

## Supplementary Report to Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel

<b>JRPP No:</b>	<b>2011SYW045</b>
<b>DA No:</b>	<b>JRPP-11-650</b>
<b>Local Government Area:</b>	<b>Blacktown</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>7 multi-level residential flat buildings ranging in height from 2-5 storeys</b>
<b>Development Type:</b>	<b>“Regional Development” – Capital Investment Value &gt;\$20 million</b>
<b>Lodgement Date:</b>	<b>5 April 2011</b>
<b>Land/Address:</b>	<b>Lot 42, DP 1004176, H/N 8 Myrtle Street, Prospect</b>
<b>Land Zoning:</b>	<b>2(c) Residential pursuant to Blacktown Local Environmental Plan 1988</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Turner Hughes Architects Pty Limited</b>
<b>Previous Resolution:</b>	<b>Matter deferred by JRPP at its meeting of 13 December 2011</b>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Approval</b>
<b>Report Author:</b>	<b>Rebecca Gordon, Town Planner</b>
<b>Instructing Officers:</b>	<b>Judith Portelli, Manager Development Services &amp; Administration and Glennys James, Director City Strategy &amp; Development</b>



Figure: *Photomontage of the Proposed Development*

## ASSESSMENT REPORT

### CONTENTS

1.	Summary	Page 2
2.	Background	Page 3
3.	Peer Review Process	Page 3
4.	Peer Recommendations and Applicant's Response	Page 5
5.	Independent Consultants' Supplementary Comments	Page 34
6.	Conclusion	Page 37
7.	Recommendation	Page 38

### TABLE

Peer Review Recommendations and the Applicant's and Council Officers' Responses	Page 6
---	--------

### ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Council Development Assessment Report on the Development Application as considered by the JRPP on 13 December 2011 and DA Plans
Attachment 2	Consultants' Briefs
Attachment 3	Independent Traffic Peer Review Report
Attachment 4	Independent Urban Design Peer Review Report
Attachment 5	Applicant's Supplementary Drawings
Attachment 6	Amended Draft Conditions of Consent

## 1. Summary

---

- 1.1 On 13 December 2011 the Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel (JRPP) considered a Development Application (DA) for the construction of 7 multi-level residential flat buildings ranging in height from 2 to 5 storeys over basement car parking at Lot 42, DP 1004176, H/N 8 Myrtle Street, Prospect.
- 1.2 The Panel unanimously deferred its determination of the DA pending the submission of a reports from:
  - (a) an independently chosen acknowledged **expert Urban Designer**. The report was to comment on whether the proposed development was suitable in its context, and provide advice about the SEPP 65 Assessment and matters relating to context, bulk and scale, and built form; and
  - (b) an independently chosen acknowledged **expert Traffic Engineer**. The report was to comment on the cumulative effect on existing traffic as a result of the proposed development and the proposed Department of Housing redevelopment in Flushcombe Road, and what impact the development will have on the local road network, in particular the intersection of Flushcombe Road and Myrtle Street.
- 1.3 The peer review process has now concluded.

- 1.4 Accordingly, the Application is referred back to the Sydney West JRPP for further consideration and determination.
- 1.5 Council Officers have considered the recommendations and comments made by the Independent Traffic and Urban Design Consultants and the applicant's response to each identified issue. After detailed consideration and review of both the Independent Consultants' and the Applicant's advices, it is **recommended** that the DA be **approved** subject to amended conditions as held at Attachment 6 to this report.

## 2. Background

---

- 2.1 Blacktown City Council is in receipt of a Development Application (DA) from Turner Hughes Architects Pty Ltd on behalf of Valiant Timber and Hardware Co Pty Limited for the construction of 7 multi-level residential flat buildings ranging in height from 2 to 5 storeys over basement car parking at Lot 42, DP 1004176, H/N 8 Myrtle Street, Prospect. The proposal has a Capital Investment Value of \$22.7 million and therefore constitutes "Regional Development" requiring determination by a Joint Regional Planning Panel (JRPP).
- 2.2 Following assessment and public notification of the proposal, a detailed report on the Application was forwarded to the Sydney West Region JRPP for consideration at their meeting of 13 December 2011. The report concluded that the proposal is satisfactory in terms of bulk and scale, privacy, overshadowing, parking, traffic impacts, stormwater drainage and the like. The proposal was also considered consistent with the objectives of State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 65 and was considered satisfactory in terms of the relevant matters for consideration pursuant to Section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment (EP&A) Act 1979, and therefore was recommended for approval subject to conditions. A copy of Council's Development Assessment Report, the Development Application plans and the original "draft" conditions of consent are included at **Attachment 1** to this report.
- 2.3 At the JRPP meeting Councillors and members of the public made deputations to the Panel against the approval. The applicant's consultants then addressed the Panel in favour of the proposal. After careful consideration, the JRPP resolved the following:

*"The Panel unanimously deferred the decision because the Panel remains unconvinced by the Urban Design arguments that the development is suitable in its context. The Panel has decided to require a further urban design report from an independently chosen acknowledged expert in Urban Design to provide advice about the SEPP 65 assessment especially about matters of context, bulk and scale and built form and a report from an independently chosen acknowledged expert traffic engineer for comment on the cumulative effect on existing traffic, of the traffic from this development and the proposed Department of Housing estate in Flushcombe Road and the effect, in particular, on the intersection of Flushcombe Road and Myrtle Street.*

*These additional reports, when received, are to be published on the JRPP website and the applicant and members of the public may comment in writing or to the next JRPP meeting when this will be reconsidered."*

## 3. Peer Review Process

---

- 3.1 Following the JRPP meeting of 13 December 2011, draft briefs were prepared for the engagement of the expert independent consultants in accordance with the Panel's resolution. Copies of the consultant's briefs are included at **Attachment 2**.

3.2 The draft briefs, together with a list of traffic consultants and urban designers, were forwarded to the JRPP for their consideration on 16 December 2011. The traffic consultants and urban designers selected included consultants with knowledge of the Blacktown LGA and were also obtained from the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) website. The Panel was able to select any consultant and was not limited to the list provided.

3.3 Once the briefs had been endorsed by the JRPP they were sent to the following consultants for a fee quote:

Traffic Consultants:

- Road Delay Solutions Pty Limited
- Transport & Traffic Planning Associates
- Traffix

Urban Design Consultants:

- Architectus
- Annand Alcock
- Alan Jack Cottier

3.4 Following receipt, the fee quotes were forwarded to the Panel who was requested to select an Urban Designer and Traffic Consultant to undertake the required independent reviews. The Panel agreed that Traffix and Architectus should be engaged. **Neither Council nor the applicant were involved in the selection process.**

3.5 The applicant was advised, however, that they would be responsible for payment of the reports. In this regard, the fee was to be paid directly to Council and Council would hold the money in trust. Once the terms of the brief had been satisfied, Council would then pay the consultants. It is worth noting that in the event the applicant had not agreed to pay for the reports, Council would have instructed the Panel to determine the Application on the basis of the information submitted to date.

3.6 As the applicant agreed to pay for the reports, the consultants (Traffix and Architectus) were engaged on 15 February 2012. The consultants were instructed to undertake their independent reviews and forward their reports to Council on completion. As part of the peer review process the independent consultants were provided with copies of all relevant information including the JRPP Report, Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE), DA drawings, the applicant's Traffic Impact Assessment, minutes from the Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee (SRDAC) and Local Traffic Committee (LTC) meetings, and a summary of the public submissions etc.

3.7 Traffix submitted their Independent Traffic Report on 1 March 2012 and Architectus submitted their Independent Urban Design Report on 21 March 2012. Copies of the independent consultants' peer reviews are included at **Attachments 3 and 4** respectively. On receipt of the reports a review was undertaken to ensure that the terms of the brief had been satisfied. On 22 March 2012 Council Officers then forwarded the reports to the Panel and waited for further instructions. It was at this time that the Panel published the reports on the JRPP website.

3.8 The Panel advised Council Officers that copies of the reports could be forwarded to the applicant for any response they wished to make. In this regard it was considered reasonable to allow the applicant to provide a justified response to the independent consultants' recommendations before referring the matter back to the Panel. Likewise, if the applicant

was unable to respond/make changes in line with the independent consultants' recommendations, it was considered appropriate that this be ascertained prior to reporting the matter back to the Panel. To ensure impartiality, the applicant was advised, however, that it was inappropriate to meet with the independent consultants when preparing any response to the proposed recommendations.

#### **4. Peer Recommendations and Applicant's Response**

---

- 4.1 On 24 April 2012 the applicant submitted a response to each recommendation made within the independent peer reviews. The applicant, Turner Hughes Architects, responded to the Independent Traffic Report prepared by Traffix, but engaged their own urban design expert, Urbis, to respond to the Independent Urban Design recommendations proposed by Architectus.
- 4.2 The applicant's response was provided in table format and included both independent consultants' recommendations, the applicant's proposed amendment to each recommendation and an assessment of the proposed amendments. Where the independent consultant's recommendation has not been taken up, an alternative response has been made by the applicant to address the underlying intent behind the recommendation. To simplify the assessment process, the applicant's table has been duplicated below. The table, however, has been modified to also include a Council Officer comment/recommendation to each of the identified issues. The Independent Traffic Consultant's recommendations are summarised under points 1-19 in the following table, while the Independent Urban Designer's recommendations are summarised under points 20-31.
- 4.3 As part of the assessment process, the Independent Traffic Report was forwarded to Council's Traffic Section and the Independent Urban Design Report was forwarded to Council's Traffic Section and Drainage Section for comment. The responses received from these Sections of Council have also been included in the following table.

