirements from the street or car parking area to the apartment entrance. | <p>To be demonstrated by proponent Any forthcoming application is to be accompanied by an Access Report that demonstrates compliance with the requirements of this part.</p> | Refer Access Report | Complies |
| | Follow the accessibility standard set out in AS 1428 (parts 1 and 2), as a minimum. | <p>Compliance not demonstrated No documentation has been submitted demonstrating compliance with the requirements of this section. Any forthcoming application must be accompanied by an Access Report demonstrating compliance with this part.</p> | Refer Access Report | Complies |
| Vehicle Access | Generally limit the width of driveways to a maximum of 6.0m. | <p>Does not comply Driveway access for the Rowe St building exceeds 6m, however given that this driveway provides access for large delivery trucks also, considered acceptable.</p> | Refer Traffic Report | Complies |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|
| | Locate vehicle entries away from main pedestrian entries and on secondary frontages. | <p>Does not comply The proposed Shop 118 and residential foyer access is directly adjacent to driveway, with minimum separation. In this regard it is questionable whether the resulting situation will be safe and acceptable.</p> <p>The proponents must demonstrate the suitability of the proposed lay out and design of these areas.</p> | Proximity provisions and site lines meet the requirements of AS 2890.2 | Complies |
| Part 03 – Building Design | | | | |
| Balconies | <i>Provide primary balconies for all apartments with a minimum depth of 2.0m. Developments which seek to vary from the minimum standards must demonstrate that negative impacts from the context-noise, wind – can be satisfactorily mitigated with design solutions.</i> | <p>Does not Comply Whilst all terraces provided are greater than 2m in depth, as identified previously, it appears as though some apartments do not have access to balcony/terrace areas.</p> <p>During the meeting it was indicated by the proponent that this was in error and that the balcony areas have not been shown hatched.</p> <p>All apartments are to be provided with private open space and this is to be detailed in any forthcoming development application.</p> | Refer attached spread sheet | Complies |
| Ceiling Heights | <p><i>The following recommended dimensions are measured from finished floor level (FFL) to finished ceiling level (FCL). These are minimums only and do not preclude higher ceilings, if desired.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>in mixed use buildings: 3.3m minimum for ground floor retail or commercial and for first floor residential, retail or commercial to promote future flexibility of use</i> <i>in residential flat buildings in mixed</i> | <p>Does not comply The initial documentation provided by the proponent did not provide details regarding the proposed floor to ceiling heights. Additional documentation submitted during the meeting however included a section from which proposed floor to ceiling heights can approximated.</p> <p>It appears as though the proposal does not achieve full compliance with this control.</p> | Refer above | Meets the Objectives |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|--|-------------|----------|
| | <p><i>use areas: 3.3m minimum for ground floor to promote future flexibility of use in residential flat buildings or other residential floors in mixed use buildings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>in general, 2.7m minimum for all habitable rooms on all floors, 2.4m is the preferred minimum for all non-habitable rooms, however 2.25m is permitted.</i> <i>for two storey units, 2.4m minimum for second storey if 50% or more of the minimum wall height at edge</i> <i>for two-storey units with a two storey void space, 2.4m minimum ceiling heights</i> <i>attic spaces, 1.5m minimum wall height at edge of room with a 30° minimum - ceiling slope.</i> | <p>It is noted that the submitted documentation provides the following floor to floor heights for the Rowe St Building:</p> <p>Level 1 Retail – 3.47m - 3.7m Level 2 Retail – 4.33m Level 3 Residential – 2.9m Level 4 Residential – 2.55m - 2.9m Level 5 Residential (Eastern portion of building) – 2.55 Loft Areas – approx 2.55m</p> <p>The above heights do not take into consideration floor treatments or ceiling treatments for the provision of services. It should be noted that this requirement relates specifically to FFL and FCL. Accordingly, it appears as though it is unlikely that the proposal will achieve compliance with the requirements of this control.</p> <p>Given the importance of floor to ceiling heights in providing a reasonable level of amenity to future residents, Council is unlikely to support a variation to this control.</p> <p>Accordingly, total compliance with the minimum floor to ceiling heights is required. These height limits are to be provided within the maximum height limit of 15.5m.</p> | | |
| Internal Circulation | <p><i>In general, where units are arranged off a double-loaded corridor, the number of units accessible from a single core/corridor should be limited to eight.</i></p> <p><i>Exceptions may be allowed:</i></p> | <p>Does not Comply</p> <p>Whilst the First Av building complies with the requirements of this part, the Rowe St building does not.</p> <p>The Rowe St building contains three lifts which provide access to the residential areas. Two of</p> | Refer above | Complies |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for adaptive re-use buildings where developments can demonstrate the achievement of the desired streetscape character and entry response where developments can demonstrate a high level of amenity for common lobbies, corridors and units, (cross over, dual aspect apartments). | <p>these lifts serve the eastern portion of the building, whilst one lift serves the western area. Compliance with this control is achieved in the eastern portion given that the two lifts are located at opposite ends of an extended corridor, servicing a total of 11 units per floor.</p> <p>In the western portion of the building, one lift serves levels 3-4, each containing 11 units. This represents an additional 6 units rely upon access to this singular lift, in comparison with the original application. It is questionable whether the provision of a single lift for this entire section of the building will adequately service the resultant demand.</p> <p>In this respect, the proponents are advised to either achieve total compliance with the requirements of this part, or provide detailed justification demonstrating that the single lift will be able to cater for the demands of the residents.</p> | | |
| Storage | <p><i>In addition to kitchen cupboards and bedroom wardrobes, provide accessible storage facilities at the following rates:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> studio apartments - 6.0m³ one-bedroom apartments - 6.0m³ two-bedroom apartments - 8.0m³ three plus bedroom apartments -10m³ <p><i>50% of the above areas may allocated within each respective apartment while the remaining 50% is to be located within the car parking area.</i></p> | <p>To be demonstrated by proponent</p> <p>The submitted documentation indicates storage area for individual units on Basement 3 of the Rowe St Building, no details of the cubic size of the storage areas have been provided. With regards to the First Av building, no sizes of the proposed storage areas have been provided.</p> <p>Demonstrated compliance with the requirements of this part is to be provided with any forthcoming application.</p> | Refer attached spreadsheet | Complies |
| Building Amenity | | | | |

| Primary Development Controls | Guideline | Council Prelodgement Comments | Response | Outcome |
|------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Daylight Access | <p><i>Living rooms and private open spaces for at least 70% of apartments in a development should receive a minimum of three hours direct sunlight between 9.00am and 3.00pm in mid winter.</i></p> <p><i>In dense urban areas a minimum of two hours may be acceptable.</i></p> | <p>In adequate information provided The submitted information did not include shadowing or solar access diagrams. Accordingly, it is questionable whether the proposal will ensure that adequate compliance with the requirements of this section will be achieved.</p> <p>The configuration of the building may result in overshadowing of private open space and living room areas with the proposal itself and of adjoining and adjacent properties. As such, plan and elevation shadow diagrams are to be provided demonstrating total compliance with the requirements of this section.</p> | Refer attached spreadsheet | Complies |
| Building Performance | | | | |
| Waste Management | <p><i>Supply waste management plans as part of the development application submission as per the NSW Waste Board.</i></p> | <p>To be determined as part of Development Application Waste management plan to be provided with any forthcoming application.</p> | Refer attached Waste Management Plan | Complies |