

2010SYE079

99 CALDARRA AVENUE, ENGADINE NSW 2233

DA10/0917

## ASSESSMENT REPORT APPENDICES

Appendix	A	Minutes from Architectural Review Advisory Panel Meeting
----------	---	--

# Architectural Review Advisory Panel

Proposal:

**Demolition of Existing Car Parking, Construction of Six (6) Storey, 120 Bed Residential Aged Care Facility with Basement Car Parking and Respite Day Centre**  
Property:

**99 Caldarra Avenue ENGADINE NSW 2233**

Applicant:

**Moran Health Care Group P/L**

File Number:

**DA10/0917**

---

The following is the report of the Architectural Review Advisory Panel Meeting held on 14 October 2010 at the Administration Centre, Sutherland Shire Council, Eton Street, Sutherland. The report documents the Panel's consideration of the proposed development described above.

## **"2. Consideration of Development Application No. 10/0917 - Residential Aged Care Facility at 99R Caldarra Avenue, Engadine**

Council's David Jarvis and Ian McPherson outlined the proposal, including providing details of Council's relevant codes and policies.

John Wong, Anthony Kelly, Kendall Mackay and Geoff Olson addressed the Panel regarding further development of the proposal and how they have addressed the concerns raised by the Panel at the previous meeting.

There is currently an approved development application for the subject site that consists of a public square, a multi purpose community building and a residential aged care facility (RACF). The approved application is separated into two stages. Stage 1 consists of the construction of the public square and community building (this stage is nearing completion) and Stage 2 consists of the construction of an 89 bed RACF and adjacent public landscaped area.

Due to a proposed increase in height and capacity of the RACF to 120 beds, a new development application has now been lodged for the proposed RACF. This new proposal is of such a scale that it will be considered by the Joint Regional Planning Panel. To assist the Council officers evaluating the proposal ARAP has provided the following comments as an independent assessment of the architectural merits of the proposal.

### Context

The building's relationship with the public plaza is a major contextual component of the development. Though the proposed building form generally responds appropriately to this context, detail aspects of the proposal require attention.

The respite terrace relates poorly to the adjacent public urban space. The proposed continuous glazed screen (approximately 1.8m high) provides an inappropriate interface between the terrace and the public space. Ideally, separation between the terrace and the plaza would be provided by locating the terrace at a slightly higher level than the public space. However, given the topography of the site and the access requirements of the RACF, this may be difficult to achieve. This needs to be a pleasant outdoor space for residents to enjoy but be protected from onlookers. Further development of the landscaping around the terrace and the types of screening

used is recommended. The terrace should respond to the square in a more urban manner, while still providing an appropriate level of separation required for the people using the terrace. Equally, this interface must contribute meaningfully to the building's urban address to the square.

The treatment of the northern boundary below the undercroft also requires further refinement. The intended use of the area created behind the basement egress stairs is unclear and the form of the stairs relates poorly to the proposed building form. This is an unwelcome intrusion into the space. It is suggested that the stairs could become part of a structural wall and be extended up to the underside of the undercroft. In developing this approach, consideration would need to be given to the configuration of columns within the undercroft space.

The location of stair No. 01 on the north-eastern corner of the building obscures the building entrance from Caldarra Avenue and degrades the relationship of the building with the street. It is suggested that the stairs be relocated further to the west between grid lines Y7 and Y8. To accommodate the relocation of the egress stair, some re-planning of the wards above will be necessary to ensure that the amenity of the dining areas is not compromised.

#### Scale/Density

The proposed density of the development is considered reasonable. However, the height of the building needs to be carefully treated, as the building is tall in relation to its context. While the Engadine Centre may be moving towards having higher buildings, adequate recognition must be given to current heights. It is suggested that the height of the building could be tempered by the use of landscape trees of a more significant scale within the public domain.

#### Built Form

The form of the building generally relates well to the surrounding public space. The two (2) storey undercroft helps to reinforce the link through the site to the eastern precinct of Engadine Centre with its community facilities. However, the creation of the south facing courtyard at the upper level is considered to be a less successful aspect of the proposed building form.

#### Amenity

The Level 2 courtyard is buried within the proposed building form. It is a concern that this space will be very dark and moist. The suitability of this space as an activities area (as outlined by the applicant) is questionable. It is recommended that this space be treated as an area that is accessible to residents but not utilised as an activities area. Ideally, it should be planted out with tall palms and other rain forest species and treated as a space that is looked into or walked through, rather than used as an activities area. It is appreciated that activity areas are important and it is suggested that the roof could be developed to be utilised as an activities area. Any space on the roof would need to be low key so that the apparent height is not increased. Structures would need to be located away from the building edge. If a good solution cannot be guaranteed then this option should not be pursued.

Consideration should be given to developing balustrades to terraces. The proposed fully glazed balustrades will provide little privacy to the residents occupying the terraces. The use of obscure/partially obscure balustrades is recommended.

#### Social Dimension

The proposed development is acknowledged as being a much needed facility that is appropriately sited within the community.

#### Aesthetics

The aesthetics of the proposal are considered to be reasonable.

The glazed awning provided to the building entrance is considered to be unnecessary, particularly if the egress stair is relocated and the entry is developed as outlined above.

### Resource & Energy Efficiency

The proposed louvres are noted on the drawings as being fixed light weight louvres, however, the applicant advised during the meeting that louvres would be adjustable. If the louvres are fixed, further consideration should be given to their orientation to ensure they are providing protection from excessive solar gain, while ensuring that sight lines from beds are not obscured. If the louvres are adjustable, consideration should be given to their operating system to ensure that they can be utilised effectively. In either case, further detail information is required to document the proposed louvres.

### Landscape

The Level 6 dementia garden is appropriately located and provides a reasonable level of amenity for residents. Trees within the public domain should be of a larger scale and planted at grade, not within raised planter beds. There needs to be a strong rationale for the placement of the trees either as a double row to form an avenue or a stronger single row. Consistency with the adjacent public plaza is required. Both the southern courtyard and the respite terrace require further development as outlined above.

### **Recommendation/Conclusion:**

The general form of the proposed building is a reasonable response to the site. The proposed density of the development is also considered reasonable; however, the height of the building needs to be carefully treated as the building is tall in relation to its context. It is suggested that the height of the building be tempered by the use of landscape trees of a more significant scale within the public domain.

It is recommended that egress stair No. 1 be relocated and the respite terrace developed to improve the building's connection to the public domain. Further development of the southern courtyard is also required. Detailed development of the proposed louvres and balustrades is also recommended to ensure the amenity of future residents.

Ideally these amendments should be made before the application is considered by the Joint Regional Planning Panel. Otherwise, appropriate conditions could be attached to any consent."

Colleen Baker  
ARAP Coordinator

29 October 2010