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
The Independent Traffic Consultant has highlighted a number of issues that should be addressed as follows:			
<b>Main Vehicular Site Access</b>			
<p>1. The main site access is proposed via the existing roundabout within the shopping centre, which is itself accessed via the adjacent roundabout at Myrtle Street. There is however a non-compliance with this access as indicated on the submitted plans that may have significant implications for the development. Specifically, Drawing DA101 Revision L shows a ramp grade of 1 in 20 (5%) on approach to the roundabout. This plan however shows a height difference of 1.45 metres over a length of about 6 metres, from RL 65.00 internally to RL 66.45 at the roundabout. This is a grade of 20% rather than 1 in 20 (5%), which is unacceptable.</p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p>	<p>It is believed that the Engineer has confused an existing contour line marker of RL 65.00 with a level indicative of the finished level of the drive at this point. Sketch 157.SK04 (i.e. Plan 1 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>) shows a section through the driveway with the intended finished levels at changes in grade. The drawing demonstrates that the intended levels are in line with the requirements and no modification to the proposed grades is required.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed as part of the assessment process for the original DA. In this regard, concerns were raised in relation to the driveway gradients and the applicant was requested to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of AS 2890.1 (2004). As a result, changes were made to the proposed driveway gradients.</p> <p>As part of this peer review process, Council's Traffic Management Section (TMS) was requested to reassess this issue and assess the submitted driveway long sections (Sketch 157.SK04) submitted by the applicant. Council's TMS has confirmed that the proposed driveway gradients are in accordance with AS2890.1 (2004) and AS2890.2 (2002). No further amendments are therefore considered necessary. A <b>condition</b>, however, will be imposed on any consent granted to ensure the driveway grades comply with the relevant Australian Standard and the applicant's plan 157.SK04.</p>

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<b>Secondary Vehicular Site Access</b>			
2. The secondary site access directly onto Myrtle Street should only be considered if it provides a planning benefit. This could include the fact that a secondary access provides a 'safety valve' in the event of an accident within the main shopping centre access, or possibly an emergency evacuation.	No amendment proposed.	From a planning perspective the applicant believes there are numerous benefits to having 2 access points, including the safety benefits noted. The Myrtle Street access presents as the clear address and link to the residential neighbourhood for the development.	<p>This matter was referred to Council's TMS for comment. Council's Traffic Engineers believe that direct access to Myrtle Street, in the form of right-in and left-in/left-out movements, should be retained as it provides alternative access to the development. It could also be used in an emergency if the main access driveway (i.e. via the existing roundabout within the shopping centre) was blocked.</p> <p>Council's TMS have requested that the proposed exit driveway off Myrtle Street be positioned/angled in such a way that will physically prevent right-turn movements out of the proposed development. Appropriate signage is also to be provided to advise residents/visitors that it is 'left turn exit only'. Details are to be submitted for the separate approval of Council's Manager Transport and City Projects prior to the release of any Construction Certificate. A suitable <b>condition</b> addressing this matter forms part of the original "draft" conditions of consent [i.e. Condition 4.2.1(b)].</p>
3. While no objection is raised to the secondary access (Myrtle Street access),	Driveway levels revised as per attached sketch	A long section of the amended driveway is attached (i.e. 157.SK05 being Plan 2 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> demonstrating compliance with the grades noted. At	Council Officers are satisfied that the amended driveway gradients are now in accordance with AS2890.1 (2004) and AS2890.2 (2002). It is

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<p>the following concerns are raised:</p> <p><b>3(a)</b> Drawing DA101 (Revision L) shows a change in level from RL63.3 within the site to RL64.3 near the property boundary. This suggests a gradient of about 15% which is significantly more than the 5% permitted under Clause 3.3 of AS2890.1 (2004). The difference in height (about 600mm) will probably require the Ground Floor to be raised by this amount, which may be difficult to achieve and have adverse consequences.</p>	<p>157.SK05 (i.e. Plan 2 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> and Plan 157.SK08 (i.e. Plan 5 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>. Propose increase in Block G roof ridge by 200mm to RL 72.55.</p>	<p>the critical point for Building G the internal road grade will only be 200mm above the submitted level. With only a minor change in the road level, Block G roof level would be no more than 200mm higher. The impact of this change on overshadowing and potential overlooking will be unperceivable. The roof will still be well below the height plane at this location.</p>	<p>recommended that a <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent to ensure that any Construction Certificate Plans comply with the applicant's submitted plans 157.SK05 &amp; 157.SK08 and the relevant Australian Standards.</p> <p>It is noted that the overall height of Block G (i.e. building fronting Myrtle Street adjacent to the eastern boundary) will increase by a maximum of 200mm. The required increase is considered minor and will not alter the overall bulk and scale of the building. The shadow diagrams submitted with the original DA indicate that the increased height to the building will only have a minor additional impact on the adjoining residents from 3pm onwards. The dwelling located adjacent to Block G will not experience any additional shadow impacts during the earlier part of the day. The proposed increase to the roof ridge of Block G will be required to be shown on any Construction Certificate Plans and will be addressed as a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted.</p>
<p><b>3(b)</b> The left-turn exit movement onto Myrtle Street introduces potential head-light glare issues which need to be considered and addressed. Given that there is limited scope to prevent right-turn exit movements, this may</p>	<p>Proposed revision of gate operation to exclude exit via Myrtle Street by non-emergency vehicles between</p>	<p>The applicant feels that this entry is valuable in establishing a clear Myrtle Street address for the residential development.</p> <p>Any other development of the site would require a driveway to the street which would have a similar impact on the neighbours. It is proposed, however,</p>	<p>The proposed exit driveway off Myrtle Street will be positioned/angled in such a way that will physically prevent right-turn movements out of the proposed development. Appropriate signage will also be provided to advise residents/visitors that it is 'left-turn only'. A suitable <b>condition</b> addressing</p>



INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
also be an issue for other residential dwellings opposite the driveway.	the hours of 10pm and 6am.	that the access control gates at this exit will be time locked to not open during the hours of the night that sleep disturbance is likely to occur. Exiting cars would be directed to the roundabout during that time. Gate will only be activated in emergency events during these hours.	<p>this matter forms part of the original “draft” conditions of consent [i.e. Condition 4.2.1(b)].</p> <p>It is recognised, however, that left-turn exit movements onto Myrtle Street may cause potential headlight glare issues at night. It is considered that the applicant’s proposal to install time controlled gates at this location will be a satisfactory means of mitigating headlight glare during sleep disturbance hours. Details of the access control gates and proposed time controlled locking mechanisms will be required for Council’s separate approval prior to release of any Construction Certificate. It is recommended that a suitable <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent to address this matter. To address concerns raised by the Independent Urban Designer, the gate will be required to be an open style gate to allow direct sightlines in and out of the development. Given the gate will be located 10 metres back from the front property boundary, it is still considered that an open style gate will adequately address this concern. A further <b>condition</b> will also be imposed to ensure that the gates remained locked between the hours of 10pm and 6am.</p>
<b>3(c)</b> The entry and exit movements across the footpath may be considered an unnecessary conflict point for	No amendment proposed	The driveways have been designed to maintain levels at the boundary and only change grade internal to the	The main site access is proposed via the existing roundabout within the shopping centre. The proposed driveway off Myrtle Street will be limited

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
pedestrians, given that this driveway is not required for capacity reasons.		<p>site.</p> <p>While not required for capacity reasons, the applicant considers a secondary driveway to be good practice and notes this was actively encouraged by Council Traffic Engineers during all pre-submission discussions.</p>	to right-in and left-in/left-out movements only. To ensure pedestrian safety is not compromised, a <b>condition</b> will be imposed to ensure selected landscaping and fencing does not obstruct motorist sightlines in this location.
<b>Pedestrian Safety</b>			
<p>4. The main entry-exit driveway onto the 'internal' roundabout appears to be constructed with kerb returns, such that vehicles have priority over pedestrians (as occurs at the roundabout at Myrtle Street or indeed any other roundabout on a public road). It is considered that the driveway should be constructed with laybacks, so that pedestrians have priority across this driveway frontage on a level grade. This comment is equally valid in relation to the secondary driveway onto Myrtle Street.</p>	<p>Refer attached sketch 157.SK09 (i.e. Plan 6 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>.</p> <p>Revised footpath proposal connecting Myrtle Street, entry gates and shopping centre carpark.</p>	<p>The driveways have been redesigned to meet the current boundary levels. This allows for the footpath levels to be maintained and given preference.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Independent Traffic Consultant's recommendation, the main entry-exit driveway proposed via the existing roundabout within the shopping centre has been redesigned to give pedestrians priority over vehicles. Council's TMS has recommended that the driveway off the roundabout be constructed with laybacks or contrast materials to give pedestrian priority over vehicles. It is recommended that a suitable <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent granted to address this matter and to ensure that the footpath is constructed generally in accordance with the applicant's sketch 157.SK09.</p> <p>The issue of pedestrian safety at the secondary driveway onto Myrtle Street is addressed under point 3(c) above.</p>
<p>5. It is considered that the footpath connection between this driveway</p>	<p>Refer attached sketched. 157.SK09</p>	<p>The applicant is of the understanding that the shopping centre ramp is not used for truck access to</p>	<p>The footpath has been redesigned to give priority to pedestrians over vehicles (see point 4. above).</p>

