## Re: Amendments to DA 211-10

Our initial review of the amendments to the above development application suggests that many important issues have been successfully addressed, however the overall configuration of entries, lift circulation and communal open space issues essentially remain. Our outstanding concerns are as follows:

Overall issues that in our preliminary opinion, have NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED:

- Provision of sufficient numbers of units with sun access in compliance with guidelines of the RFDC and arrangement to allow better natural ventilation Ollson & Associates Architects are suggesting the RFDC rules be relaxed on this issue, however it may be possible to relocate the lifts towards the southern façade thereby making more room for potentially two single aspect north facing units in place of unit 805, 905, 1005 etc and absorbing part of the southern façade into the adjacent corner unit. GMU acknowledges that such a change would entail a fairly major redesign of the scheme, however our stance remains that the configuration should be amended to comply with the 10% maximum for south facing single-aspect units since currently there is no other development that overshadows the proposal.
- Appropriate visual treatment of the blank walls to the common boundaries with 18 George Street The painting of the blank wall in coloured bands aligning with each of the commercial floors is not considered a satisfactory approach should the wall remain blank for an extended period. However, in light of Council having received a pre-DA for 18 George Street, this issue may be considered with less weight since that suggests that 18 George Street might be more readily, more quickly redeveloped than previously thought. The side boundary wall will be most visible and should be thoughtfully treated and articulated to provide visual interest.
- In terms of design excellence, since GMU have not received accurate photomontages or a better indication
  of the real appearance of the materiality of the proposed development. In light of this, we are unable to
  make a definitive assessment of the level of design excellence of the proposal.

## Issues that have been PARTIALLY ADDRESSED:

- Arranging communal open spaces to provide a distinct and separate gathering area, drying space and with sufficient area to comply with the guidelines of the RFDC A drying space has not been provided, forcing the use of dryers which is less environmentally sustainable or the use of private balconies to dry clothes. Fold out drying racks behind solid portions of residential balustrades may be provided to alleviate this issue. However, potential security issues have been addressed with regard to communal space access, and privacy has been somewhat improved by defining a lobby area which could utilise milk glass / frosted glass to further provide some privacy to the communal open space from the lobby & gym.
- Provision of real deep soil planting and better landscaping at ground level that does not obstruct pedestrian movement and enjoys sunlight to allow for lush plantings The existing landscape to Deane Street that was restricting access has been entirely removed rather than reduced to allow access behind a pleasant landscaped strip or the like. No landscaping has been proposed where it can flourish at street level on George Street. GMU acknowledges that planting on structures (podiums) are appropriate in leu of deep soil however the proposed development should provide either a green roof or landscaping to the podium roof. Further, since there are no street trees to Dean Street in this location, thoughtfully located landscaping along the Deane Street frontage that does not restrict access or visibility would greatly improve amenity for

residents and commercial / retail tenants alike.

Issues that have been SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSED OR ADEQUATELY JUSTIFIED:

- Arrangement of core circulation to allow better separation and distinction between commercial and residential areas and paths of travel the joint entry remains, and one of the residential lifts remains accessible from commercial floors but if this will only be the case in the event of the commercial lift being out of order then that justifies the joint entry (to allow commercial tenants to temporarily access the "shared" lift) and it justifies the access to commercial floors which would normally be restricted by an electronic swipe.
- Access from all retail areas to garbage and loading areas, as well as improved access to and visibility from the street for retail areas – Access has been provided to garbage areas along with fixing problems with the compost room as well as addressing access and visibility issues to Dean Street retail.
- Other more minor issues to do with apartment layouts, providing accessible apartments, ground level safety, security and access to mail boxes, and provision of showers in commercial floors have been adequately addressed or explained.

OTHER ISSUES raised by Ollson & Associates in relation to a development application for 18 George Street by the owner of that site:

• The objection of the owner of 18 George Street to proposed zero setbacks to podium levels of 15 Deane Street – The DCP controls require podiums to be built to front boundaries and allow them to be built to rear and side boundaries, and this should remain true and be encouraged for both proposed developments for 18 George Street and 15 Deane Street. This would maximise the ability to provide good separation and minimize bulk above podium levels, and subsequent overshadowing for both proposed developments.

I hope that the above points for discussion will provide you with sufficient material to bring to the JRPP meeting on Friday. With kind regards,

## Paul Adkinson



**Architects and Urban Designers** 

Tel: 02 9460 6088 Fax: 02 9460 6099

Studio 201 8 Clarke Street Crows Nest NSW 2065

PO Box 790 Crows Nest NSW 1585

Email: padkinson@gmu.com.au

No virus found in this incoming message. Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.449 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/3509 - Release Date: 03/15/11 19:34:00