

John Brunton (9710 0474)
File Ref: DA10/1359

24 March, 2011

Dr John Roseth
Chairman
Sydney East Region Joint Regional Planning Panel
GPO Box 3415
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir

**Council Submission: JRPP Reference Number 2011SYE005
(DA10/1359) 558-566 President Avenue, Sutherland
Residential Flat Building containing 31 units**
[In response, please quote File Ref: DA10/1359]

At its meeting of 21 March 2011 Council considered a report in relation to this application for residential development adjoining the southern section of the Sutherland commercial centre. It was resolved that the Panel be informed that Council considers that the proposal is unsatisfactory. In particular, Council concluded that the objection under State Environmental Planning Policy No. 1 does not warrant support.

As the basement car park projects beyond the footprint of the building, the proposed development does not satisfy the development standard for landscaped area. On a site of this size there should be no reason why the required amount of landscaped area should not be achieved. The Council resolution stated that "the objection under State Environmental Planning Policy No 1 is not supported because the proposal could be configured to increase the quantity of landscaped area and the general quality of the landscaping could be significantly improved".

Landscaping

State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 recognises that the quality of residential development requires that "landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in greater aesthetic quality and amenity for both occupants and the adjoining public domain Landscape design should optimise usability, privacy and social opportunity, equitable access and respect for neighbours' amenity, and provide for practical establishment and long term management."

This proposal falls well short of satisfying this principle. Council was of the opinion that too little attention has been given to retaining existing vegetation. Generally, the landscaping is designed to occupy the space not required for buildings. This should not be the purpose of the landscaping. It needs to be designed so that it has an inherent quality which benefits occupants, neighbours and the broader community. None of these parties is well served by this proposal.

Design Quality

When considering this application Council had the benefit of a report from its Architectural Review Advisory Panel. This expert Panel did not support the proposal. It identified some significant shortcomings in the proposal which result in the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 not being satisfied. Council endorsed the conclusions in the report and resolved that "the concerns about the architectural form and treatment of the proposal warrant improvements to the design".

Even if the JRPP is inclined to contemplate approval of the proposal Council requests that attention be given to the design shortcomings through the imposition of conditions of consent, if that is possible.

Affordable Housing

Due to its desire to facilitate affordable housing, Council is keen to promote developments such as this proposal. Elements such as the size of the dwellings, the limited provision of car parking and the simplified form of the building illustrate that this is intended to satisfy a segment of the market which requires low cost housing. However, affordable housing does not, by necessity, need to be poor quality.

Conclusion

This application fails to satisfy the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 and State Environmental Planning Policy No. 1. Council submits that the requested variation to the development standard for landscaped area should not be granted. Consequently, the development application should be refused.

Yours faithfully

John Brunton
Director - Environmental Services
for J W Rayner
General Manager