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<p>crossing and the shopping centre along the eastern side of the shopping centre access is unresolved and this is an issue for the public generally as well as residents of the subject development. Specifically, the footpath leads pedestrians to the supermarket loading dock ramp area, where no crossing opportunity is available and where trucks presumably reverse down the ramp across an apron area that will be traversed by pedestrians.</p> <p>This situation is exacerbated by the relatively poor pedestrian connectivity along the western side of the shopping centre access, which is narrow and has steep gradients. This would require cooperation with the adjoining landowner and may not be deliverable in the context of this development application.</p>	<p>(i.e. Plan 6 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>. Revised footpath proposal connecting Myrtle Street entry gates and the shopping centre carpark.</p>	<p>the docks.</p> <p>All truck access to the shopping centre is via the southernmost Flushcombe Road driveways, generally not mixing with the shoppers or the future resident car traffic using the roundabout.</p> <p>The applicant believes the revised footpath design improves the situation greatly and allows a good interface that the adjoining land owners could work with to improve connections and access within their site.</p>	<p>It is recognised that to some degree, however, the pedestrian footpath connection will remain unresolved given the proposal is limited to the subject property only. To further improve pedestrian safety in this location, the adjoining property owners would be required to undertake works within the shopping centre carpark. This, however, is outside the scope of the application.</p> <p>As truck access and loading/unloading operations are typically undertaken at the rear of the shopping centre via the southernmost Flushcombe Road driveway, Council Officers are satisfied that pedestrians will not be channelled to an area where they will be mixing with truck movements.</p>
<b>Parking Provision</b>			
<p><b>6.</b> It is noted that the main entry driveway from the roundabout is not controlled by boom gates on the plans provided. In our view, this is desirable in order to provide security and avoid intrusion by shopping</p>	<p>Main access gates are to be on a timed operation. Boom gates are to be added to all</p>	<p>Gates have been indicated at this location which would prevent shopping centre traffic from entering the site.</p> <p>The main gates, however, will be left open during the</p>	<p>Council's TMS supports the provision of boom gates at the main entry driveways to exclude shopping centre visitors from parking within the residential development. It is recommended that a suitable <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent to</p>

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
centre traffic.	driveways and will be used when the main gates are open.	daylight hours to satisfy the recommendations of the Independent Urban Designer. During the daylight period, when the gates are locked open, boom gates will be used to prevent intrusion of shopping centre traffic.	address this matter.
<b>Traffic Generation and External Traffic Impacts</b>			
7. The Traffic Report does not consider the performance of the main intersection of Myrtle Street with Flushcombe Road. Nevertheless, we are in possession of separate traffic count data and have undertaken a Sidra analysis which demonstrates satisfactory operation, with Level of Service A and minimal delays.	No amendment required.		It is acknowledged that the Independent Traffic Consultant has undertaken an analysis of the Myrtle Street and Flushcombe Road intersection, and has found that the intersection will operate at a Level of Service "A" and will have minimal delays. The Level of Service (LOS) categories range from "A" to "F", with "A" being a good LOS. The proposed development is therefore unlikely to have any negative traffic impacts on the surrounding road network.
8. In the event that the mid-site access onto Myrtle Street is retained, vehicles turning right into this driveway will block through traffic in the event that there is kerbside on-street parking opposite the driveway. On this basis we would recommend the introduction of "No Stopping" restrictions opposite the driveway for a short distance on approach and departure.	No amendment proposed.	The applicant suggests that any "No Stopping" zone should be time limited, similar to a clearway, so that the impact is limited to only when it will be effective, nominally the afternoon peak.	Council's TMS agree that "No Stopping" restrictions should be introduced opposite the Myrtle Street driveway. The restrictions will require the separate approval of the Local Traffic Committee (LTC) at which time details regarding the length of the "No Stopping" Zone and any time restrictions will be determined. It is recommended that as a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted the applicant will be required to make application to

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
			Council's LTC to address this matter. Any Construction Certificate plans are to be prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the LTC. <b>Condition 6.2.2</b> has been included accordingly.
<b>Residential Environmental Amenity Impacts</b>			
9. Myrtle Street is a residential collector road to the east of the subject site and it therefore has a maximum environmental amenity threshold of 500 veh/hr. The surveys reported upon in the Varga Traffic report (i.e. the applicant's traffic consultant) show that this section of Myrtle Street presently carries a maximum of 245 veh/hr (two-way) in the AM peak (which occurs between 7.30am and 8.30am); and a maximum of 386 veh/hr in the PM peak (which occurs between 4.30pm and 5.30pm). These volumes are well below the maximum threshold level of 500 veh/hr and it is concluded that the development creates no unacceptable amenity impacts arising from its traffic generation.	No amendment required.		The Independent Traffic Consultant has reviewed the Traffic Report submitted by the applicant. The Independent Traffic Consultant is satisfied that the traffic generated by the proposed development will not create any unacceptable amenity impacts. Based on the Independent Traffic Consultant's conclusion, further investigations into traffic generation are therefore considered unnecessary.
<b>External Road Improvements</b>			
10. It is considered that there is no basis for	No amendment		The Independent Traffic Consultant has reviewed

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
any external road network improvements to accommodate the proposed development, due to the low traffic volumes that are generated.	required.		the anticipated traffic volumes and is satisfied that the traffic generated by the proposed development will not create any unacceptable amenity impacts. The Independent Traffic Consultant has concluded that no improvements/upgrades are required to the external road network given the development will generate low traffic volumes.
<b>Internal Design Aspects</b>			
<b>11.</b> The driveway non-compliances, as discussed above, raise potentially significant issues in order to achieve compliant gradients.	Amendments as detailed above and on sketch 157.SK04 (i.e. Plan 1 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> , sketch 157.SK05 (i.e. Plan 2 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> and Plan 157.SK08 (i.e. Plan 5 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> .	Driveway grades have been altered to address the issues noted.	See comments under Points 1 and 3(a) above.
<b>12.</b> The necessity for the secondary access and the issues identified above in relation to this driveway including adverse gradients and headlight glare issues.	Amendments as detailed above to address potential headlight glare.	There are numerous benefits to having 2 access points, including the safety benefits noted by the Independent Traffic Consultant. The Myrtle Street access presents as the clear address and link to the residential neighbourhood for the development. Time	See comments under Points 2, 3(a) and 3(b) above.

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
		controls on gates will be used to address headlight glare issues.	
13. The pedestrian issues as discussed above.	Amendments as detailed above.		See comments under Points 3(c), 4 and 5 above.
14. The inadequate geometry of the left-turn from Block A to the exit driveway, which requires a swept path analysis to be undertaken as identified by Council's Traffic Committee.	Ramp access to basement to be deleted at Block A.	This ramp access to Block A will be deleted and cars will be directed to the Block B ramps. The applicant doesn't believe this is a capacity issue as the basement will still be served by 3 entries providing good access and fail safety in the event one is under repair. This will free up and resolve the possible conflict at the entry and address the turning path issue.	Council's Town Planning and TMS raise no objection to the deletion of the access ramp located under Block A given that access to the basement carpark will still be available via 3 separate ramps. The deletion of this 4 <sup>th</sup> ramp addresses the Independent Traffic Consultant's concern regarding left-turn movements out of the basement carpark, without compromising the access arrangements on site and is therefore considered a satisfactory solution to the problem. The deletion of the 4 <sup>th</sup> access ramp also creates an opportunity to provide additional car parking/storage at the basement level, and additional landscaping at the ground level. Details of the revised car parking and access arrangements in this location will be required for the separate approval of Council prior to release of any Construction Certificate. It is recommended that a suitable <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent to address this matter.
15. A swept path analysis to demonstrate	Refer 157.SK16 (i.e.		Drawings 157.SK16 and 157.SK17 were reviewed

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
that uninterrupted two-way flow is possible at the ramp that connects to the Estate Road from the 'internal' roundabout. Priority control is also desirable at this junction to reinforce the intended priority and reduce conflicts, given that all traffic passes through this junction by the confluence of both access driveways.	Plan 13 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> and 157.SK17 (i.e. Plan 14 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> with swept paths provided by Varga Traffic Planning (i.e. the applicant's traffic consultant). Splays added to ramp junction with internal road as detailed in sketch.		by Council's TMS. The TMS advised that the swept path analysis satisfactorily demonstrates that unrestricted 2-way flow is available on the ramp connecting the internal "estate road" with the shopping centre roundabout. The TMS has recommended that appropriate line-marking and signage be installed at the T-junction to ensure vehicles on the internal "estate road" are given priority. It is recommended that this matter be addressed via a suitable <b>condition</b> of any consent.
<b>16.</b> Relocation of all columns 750mm back from the parking aisles on Basement carpark level to comply with Figure 5.2 of AS 2890.1 (2004).	No amendment proposed as car spaces are AS2890.1 (2004) compliant.	Refer to sketch 157.SK06 (i.e. Plan 3 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> showing the relationship between the area required for a parked vehicle and the adjoining columns. The sketch includes an allowance for future cage garages by residents.	Council's TMS has reviewed drawing 157.SK06 and has confirmed that the basement car parking spaces and associated columns have been designed in accordance with AS2890.1 (2004). A standard <b>condition</b> has been included to ensure that the design of all carparking areas, including the car space dimensions, aisle widths, ramp grades, etc., comply with AS2890.1 (2004) and AS 2890.2 (2002).



INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<b>Service Vehicles</b>			
<b>17.</b> The service vehicle access is proposed for a 9.5m garbage truck via the secondary access onto Myrtle Street. As discussed above, this driveway is deficient even for cars and is totally unsuited for trucks in view of the steep gradients that arise from the stated RLs. Compliance with AS 2890.2 (2002) will be required, which requires a gradient of 1 in 20 (5%) for a distance of 6.0 metres within the site, then transitions beyond that to achieve a change of grade of no more than 6.25% over a length of 7.0 metres of travel.	Refer revised driveway as detailed above and in sketch 157.SK05 (i.e. Plan 2 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> and 157.SK08 (i.e. Plan 5 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> to address deficiencies.	A long section of the amended driveway is attached (i.e. 157.SK05 being Plan 2 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> demonstrating compliance with the grades noted.	Council Officers are satisfied that the amended driveway gradients are now in accordance with AS2890.1 (2004) and AS2890.2 (2002). It is recommended that a <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent granted to address this matter and ensure compliance with submitted plans 157.SK05 and 157.SK08.
<b>18.</b> A swept path analysis is required to demonstrate satisfactory site access and also turning within the reversing area provided for garbage trucks. We also support the Traffic Committee recommendation that this area be signposted as "No Stopping".	Refer 157.SK15 (i.e. Plan 12 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> showing truck swept paths provided by Varga Traffic Planning (i.e. the applicant's traffic consultant).	Swept paths suggest a reduction of the hard surface area is practical.  Area will be signposted and supervised by the on-site Building Manager.	The submitted swept path analysis demonstrates that sufficient area is provided on site for garbage trucks to access the site, and enter and exit the site in a forward direction. A suitable <b>condition</b> will be imposed on any consent granted to ensure the truck turning area is signposted as "No Stopping".

INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY TRAFFIX			
INDEPENDENT TRAFFIC CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICERS' COMMENTS
<b>Construction Traffic Impacts</b>			
<p><b>19.</b> It is considered that a standard condition of consent should be imposed on the development requiring the preparation of a detailed Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan. It is possible that the secondary access onto Myrtle Street could be provided for construction access purposes to overcome conflicts with shopping centre traffic. This would be closed in the event that this secondary driveway system cannot be designed to be compliant and/or if headlight glare issues cannot be overcome.</p>	<p>Agree that a detailed construction plan will be needed.</p>	<p>Note plan cannot be prepared for the Development Application as it will be developed in consultation with the chosen builders, as it needs to account for construction methods and site staging.</p> <p>Condition if imposed should be prior to release of Construction Certificate.</p>	<p>As recommended by the Independent Traffic Consultant a standard <b>condition</b> will be imposed on any development consent granted requiring the submission of a Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan prior to the release of any Construction Certificate. To overcome conflicts with shopping centre traffic, it will be recommended that the Myrtle Street access point be utilised during the construction period. As outlined under point 2 above, the Myrtle Street access point provides the development with a the clear sense of address and link to the residential neighbourhood. It also provides safety benefits and an alternate means of entering/exiting the development. Deletion of this secondary access point is not considered appropriate, given that gradient and headlight glare issues have been satisfactorily addressed as discussed under points 3(a) and 3(b) above.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<p>The Independent Urban Design Consultant has indicated that the layout of the buildings on the site is generally well done. In this regard the Consultant has indicated that there is a clear legible roadway that runs north-south through the site and that the roadway terminates with a view of the open space/drainage land at the southern end. It has also been noted that the buildings have a range of heights that respond well to the edge conditions of the site. However, the Independent Urban Design Consultant has also recognised that there are a number of site planning and building design issues that should be addressed as follows:</p>			
<b>Entry Gates</b>			
<p><b>20.</b> The need for the gates at the entry is questioned. An open entry is more compatible with the physical and social nature of the neighbourhood. Gated communities are to be discouraged for the social well-being of the wider community. [Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC) p.56 Safety].</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 1:</b></p> <p><b>Delete the entry gates.</b></p>	<p>Propose gates that are on time switch, and boom gates to control entry during the day.</p>	<p>While there is merit in having an open entry gate, the proximity of the site to the adjacent shopping centre raises concerns with regard to shoppers utilising the site as overflow parking. As a compromise, boom gates at both entry points are proposed to control access to and from the site during the day, while the separate main entry gates at both entry points will only be controlled via access security during the night (nominally between 6pm-7am). Further, between 10pm and 6am only entry movements will be permitted from the Myrtle Street driveway. This will address safety concerns and the impact of headlight glare to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>In addition, the driveway gates will assist to demarcate between the public and private domain. The proposed fence treatment will be an open metal fence allowing direct sightlines in and out of the development. It is noted that no</p>	<p>It is noted that the sliding entry gates at both entry points will only control access to and from the site at night. Between the hours of 7am and 6pm the sliding gates will remain open with boom gates operable, and therefore satisfies the intent behind the Independent Consultant's recommendation. Although the gates will be closed at night, the selected fencing materials will ensure that direct sightlines in and out of the development are maintained. For this reason it is considered that the gates will not segregate the development from the wider community. The provision of gates at night will also help to address crime and safety concerns (e.g. theft) raised by the Blacktown Police Crime Prevention Officer, and will assist in addressing potential headlight glare impacts as discussed under point 3(b) above.</p> <p>Given that the site is located adjacent to a shopping centre, Council Officers also support the provision of boom gates at the entry/exit driveways. The boom gates are considered necessary to prevent retail customers from accessing the on-site visitor car parking spaces. Suitable <b>conditions</b> will</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
		resident objections were raised in relation to the appearance of the proposed gates on the streetscape.	be imposed on any consent to ensure that the boom gates and entry gates operate in the manner described.
<b>Streetscape</b>			
<p><b>21.</b> The internal street is on deep soil providing a valuable opportunity to put street trees along the street thereby softening the built environment, providing shade for cars and pedestrians and lowering the urban heat effect caused by hard surfaces. The objective should be to achieve at least 50% tree canopy cover of the street and parking spaces. The trees should be planted as street trees and not be contained within low walls. (RFDC p.20-21 deep soil).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 2:</b></p> <p><i>Provide sufficient tree planting to provide at least 50% canopy cover once the trees are mature to the internal street and the space between the buildings.</i></p>	<p>Increased tree planting along the western side of the internal Estate Road proposed as per this recommendation, through a relocation of parking spaces.</p> <p>Refer to 157.SK07 (i.e. Plan 4 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>).</p>	<p>The report recommendation is addressed through the proposed amendment, which will improve upon the existing situation by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increasing the number of street trees along the internal road, to create a denser and consistent row of planting; and</li> <li>softening the built form edges of Blocks A - D as viewed from the internal road.</li> </ul> <p>A total of 2 surface parking spaces have been relocated off Estate Road to the basement (near Building A lift foyer). Accordingly, the total number of parking spaces across the site remains unchanged.</p>	<p>The increased number and size of the street trees along the internal Estate Road has resulted in a loss of 2 car parking spaces at ground level. As discussed under point 14 above, the deletion of the 4<sup>th</sup> access ramp under Block A has created an opportunity to provide additional car parking at the basement level. Council Officers are therefore satisfied that the on-site car parking will remain in accordance with the provisions of Blacktown Development Control Plan (DCP) 2006 – Parts A &amp; C.</p> <p>It is considered that the provision of the additional street trees, as proposed by the applicant, will assist in softening the built environment and provide shade for cars and pedestrians. As recommended by the Independent Consultant, the nominated street trees are located in deep soil zones and are not contained within low walls.</p> <p>It is also noted that with the deletion of the 4<sup>th</sup> access ramp under Block A an opportunity exists to provide additional landscaping at ground level. Prior to the release of any Construction Certificate the applicant will be required to submit a detailed landscape plan. As part of that plan, the applicant will be required to investigate if additional deep soil planting can be provided in this location. These matters</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
			will be addressed as <b>conditions</b> of any consent granted.
<b>Retaining Walls and Pedestrian Ramps</b>			
<p><b>22.</b> The pedestrian ramps and retaining walls lining the west side of the internal Estate Road emphasise the hard surfaces of the development and provide poor amenity. The open space between the 5 storey buildings needs to be as close to grade as possible especially as it is an artificial level created by the roof of a carpark. To substantially reduce the numerous ramps and retaining walls all three of the 5 storey apartment buildings should be lowered by at least one metre or so into the ground. (RFDC p.45 Fences and Walls, p.46-47 Landscape Design, p.60 Building Entry).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 3:</b>  <i>Lower the three 5 storey apartment buildings by at least 1 metre and resolve the walkway between the visitor parking spaces and the</i></p>	<p>Increase deep soil zones on the western side of the internal Estate Road by reducing the length of the basement parking level.</p> <p>Refer to 157.SK07 (i.e. Plan 4 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>).</p>	<p>We understand that the underlying intent of this recommendation seeks to reduce the hard surfaces created by the ramps and retaining walls on the western edge of the Estate Road, and make the open space between the 5 storey buildings at a grade closer to the Estate Road.</p> <p>Due to the fall of the site, lowering the three 5 storey apartment buildings by at least 1 metre would impact on the ground level relationship at the western end of these buildings. However, we have reduced the length of the basement levels (as it encroaches upon the western side of the Estate Road), and allowed for the terracing of landscaped areas to create a more fluid connection to the Estate Road.</p> <p>The proposed amendment will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>create an 8.5m wide deep soil zone as a green space with an additional 6m zone for parking incorporating street trees;</li> <li>increase the quantum of deep soil planting across the site and specifically between the 5 storey buildings;</li> <li>enable a more natural landscaped terrace</li> </ul>	<p>Council Officers agree that the intent behind this recommendation is not to reduce the overall height of the 5 storey buildings, but rather is to reduce the extent of hard surfaces along the western edge of the internal central driveway in order to provide better amenity at the ground level and provide better access from the Estate Road to the building entries.</p> <p>It is considered that the applicant's proposal to increase the deep soil zones, provide additional landscaping and delete sections of the ramping goes a long way in reducing the extent of hard surfaces along the western edge of the internal driveway and providing better amenity in this part of the site.</p> <p>While the applicant has indicated that lowering the three 5 storey buildings would impact on the ground level relationship at the western end of these buildings, Council Officers consider, however, that this matter could be investigated further and that there may be an opportunity to further reduce the height of the retaining walls and extent of ramping along the western edge of the Estate Road.</p> <p>In this regard, Council's Senior Drainage &amp; Flooding Engineer has advised that while there are drainage/flooding issues in the eastern portion of the site, there appear to be</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<i>buildings to be landscaped on both sides.</i>		<p>treatment in the area between the Estate Road and 5 storey apartment buildings; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consequently, reduce the extent of retaining walls and pedestrian ramping originally proposed by the DA.</li> </ul> <p>Combined with the additional street trees as proposed (refer response to Recommendation 2), a significantly improved landscape treatment is provided along the western edge of the internal road. As a result, the built form edge of Blocks A - D will be complemented by a denser landscaped response.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not compromise the stormwater drainage plan supported by Council's Flooding and Drainage Engineers, and will not alter the ability for the development to comply with the drainage conditions put forward in Council's Development Assessment Report.</p>	<p>no drainage/flooding constraints which would prevent the 5 storey buildings (i.e. Blocks B - D) from being lowered. It has been noted, however, that the lowering of the buildings would require the basement car parking level to also be lowered and that this could consequently impact on the underground on-site detention (OSD) tanks. It is further noted that the lowering of the basement carpark would impact directly on the grade of the basement access ramps. Initial calculations indicate, however, that if the ramps were extended to the edge of the Estate Road the buildings could potentially be lowered by approximately 300mm without any impacts on the vehicular access arrangements.</p> <p>While it is considered that the deep soil zones and additional landscaping do address the intent behind the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation, it is recommended that as a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted that the applicant be required to investigate this matter further and where possible lower the height of the three 5 storey buildings (Blocks B - D). This matter would be required to be addressed to Council's satisfaction prior to release of any Construction Certificate.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<b>Car Ramps to Visitor Parking on East Side</b>			
<p><b>23.</b> There are two visitor parking areas for the eastern row of 2-3 storey apartment buildings. Each parking area has an overly large entry ramp. The ramp to the south can be kept wide for truck turning (addressed below) but the northern ramp should be narrowed to a single lane and the remaining area used for deep soil planting of a tree and garden. (RFDC p.62-63 Parking, p.65 Vehicle Access).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 4:</b></p> <p><i>Narrow the drive entry to the visitor parking between Blocks F and G and provide more landscaping. Provide for truck turning via the entry drive to the visitor parking area between Blocks E and F.</i></p>	<p>Ramp entry between Blocks F and G and Blocks E and F have been narrowed and tree planting added.</p> <p>Refer to 157.SK07 (i.e. Plan 4 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>).</p>	<p>The driveway ramps between Blocks E and F and Blocks F and G currently provide access to visitor parking spaces (i.e. 5 spaces in each of the two bays). Both ramp widths have been reduced to accommodate greater landscaping in these areas.</p> <p>The proposed planting will not affect sight distances for vehicles entering and exiting the visitor parking bays via the driveways, as high or clear canopy trees will be selected, consistent with street tree species with tall growth patterns.</p> <p>The ramp between Blocks E and F has also been narrowed as it is considered inappropriate to providing a truck turning area in this located.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation, the applicant has narrowed the ramp entry to the visitor parking area located between Blocks F and G, to provide a deep soil area for tree planting. Council Officers agree with the applicant's response that it is inappropriate for garbage trucks to reverse along any length of the driveway and rely on the ramp as a turning area. This matter is discussed further under Point 25 below. Council Officers therefore support the applicant's proposal to also narrow the ramp between Blocks E and F in order to provide an additional deep soil zone for tree planting. Suitable <b>conditions</b> will be imposed on any consent to address this matter.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<b>Second Vehicle Entrance</b>			
<p><b>24.</b> Remove the second vehicle entry (i.e. from the shopping centre roundabout) as there is adequate access to the site from Myrtle Street and more space is needed for deep soil landscaping. (RFDC p.65 Vehicle Access).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 5:</b></p> <p><b><i>Delete second vehicle entry to the site from the roundabout.</i></b></p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p>	<p>We understand the underlying intent behind this recommendation as being to increase deep soil landscaping. As detailed in the response to Point 22 (Recommendation 3) above, greater deep soil zones are proposed by this submission along the western edge of the Estate Road through the reduction of basement parking in this area. Consequently, retaining the vehicular access point from the roundabout will not compromise the ability for the revised design to accommodate additional deep soil planting. It is considered more beneficial to locate the additional deep soil planting along the Estate Road to act as a consolidated landscaped edge, rather than providing additional deep soil planting in a fragmented manner between Bocks A and B.</p> <p>The Independent Traffic Report (Traffix) acknowledges that access to and from the site off the roundabout has historically been identified as the preferred means of access to the subject site. This is consistent with Council's advice during pre-DA meetings and Council's Traffic Engineers. Consequently, no amendment is proposed.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation is contrary to that of the Independent Traffic Consultant who states that the Myrtle Street access should only be considered if it provides a planning benefit. In this regard the Independent Traffic Consultant recognises that the main site access to and from the site as being via the existing roundabout within the shopping centre. From a traffic point-of-view it is therefore argued that this site access should be retained.</p> <p>Council's TMS has also advised that the main access to/from the site is via the shopping centre roundabout and that this access should be retained from a traffic point-of-view. Furthermore, the exclusive use of the Myrtle Street driveway would not adequately cater for the development given that exit movements are limited to left-turn only.</p> <p>Council Officers agree that the intent behind this recommendation is to increase the amount of deep soil landscaping on the site. As discussed under Points 21 and 22 above, additional deep soil planting is now proposed along each side of the internal Estate Road. The provision of the additional trees will reduce the extent of hard surfaces and provide better amenity throughout the site.</p> <p>Given that the removal of the vehicle entry adjacent to the shopping centre roundabout will have significant traffic implications, and that additional deep soil zones have been</p>



INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
			provided elsewhere on site, it is recommended that the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation not be adopted in this instance.
<b>Truck Turning Area</b>			
<p><b>25.</b> There should not need to be a dedicated truck turning area at the southern end of the site. This space could be better used for a landscaped area. Truck turning could be accommodated via the entry to the visitor parking between Block E and Block F. Trucks need only reverse a few metres to pick up garbage from Blocks D and E. (RFDC p.65 Vehicle Access).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 6:</b></p> <p><b><i>Delete the truck turning area at the southern end of the site and landscape that area.</i></b></p>	No amendment proposed.	<p>The truck turning area has been designed to provide a safe turning circle for garbage trucks. Deletion of this turning area at the southern end of the site will raise significant safety concerns for residents. There may also be significant occupational health and safety issues with deleting the turning circle, as this would force garbage trucks to reverse at least 37.5m (the length of Block E) to the driveway between Blocks E and F, in order to turn around and exit the site in a forward direction. The Independent Traffic Report (Traffix) did not raise any issues with, or recommend removal of, the truck turning area.</p> <p>In response to this recommendation which seeks to increase the landscaped area through removal of the truck turning area, it is noted that consolidated and usable open space areas are already proposed between Blocks B and C, and Blocks C and D, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are more suitably located away from vehicular traffic; but</li> </ul>	<p>This matter was referred to Council's TMS for comment. Council's Traffic Engineers disagree with the Urban Designer's recommendation to delete the truck turning area at the southern end of the site. In this regard the reversing of trucks within the parking area is considered a potential safety issue and should not be allowed.</p> <p>Council's Town Planning Officers also object to the reversing of trucks down the central Estate Road (i.e. for a length of 37.5m). The deletion of the truck turning area would raise significant safety concerns and would not be supported. For these reasons it is recommended that the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation not be adopted in this instance.</p> <p>While it is recognised that landscaping does help to enhance the overall appearance of the development, it is considered that it would provide minimal benefit in this location. In this regard the view from Myrtle Street down the central driveway already terminates with boundary tree planting and a large area of open space (i.e. the drainage reserve). This view would not be significantly enhanced by additional landscaping.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>still maintain strong visual connections from the open space to the Estate Road through direct sightlines and overlooking opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal has also incorporated a consistent row of tree planting along the southern property boundary to provide a suitable landscaped interface with the adjacent open space (Lot 43, DP 1004176).</p>	
<b>Corridors</b>			
<p><b>26.</b> The internal corridors in the 5 storey buildings are long and need some further modulation such as recessing the front doors of the larger apartments and providing sidelight translucent windows to their front doors. (RFDC p.79 Internal Circulation).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 7:</b></p> <p><b><i>Provide greater internal modulation to the corridors of the 5 storey buildings.</i></b></p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p> <p>Refer to 157.SK10 (i.e. Plan 7 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>).</p>	<p>The internal corridors within the 5 storey buildings have been designed with full length windows terminating on the eastern and western ends of the corridor to allow daylight access. The straight corridor alignment assists with maximising daylight access into the corridors. The corridor lengths are not overly long, meaning direct visibility is maintained along the corridors from end to end.</p> <p>Any design changes to the corridors to provide greater internal modulation should be balanced against security considerations, as recessing unit entrances may present undesirable concealment opportunities within the corridors.</p> <p>However, there are a range of textural treatments documented by Turner Hughes</p>	<p>Council's Town Planning Officers agree that any design changes should be balanced against security considerations. For this reason it is considered that the recessing of front doors should be discouraged as it would create opportunities for concealment.</p> <p>Town Planning Officers are satisfied that variation and modulation can be provided to the corridors through the use of different ceiling and wall features, lighting, floor finishes and the like. It is recommended that, as a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted, details of the internal corridor treatment be submitted for the separate consent of Council prior to the release of any Construction Certificate.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
		<p>Architects that can assist in greater defining unit entrances (which can be confirmed at the CC stage), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the use of ceiling and wall features at unit doorways with distinct change of finish and lighting; and</li> <li>the treatment of remaining corridor walls using varied features of textural treatments to enhance the space.</li> </ul> <p>At this stage no specific amendments are proposed to the internal modulation of the corridors of the 5 storey buildings.</p>	
<b>Entrances to the 5 Storey Buildings</b>			
<p><b>27.</b> The sense of arrival to the 5 storey buildings from the internal road needs to be improved. A direct axial entrance needs to be designed for each building. The proposal has a planter in front of each entry. A planter/garden including a major tree in deep soil needs to be planted to one side of the entry path. The recommendation to lower these buildings by 1m will also assist in</p>	<p>Amended as per this recommendation.</p> <p>Refer to 157.SK07 (i.e. Plan 4 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>).</p>	<p>The landscaping, access and entries to the 5 storey buildings now represent an improvement to the built form address of these buildings from the internal road. The design changes improve upon the existing proposal by providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>direct entry paths to the 5 storey buildings by reconfiguring planter areas; and</li> <li>greater definition of building entry courtyard spaces with connections to walkways and communal open space, while responding to this recommendation for direct pedestrian</li> </ul>	<p><b>The original development proposed 29 x 1 bedroom units, 110 x 2 bedroom units and 23 x 3 bedroom units. The development has been revised to address the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation and as a result now proposes 32 x 1 bedroom, 107 x 2 bedroom and 23 x 3 bedroom units.</b> In this regard the 2 bedroom ground level units located at the north-eastern corner of each 5 storey building (Blocks B - D) have been converted to 1 bedroom units to allow a defined foyer/entry court to be provided at the front of each building. Deep soil tree planting and redesigned planter boxes have also been provided adjacent to the building entries to enhance the</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<p>resolving the current poor entry condition (see comments under Point 22 above). (RFDC p.60 Building Entry, p.64 Pedestrian Access).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 8:</b></p> <p><b><i>Make the external entry paths to the three 5 storey buildings direct by locating planting to one side of the axial entries.</i></b></p>		<p>paths from the internal road.</p> <p>In order to facilitate these changes, one ground floor unit (2-bed) at the north-eastern corner of each of the 5 storey buildings (Blocks B - D) has been converted to a 1-bed unit, to allow the building entry space to be enlarged into a defined foyer/entry court. We understand that this amendment does not require an alteration to the parking provisions as 1 car space is to be provided for 1 or 2 bedroom units, in accordance with Blacktown DCP 2006.</p>	<p>overall appearance of the development. The planter boxes provided in front of each entry have been removed as per the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation. It is considered that the amendment made by the applicant satisfactorily address the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation. It is recommended that the changes are reflected on any Construction Certificate Plans and that a suitable <b>condition</b> be imposed on any consent to address this matter. The development description will also be amended to reflect the revised unit mix.</p>
<b>Storage</b>			
<p><b>28.</b> Storage is an important issue for apartment living. Check that the larger apartments have sufficient internal storage. (RFDC p.82 Storage).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 9:</b></p> <p><b><i>Check that the 3 bed apartments have adequate internal storage.</i></b></p>	<p>Addressed by Turner Hughes Architects.</p>	<p>The proposal complies with the minimum requirements for internal storage as per State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 65 for the 3 bedroom apartments.</p> <p>The Type 3B-3 and 3B-4 units located within the residential flat buildings provide 7.8m<sup>3</sup> of storage internally, with the allowance for a further 7.5m<sup>3</sup> of storage at the back of each of the car spaces (basement level). The 3 bed units exceed the Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC) Rule of Thumb for a minimum of 50% storage located internal to units, and for available storage overall (total 10m<sup>3</sup>).</p>	<p>Council's Town Planning Officers are satisfied that the proposal provides adequate storage in accordance with the recommendations of the RFDC. No amendments or changes are therefore considered warranted.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<b>Landscaping</b>			
<p>29. There needs to be at least 200sqm of deep soil (no structure under) with a minimum of 10m dimension at least in one part of the site. This could be in place of the truck turning area or between Blocks A and B. A common BBQ area and a children's playground is needed. The preferred location is the truck turning area because of its access to sunlight and proximity to the drainage open space outlook. (RFDC p.44 Deep Soil Zones).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 10:</b></p> <p><i>Provide at least 200sqm contiguous area of deep soil landscaping of min dimension 10m and provide a BBQ area and children's playground (with sunlight access in midwinter). The preferred location is in place of the proposed truck turning area.</i></p>	<p>No amendment proposed.</p>	<p>The deletion of the truck turning area is not supported by the applicant for the safety reasons outlined in response to Point 25 (Recommendation 6) above. In lieu of removing the truck turning area, the proposal will nevertheless provide sufficient open space and deep soil provisions, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deep soil (1m soil depth) area of landscape between Blocks B and C totalling 275.5sqm; and</li> <li>deep soil (1m depth) area of landscape between Blocks C and D totalling 263.7sqm.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted in the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC) that soil depths greater than 1.5m are unlikely to have any benefits for tree growth (RFDC – Planting on Structures, page 52). The two open space areas between Blocks B, C and D currently provide soil depths of 1 - 1.2m. In accordance with the RFDC Rules of Thumb, this can accommodate deep soil planting with indicative tree canopy spreads of 8m.</p> <p>BBQ facilities are provided in both these open space areas, and on balance the benefit of providing two landscaped areas between Blocks B, C and D are preferable over the truck turning</p>	<p>As outlined under Point 25 above, Council Officers do not support the deletion of the truck turning area. Nor do Council Officers support the deletion of the main vehicular access point provided between Blocks A and B (see Point 24 above). The provision of additional deep soil landscaping in either of these portions of the site is therefore considered inappropriate.</p> <p>The open space provisions were considered in detail during the development assessment process. As discussed under Section 7.3(g) of the Development Assessment Report (see page 42 at <b>Attachment 1</b>) the total amount of common open space provided for the development is 7,735sq.m and therefore exceeds Council's minimum DCP requirement by 1,200sq.m.</p> <p>The proposal provides 1,960sq.m of private balcony/terrace area and 5,775sq.m of common open space at the ground floor level. The ground level common open space includes 1,018sq.m within Lot 43 (i.e. the rear drainage reserve). In this regard, following an appeal to the NSW Land and Environment Court in 2006, it was determined by the Court that Lot 43 was to be transferred to Blacktown City Council's ownership in exchange for the site owners being granted an open space area/landscape credit of 1,018sq.m which could be retained for the future development of Lot 42 (i.e. the subject site).</p> <p>As demonstrated by the applicant, the landscaped areas</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
		<p>area, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>these areas are large, consolidated and landscaped;</li> <li>these areas benefit from maximised casual surveillance from adjacent buildings;</li> <li>improved amenity is provided during the summer and spring months by not being totally in direct sunlight;</li> <li>these areas are located away from the internal roadway (rather than at the end of the internal road) to avoid vehicle-pedestrian safety conflicts; and</li> <li>casual overlooking between the internal road and the open space areas will be afforded.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the Court Order received on 20th September 2006 states that “...<b><i>the respondent will treat an area of 1,018 square metres of Lot 43 as if it continued to form part of the land the subject of DA-97-7076 or of any new development application, as the case may be for the purposes of floor space ratio calculations, site area or landscaped area calculations and the like</i></b>” (File No. 11418 of 2004, Clause (e)).</p> <p>In accordance with the above Court Order, the proposal can legitimately rely upon Lot 43 for the RFDC open space calculation of the proposal.</p>	<p>between Blocks B and C and Blocks C and D also each exceed the minimum 200sq.m requirement, have sufficient soil depths to accommodate significant tree planting and will be appropriately embellished with BBQ facilities and the like.</p> <p>The open space provision on site is therefore considered satisfactory. As a condition of any consent granted a standard <b>condition</b> will be imposed requiring that prior to the release of any Construction Certificate a detailed landscaping plan must be submitted for the separate approval of Council.</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
		Accordingly, reliance upon the deep soil zones of the open space to achieve numerical compliance with the relevant standards should also be considered as a legitimate response to the circumstances of this case. Secured gates along the southern property boundary will be provided to allow direct pedestrian access from the subject site to the adjoining public open space, but will ensure no public access is permitted into the subject site, to maintain a high level of security for future residents.	
<b>Courtyards between Apartment Buildings</b>			
<p><b>30.</b> Each large common courtyard between the apartment buildings on the western side of the site needs at least one deep soil planted tree in a central or near central location within the courtyard. Consider any reduction in car parking to be balanced by providing one car share parking space per 5 spaces lost. (RFDC p.44 Deep Soil Zones).</p> <p>■ <b>Recommendation 11:</b></p> <p><b><i>Provide one deep soil tree in</i></b></p>	<p>Additional deep soil areas and revised entry and courtyard transition.</p> <p>Refer to 157.SK07 (i.e. Plan 4 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> and 157.SK11 (i.e. Plan 8 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>).</p>	<p>The provision of deep soil areas on the western side of the central Estate Road has been achieved through the shift of the extent of the basement level in this area. As a result there is sufficient space for additional deep soil areas and tree planting to be created between the 5 storey apartment blocks. Sketch 157.SK11 (i.e. Plan 8 at <b>Attachment (4)</b>) illustrates the ability to achieve deep soil planting areas with no structure beneath (i.e. no basement parking level), which will result in an improved interface between the internal Estate Road and the built form edges of Blocks A - D, consistent with this recommendation.</p>	<p>Council's Town Planning Officers are satisfied that the applicant has provided a suitable response to the Independent Urban Designer's recommendation without any impact on or reduction to the on-site car parking provision. To address this matter it is recommended that any Construction Certificate (CC) Plans are amended to reflect the details provided in Plans 157.SK07 and 157.SK11. This matter will be addressed via a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted.</p> <p>It is also noted under the applicant's response to Point 29 above that the open space areas between Blocks B, C and D currently provide soil depths of 1 - 1.2m and that this can accommodate deep soil planting with indicative tree canopy spreads of 8 metres. As part of the detailed</p>

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<i>each courtyard between Blocks D and C, Blocks C and B, and Blocks B and A. Deep soil has no structure under. Where car parking spaces are reduced – consider replacing every 5 car spaces with one car share space (e.g. Go-Get).</i>		There is currently no demand for a car share organisation such as Go-Get in this area. Consequently, no amendments are proposed with respect to the on-site car parking provision.	landscaping plan required as part of any CC, it is therefore recommended that at least one tree be planted in a central location between each building block. This matter will be addressed via a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted.
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
<b>31.</b> The three 5 storey buildings have too much sameness to their design. Visual differentiation should be further addressed through design variation of external building elements. For example, differentiation of balcony and balustrade treatments could provide further subtle variation. Consider providing ground level private courtyards to the ground level apartments of Block C to enable some design differentiation between the buildings at ground level. (RFDC p.89 Facades).	Colour theme proposed for each apartment block to assist with way-finding, and amended material treatment of balustrades, glazing and balcony layout.  Refer to Plans 157.SK12, 157.SK13 and 157.SK14 (i.e. Plans 9-11 at <b>Attachment (4)</b> ).	Amendments have been made to improve the design differentiation between the 5 storey apartments. The amendments will assist in way-finding for visitors and new residents, while also increasing the visual differentiation between these apartment blocks, through the amended material treatment of balustrades, glazing and balcony layout. These amendments will not alter the building separation, or impact sightlines across the communal open space.  Turner Hughes Architects have proposed to enhance the building colour themes to emphasise the variations in balcony layouts, to improve design differentiation between the 5 storey buildings. Further, the proposed revision to the entry of these buildings will create greater visual definition of the entrances.	Private courtyards have been proposed to all ground level apartments. As such, cosmetic changes have been made to each building block. The proposed changes do not impact on the building layouts, balcony sizes, building setbacks or the like. Overall it is considered that the varied colour schemes and balcony treatments achieve the visual differentiation recommended by the Independent Urban Designer. As a <b>condition</b> of any consent granted it is recommended that the applicant submit a detailed schedule of the building materials and finishes that reflect the details shown in the applicant's plans 157.SK12, 157.SK13 and 157.SK14.



INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S PEER REVIEW PREPARED BY ARCHITECTUS			
INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGNER'S RECOMMENDATION	APPLICANT'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT	APPLICANT'S COMMENT	COUNCIL OFFICER'S COMMENTS
<p>■ <b>Recommendation 12:</b></p> <p><i>Provide further design differentiation between the three 5 storey apartment buildings. For example through variation of balcony and balustrade treatments, and provision of private courtyards to ground level apartments of Block C.</i></p>			

## 5. Independent Consultants' Supplementary Comments

---

- 5.1 In addition to the recommendations summarised in the table above, the Independent Consultants have also made general comments in relation to the development proposal. Specifically, the Independent Traffic Consultant has commented on the level of traffic generated by the proposed development, while the Independent Urban Designer has commented on matters relating to context, bulk and scale and built form. While these comments do not warrant a response or any further amendments by the applicant, it is considered important that they be summarised and discussed below.
- 5.2 The **Independent Traffic Consultant** has noted that the Varga Traffic Report (the applicant's Traffic Consultant) has assessed the development as generating 47 vehicles per hour (veh/hr) during peak periods. The Independent Traffic Consultant disagrees with this level of generation and considers that it should actually be higher. In this regard the Varga Traffic Report adopts the Roads & Maritime Services (RMS) trip rate of 0.29 trips/dwelling/hr. This is the RMS rate for high density developments in a sub-regional centre, where excellent public transport services (generally bus and rail) are available. This is an acknowledged shortcoming of the RMS Guideline which does not address high density developments outside regional or sub-regional centres. Similarly, the medium density rates published by the RMS do not apply to this development.
- 5.3 In the Independent Traffic Consultant's experience and based on surveys, the Independent Traffic Consultant considers that the proposed development will generate a minimum 0.40 trips/dwelling/hr in peak periods. The Independent Traffic Consultant has indicated that this would result in the traffic generation increasing from 47 veh/hr to 65 veh/hr, with 80% of these volumes in the peak direction.
- 5.4 The Independent Traffic Consultant has indicated that, under normal circumstances, the increased traffic generation would require sensitivity testing. In this case, however, the difference is so small and the roundabout at the intersection of Myrtle Street with the shopping centre access (and Upwey Street) is operating very satisfactorily, that additional modelling is not considered necessary.
- 5.5 The Independent Traffic Consultant has indicated that, on the basis of the undertaken peer review assessment, it is concluded that the traffic generated by the development can be readily accommodated by the road network in terms of capacity considerations. In this regard the 65 veh/hr that are generated at peak times is comparable to the traffic that would be generated by about 20 retail parking spaces, which typically generate 3 trips/space/hr during the more critical PM peak period.
- 5.6 Council's Traffic Management Section (TMS) has raised no objection to the Independent Traffic Consultant using a different traffic generation rate other than the RMS Guideline, given that the difference is only 18 veh/hr. Council's TMS agrees with the Independent Consultant that further modelling is unwarranted in this circumstance given that the difference is extremely small and the roundabout controlled intersection of Myrtle Street and the shopping centre access is operating at a satisfactory level of service (LOS).
- 5.7 The Independent Traffic Consultant has also highlighted that the level of traffic generation under either scenario (i.e. 47 veh/hr or 65 veh/hr) is moderate and therefore could be accommodated by a single driveway (i.e. the main driveway via the existing roundabout within the shopping centre). In this regard, Tables 3.1 and 3.2 of Clause 3.2.1 of AS 2890.1 (2004) indicates that a single Category 1 driveway is suitable for access to a residential (Class 1A)

development serving less than 300 spaces. As the proposal is classified as a Class 1A development and proposes only 250 car parking spaces, it is classified as a low-order traffic generating use. A single driveway access would therefore be acceptable for this development. It was for these reasons that the Independent Consultant recommended that the secondary site access directly onto Myrtle Street only be considered if it provided a planning benefit. As discussed under point 2 in the table above, the secondary site access affords improved access flexibility and therefore is recommended that it be retained.

- 5.8 In terms of the **Independent Urban Design Review**, the Consultant agrees that the proposal complies with Council's local bulk/scale planning controls. It is recognised that historically the site was zoned for an industrial use and that Council rezoned the site to the current high-medium density zone in order to provide a more compatible use with the surroundings. Under the current planning controls it is recognised that the density of the permissible residential development on the site is significantly higher than the adjoining medium density residential zone, noting that the suburb of Prospect has largely been developed with single dwelling housing as opposed to medium density. The Consultant understands that this came about as part of the incentive to change the industrial zoning and recognises that there is reasonable expectation given the planning controls that a development of the type proposed is appropriate subject to merit.
- 5.9 As part of the peer review process, Architectus reviewed the previous development proposal approved over the subject site for a residential flat development (i.e. DA-97-7076). The Consultant has concluded that, in many respects, the current proposal is superior to the approved DA. For example, the current proposal has greater clarity in its arrangement with a central internal street. The quality of the architectural design is also considered to be better.
- 5.10 In accordance with the terms of the brief, Architectus also considered the development in relation to the broad suburban context. In this regard the surrounding area is characterised by single houses, mostly single storey and with landscaped front gardens. The proposal on the other hand is mainly 3 and 5 storey apartments with extensive common landscaping. The proposal has a contrasting built form and scale compared to the general suburban context. The Independent Urban Designer therefore asked the question *"is such a contrast acceptable and appropriate"*? In response, the Independent Consultant has advised that it is normal for a village centre to have a degree of contrast to its broader suburban context. Typically, a village centre or neighbourhood centre has larger footprint buildings, one or two storeys higher. The 2-3 storey apartment buildings are therefore considered acceptable and appropriate.
- 5.11 The second question asked was *"whether the three 5 storey buildings are acceptable and appropriate"*? The Consultant's response was that:

*"The unusual circumstance of the proposal is that it is on a large site adjacent a large site containing the shopping centre (which is primarily one large supermarket building in an expanse of carparking). The large site gives an opportunity for higher buildings of larger scale because the visual impacts can be mitigated by locating intervening 2-3 storey buildings between existing houses and the shopping centre and providing substantial areas for landscaping".*

- 5.12 A further consideration was *"whether the 5 storey buildings should be reduced to 3 or 4 storeys, or the fifth floor set back from all sides in order to reduce the scale and bulk of the proposal"*. Following a review of the proposal, the Independent Consultant has concluded that, on balance, it is considered unnecessary to do this because the visual impacts are well moderated by the following:

- To the north the 5 storey buildings are separated from the existing suburban development by Myrtle Street and a 3 storey apartment building and large areas of landscaping.
- To the south the 5 storey buildings are separated from existing suburban development by a very wide area of open space for stormwater as well as landscaping on the site.
- To the east the 5 storey buildings are separated from existing adjoining suburban development by 2-3 storey apartments (that have an appearance and scale not dissimilar to townhouses), a garden setback zone and a wide internal street with street trees.
- To the west the 5 storey buildings are separated from suburban development by a large supermarket shopping centre and a main road.

5.13 The Independent Urban Design Consultant has concluded that, while the proposal contains buildings that are higher than the broad suburban context and do contrast in scale and bulk, overall it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and appropriate because the visual impacts are mitigated on the broad suburban context by the size of the site, the location of the site, the proposed arrangement of built form on the site and the extensive landscaping proposed.

5.14 In relation to the adjoining land uses, the land use to the west of the site is a neighbourhood shopping centre comprising a supermarket/service station and car parking and a small group of shops on the corner of Myrtle Street and Flushcombe Road. The Independent Urban Designer has pointed out that the centre has poor amenity due to lacklustre building design, predominant hard surfaces and a lack of trees. It is the Independent Consultant's opinion that the proposal provides an improvement to this context.

5.15 To the north and south, the site is well separated from the single residential housing by a street and a wide grassed drainage area. The Urban Design Consultant considers that the proposal is sufficiently separated to mitigate impacts to the north and south.

5.16 The land use to the east of the site is residential comprising single storey, single family homes. There is some tree screening along the boundary. The Urban Design Consultant considers the eastern interface to be the main adjoining land use affected by the proposal. Generally rear yards of these houses face the shared boundary. The Independent Urban Designer is of the opinion that the interface has been carefully considered and has made the following comments:

- The controls on the subject site allow for 5 storeys with a 3 storey interface along the eastern boundary. The proposal complies with the controls.
- The proposal further reduces the building bulk by stepping down to 2 storeys towards the eastern boundary with a setback of 6m to the eastern boundary.
- It has been recognised that if the site was developed for 2 storey townhouses, the required setback would be 2.3m to the eastern boundary. The Urban Design Consultant considers that the proposal is better than such a "lesser" development intensity zoning.
- As part of the peer review process, the Independent Urban Designer Consultant walked along Rydal Street to observe the interface between the site and the line of dwellings along the eastern boundary. The Urban Design Consultant noted that the 5 storey buildings proposed for the subject site would not be readily seen from the rear yards of these dwellings because of the angle of view being screened by the intervening 2-3

storey buildings proposed along the eastern part of the subject site. In this regard the higher bulkier buildings are appropriately internal to the site and adjacent to the supermarket.

- By stepping down the 2-3 storey apartment buildings on the east side of the site, together with the window design on the eastern facades, overlooking potential is well controlled and overshadowing is within acceptable limits. It is noted that overshadowing occurs after 2.30pm across the rear yards in midwinter but does not occur at the equinox.
- The proposed apartment buildings as they face the eastern boundary have the appearance of townhouses.
- Planting is shown within the setback zone of the proposal. This is considered sufficient. The householders of Rydal Street can plant further screen planting if they wish.

## 6. Conclusion

---

6.1 In accordance with the JRPP's resolution of 13 December 2011, peer reviews of the proposed development have been undertaken. In response to the recommendations made by the Independent Traffic and Urban Design Consultants, the applicant has made various modifications to the proposal, the most significant being:

- Installation of time controlled gates at the Myrtle Street access driveway to mitigate headlight glare during sleep disturbance hours (i.e. 10pm to 6am).
- Deletion of the access ramp located under Block "A" and provision of additional car parking at the basement level and additional landscaping at ground level.
- An increase in the number and size of the street trees provided along the internal Estate Road.
- Provision of additional landscaping and reduction in the extent of ramping and retaining walls along the western edge of the internal driveway.
- A change in the unit mix from 29 x 1 bedroom units, 110 x 2 bedroom units and 23 x 3 bedroom units to 32 x 1 bedroom, 107 x 2 bedroom and 23 x 3 bedroom units.
- Provision of defined foyer/entry courts at the front of each of the three 5 storey buildings.
- Visual differentiation to the three 5 storey buildings through the use of different colours and varied treatment to the balustrades, glazing and balcony layouts.

6.2 Overall it is considered that the responses and suggested amendments made by the applicant, as detailed in the table above, are an acceptable response to the recommendations made by the Independent Traffic Consultant (Traffix) and the Independent Urban Designer (Architectus).

6.3 Furthermore, the Independent Traffic Consultant has undertaken an analysis of the Myrtle Street and Flushcombe Road intersection and has found that the intersection will operate at a Level of Service "A" (being "good") and will have minimal delays. The Traffic Consultant has concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have any negative traffic impacts on the surrounding road network and is satisfied that the traffic generated by the proposed development will not create any unacceptable amenity impacts. The Independent Traffic

Consultant has also concluded that no improvements/upgrades are required to the external road network given that the development will generate low traffic volumes.

- 6.4 The Independent Urban Design Consultant has concluded that, while the proposal contains buildings that are higher than the broad suburban context and do contrast in scale and bulk, overall it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and appropriate because the visual impacts are mitigated on the broad suburban context by the size of the site, the location of the site, the proposed arrangement of built form on the site and the extensive landscaping proposed.
- 6.5 Council has reviewed both Independent Consultants' recommendations, as well as the applicant's response to each issue, and is satisfied that the development is suitable in its context and will not have any negative traffic impacts on the surrounding road network. This supplementary report is therefore forwarded to the Panel for further consideration and determination of the proposal. Given that the development in its amended form satisfactorily addresses the areas of concern identified by the JRPP, Council Officers recommend that the Application be approved subject to conditions, including those identified in this report.

## **7. Recommendation**

---

- 7.1 The subject Development Application be approved by the Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel subject to the amended conditions held at **Attachment 6**.
- 7.2 The applicant and objectors be advised of the Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel's decision.

---

REBECCA GORDON  
SENIOR TOWN PLANNER

---

JUDITH PORTELLI  
MANAGER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION

---

GLENNYS JAMES  
DIRECTOR CITY STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT