

**JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL  
(Sydney East Region)**

<b>JRPP No</b>	<b>2012 SYE108</b>
<b>DA Number</b>	<b>2012/DA-325</b>
<b>Local Government Area</b>	<b>Hurstville City Council</b>
<b>Proposed Development</b>	<b>Demolition of existing building and construction of fifteen (15) storey mixed use development with basement parking</b>
<b>Street Address</b>	<b>454-456 Forest Road, Hurstville</b>
<b>Applicant/Owner</b>	<b>Elieti Pty Ltd</b>
<b>Number of Submissions</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Advertising/Notification – Total thirty six (36) with four (4) individuals including signed petition of thirty two (32) persons;  2<sup>nd</sup> Second Advertising/Notification Period – five (5) individual submissions</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Approval with Conditions</b>
<b>Report by</b>	<b>Ilyas Karaman – Senior Development Assessment Planner</b>

**Assessment Report and Recommendation**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The application seeks approval for the construction of a mixed use development with a single tower/building being fifteen (15) storeys in height at the street frontage of a narrow site with three (3) levels of basement parking at 454 – 456 Forest Road, Hurstville.

The proposal has been amended significantly by three (3) variations to its design to reflect the advice of the Design Review Panel. The previous design of two (2) separate towers was reduced to one (1) single building, which was then subsequently amended further with a reduction in floor space ratio including numerous changes to the external and internal design to the current proposed design. This current design is supported by the Design Review Panel including its scale as being acceptable.

The proposal exceeds the maximum height requirements of 23m in Council's Development Control Plan - Hurstville City Centre with a proposed height of 46.2m. A minor variation to the overall maximum floor space ratio of 3.0:1 is also proposed with a total floor space ratio of 3.08:1. The proposed variations to the DCP can be supported on this site, particularly its height, given the proposal is considered to be well designed and achieves an appropriate built form on a narrow isolated site and is consistent in height with the existing and desired built form of the adjoining land on Forest Road. As such, the proposal is consistent in height with the existing mixed used development at 438-452 Forest Road at its immediate adjoining eastern side boundary. Whilst to the immediate west of the site, the built form as per the DCP has a maximum height control of 45m being of similar height to the proposal.

Accordingly, the proposed design, including its built form and provisions of amenity is considered to be appropriate in scale, despite the difficulty of the constraints of the site with a narrow frontage of 14.51m, which results in minimal impacts to the adjoining neighbours and as such is recommended to be supported.

The proposal was publicly exhibited on two (2) separate periods in accordance with statutory requirements and received five (5) submissions in its current amended form, which are discussed and addressed in the report.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the application be approved subject to conditions as provided in the report.

---

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL**

The proposal seeks approval for the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a mixed use development with a single tower/building being fifteen (15) storeys in height at the street frontage with three (3) levels of basement for parking at 454 – 456 Forest Road, Hurstville. A total of fifty four (54) residential units are proposed with the following mix being five (5) x studio units, nine (9) x one (1) bedroom units and forty (40) x two (2) bedroom units.

The development comprises specifically of the following:

- Basement 1: Car park with 19 spaces and separate lifts;
- Basement 2: Car park with 20 spaces and separate lifts for each building;
- Basement 3: Car park with 22 spaces and separate lifts for each building;
- Ground Floor: One (1) retail unit at street frontage, a combined street entry to separate residential and commercial lobby areas, vehicular access to rear car park, one (1) loading bay and six (6) spaces (visitors) with turning area to access lower basements, a garbage room, plant room and separate amenities room;
- First Floor: One (1) commercial unit with separate commercial lift adjoining the gym/amenities room for residential units, one (1) x two bedroom unit with courtyard, one (1) x one bedroom unit with courtyard and separate residential lift lobby with rear podium as landscaped communal area;
- Second Floor and third floor: One (1) x one bedroom unit and three (3) x two bedroom units including one (1) two bedroom unit as an adaptable unit and lift lobby;
- Fourth Floor to ninth floor: One (1) x one bedroom unit and three (3) x two bedroom units with lift lobby;
- Tenth floor to twelfth floor: one (1) x studio unit as an adaptable unit and three (3) x two bedroom units and lift lobby.
- Thirteenth floor to fourteenth floor: one (1) x studio unit and three (3) x two bedroom units and lift lobby.
- Vehicular access is via a level driveway crossing located at the street frontage of the site on Forest Road.

## **BACKGROUND**

20 Aug 12 – Development Application, 12/DA-201 (2012SYE070) withdrawn by applicant for proposed mixed use development with two (2) towers, front building (15) storeys and

45.1m in maximum height and rear building (8) storeys with maximum of 25.2m in height with basement parking. Total floor space ratio of 4.08:1 with a total of fifty four (54) residential units and mix of 7 x 1 bedroom units, 36 x 2 bedroom units and 11 x 3 bedroom units.

Note, Design Review Panel recommended substantial amendment to the design with the removal of the rear building to reduce impacts to neighbouring properties and increase landscaping to provide benefit to residents and surrounding development.

13 Nov 12 - Current development application 12/DA-325 (2012SYE108) lodged with Council for demolition of existing and construction of mixed use development with a single tower/building being fifteen (15) storeys at street frontage and basement parking. Total floor space ratio of 3.87:1 and total of fifty four (54) residential units with a mix of 14 x 1 bedroom units, 31 x 2 bedroom units; 9 x 3 bedroom units.

23 Nov 12 - Advertising and notification until 7 December 12 with total of thirty six (36) submissions received as objections to proposal with four (4) individuals including signed petition of thirty two (32) persons.

17 Dec 12 - Application presented to Design Review Panel. The Design Review Panel (DRP) could not support proposal and recommend further design changes to improve amenity within building and the external appearance of building.

20 Dec 12- Meeting with Applicant with request for further amendments to design.

15 Feb 12 – Amended plans received including FSR reduced to 3.08:1 with three (3) bedroom units deleted and external changes to appearance of building.

22 Feb 13 - Advertising and notification until 8 March 2013 with five (5) individual submissions received as objections.

7 Mar 13 - Application presented to Design Review Panel. DRP supports amended design with recommendation for only minor changes.

27 Mar 13 – Council received minor changes to proposal as per recommendations by DRP.

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND LOCALITY**

The site is located at 454-456 Forest Road, Hurstville on the northern side of the road. The site is located to the west end of the Hurstville Town Centre near Bridge Street. The site comprises of a single narrow allotment of land with an area of 1279.5 square metres. The site has a narrow frontage of 14.51m at Forest Road and side boundaries of 81.262m and 82.217m respectively and a triangular shape at its rear with boundaries of 8.746m and 12.715m. The site is relatively flat with minor shrubs only at the rear.

The site is currently occupied by a two storey building at the street frontage and warehouse/industrial type building to its rear, which was previously used as a mechanical workshop with spray painting. The surrounding development is a mix of commercial and residential zones. Immediately adjoining the site to the west at 458-460 Forest Road is a single storey building and two (2) storey commercial buildings on a predominantly large vacant site, which was previously approved for a large mixed use development having a maximum of 10 storeys with the consent considered to have since lapsed. A current development application has been lodged on the same site with a mix of four (4) to twenty

one (21) storeys for a mixed use development. The proposed buildings of 21 storeys (136.4m) and 11 storeys (104.5m) are setback 8 metres from the west boundary of the subject site for the purpose of vehicular laneway with parallel visitor parking.

To the east boundary is a large parcel of land with three (3) separate buildings with two (2) buildings located at the rear being multi-storey residential buildings with the nearest building having a height of (114.4m) and the front commercial building being two (2) storeys. Located to the very rear of the site are four (4) storey residential flat buildings. Opposite the site and to the south on Forest Road is land owned by RailCorp and currently occupied by numerous demountable buildings, which adjoin the rail corridor. Further to the southwest is a mixed use building of nine (9) storeys located at the corner of Bridge Street and Forest Road. A two (2) storey heritage building is located to the corner of Bridge Street and Forest Road.

## **COMPLIANCE AND ASSESSMENT**

The development has been inspected and assessed under the relevant Section 79C (1) "Matters for Consideration" of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

### **Statutory Controls**

- State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 - Design Quality in Residential Buildings;
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004;
- State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – Remediation of Land;
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007;
- Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 1994;
- Section 94 contributions as per E.P. & A. Act 1979;
- Draft State Environmental Planning Policy (Competition) 2010
- Draft Hurstville Local Environmental Plan (City Centre) 2011

### **Policy Controls**

- Development Control Plan No. 2 – Hurstville City Centre:  
Section 2.2- Neighbour Notification;  
Section 4.2 – Built Form Controls;  
Section 6.3 – Access and Mobility,  
Section 6.4 - Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.

### **Determining Authority**

As this proposal has a Capital Investment Value (CIV) of greater than \$20 million, the determination of the development application is the Joint Regional Planning Panel, Sydney East Region (JRPP).

#### **1. Environmental Planning Instruments**

##### Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 1994

The land is zoned no. 3(b) (City Centre Business Zone) under the provisions of the Hurstville Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 1994 and the proposed use as a mixed use building is not defined in the LEP, however it is a permissible use, given that it is not listed as a prohibited use in the zone. The other components of the building are listed being the residential units

defined as a “Residential Flat Building” and the retail unit as a “shop” and the commercial areas are defined as “business premises”.

The objectives of the zone no. 3(b) (City Centre Business Zone) are as follows:

- (a) to designate sufficient areas of land to meet the projected needs of the Hurstville Town Centre as a multi-functional regional centre,*
- (b) to facilitate development of land within the Hurstville Town Centre for commercial, retail, residential and community purposes,*
- (c) to provide a single business zone for the Hurstville Town Centre as a sub-regional centre,*
- (d) to facilitate the implementation of a development control plan for the Hurstville Town Centre:*
  - (i) by introducing appropriate floor space ratio controls,*
  - (ii) by encouraging an economically viable retail core which is centrally located and in close proximity to public transport,*
  - (iii) by enhancing employment opportunities and to service the needs of the local and regional community,*
  - (iv) by encouraging and facilitating the use of public transport,*
  - (v) by providing and enhancing pedestrian and public open space areas for shoppers and workers,*
  - (vi) by maintaining and improving the environmental and aesthetic quality of the Hurstville Town Centre and its surrounds,*
  - (vii) by ensuring adequate and accessible off-street car parking, and*
- (e) to improve traffic flow in and around the Hurstville Town Centre.*

It is considered that the proposed development generally satisfies the above stated objectives (a), (b) within the zone. That is the proposal, aims to facilitate the development of land within the Hurstville Town Centre for commercial, retail, residential purposes and to meet the projected needs of the Hurstville Town Centre as a multi-functional regional centre.

#### Clause 14 – Tree preservation orders

An assessment of the site has revealed only a few shrubs at the rear boundary with no significant trees on the site. The site is considered to be within an existing highly built-up area within Hurstville town centre and is proposed to be excavated to its boundaries for three (3) levels of basement car parking. As such, it is considered the existing shrubs on site provide minimal environmental amenity or soil stability in terms of clause 13. The landscape plan as proposed will further improve the site as compared to its current state with regard to providing suitable landscaping at the rear and along the side boundaries and to the rear private courtyards of the residential units on level one.

#### Clause 15 – Services

Pursuant to Clause 15, water supply, sewerage and drainage infrastructure is required to be available to the land. It is considered the above services can be provided to the proposed development on the land with the basement required to pump to the detention tank and with all stormwater to drain by gravity to Council's kerb and gutter, directly in front of the development site.

#### Clause 22 – Excavation, filling of land

The proposal will involve excavation of the land for the proposed three (3) levels of basement. In consideration to this clause, a condition of consent is recommended that a geotechnical report be

submitted to Council prior to the commencement of any works to ensure adequate regard is given to any potential impacts to existing drainage patterns and soil stability within the locality.

Clause 25A – Advertising and signage.

No outdoor advertising or signage is proposed as part of the application.

#### State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – Remediation of Land

The subject site is zoned no. 3(b) (City Centre Business Zone) under the provisions of the Hurstville Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 1994. The previous uses of the site include a mechanical workshop including spray painting activities. Accordingly a preliminary investigation to any potential contamination on the land was undertaken by Aargus P/L. The preliminary investigation of the land has recommended that the site can be made suitable for the proposed mixed use development after remediation of the land. A condition of consent is recommended that any remediation of the site be undertaken prior to the commencement of works on the site.

#### State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004

In accordance with this policy, all new residential dwellings and those seeking alterations and additions as identified under this policy require a BASIX certificate that measures the Building Sustainability Index to ensure dwellings are designed to use less potable water and are responsible for fewer greenhouse gas emissions by setting energy and water reduction targets for house and units.

The application is supported by a satisfactory BASIX certificate that satisfies the requirements for dwellings under this policy.

#### State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007

The State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 applies to the site, given its location on a State road. Accordingly, the application was referred to the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) with no objections raised subject to recommended conditions of consent.

#### State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings

The subject planning instrument is applicable as the proposed development satisfies the definition of a residential flat building as prescribed under the SEPP. Further to the design quality principles and referral to the Urban Design Review Panel, Clause 30(2) of SEPP 65 also requires residential flat development to be designed in accordance with the Department of Planning's publication entitled Residential Flat Design Code.

An assessment of the proposal has been undertaken against the guidelines and rules of thumb contained in the Residential Flat Design Code. As such, the proposal is considered to satisfy the Residential Flat Design Code with regards to the site and building design including the provision of adequate cross ventilation and solar access to residential units in the proposed building.

The proposal on the site has been referred to the St George Region Design Review Panel (DRP) on three (3) separate occasions with substantial amendments undertaken to the proposed design of the built form. That is, two (2) referrals to the DRP under the current application and a previous design under a previous development application. The DRP comments with respect

design quality principles of the two (2) previous referrals are attached to the appendix, whilst the DRP comments (shown in italics) of the current design are provided below.

## Context

*In relationship to the laneway the Panel understands the applicants have been unable to obtain permission from the adjacent property owner to gain access to the side laneway proposed in the adjacent development.*

*The Panel notes that the applicants have flipped their A comprehensive context plan and elevation analysis is required showing all of the existing and proposed adjacent buildings.*

*plan to locate the carpark access way along the western boundary of the site as this could support any future opportunities for access along the laneway.*

*The Panel notes the previous Panel members' comments regarding height and concurs.*

Comment: The DRP viewed the height of the original proposal as considered to be reasonable on Forest Road given the building height as permitted under the DCP for the adjacent sites. Notwithstanding, the original design for two separate buildings was criticised for being well in excess of both the draft LEP and DCP's proposed height and FSR requirements. As such, an amended design was required to further demonstrate that it can provide an excellent response to its current and future context to be argued through the provision of well considered built form and landscape to benefit not only the residents of the subject site but the residents of all surrounding properties and the street. In response, the second revision removed the rear building entirely and was replaced with additional landscaped area.

The DRP also requested that the applicant explore the opportunity with the neighbouring proposed development for alternative access to its residential development via a possible public right of way on the adjoining land, west of the site. The applicant has stated the owners of the neighbouring property have not been forthcoming regarding any dialogue between the two proposed developments. Notwithstanding, the applicant has relocated the vehicular access to the western side to allow for future possibility of access from an adjoining laneway if proposed at the adjoining site, 456-460 Forest Road.

Overall, the applicant has substantially amended the proposal with considerable changes in response to the concerns raised by the DRP, which will allow the surrounding development to also benefit from the rear half of the site as a landscaped podium by the removal of the former proposed rear building. Overall, it is considered in the context of the surrounding development that the built form including its height is acceptable.

## Scale

*The Panel notes that the carpark has been reduced to incorporate deep soil zone. However, upon reviewing the detailed section provided, the Panel recommends that the deep soil zone is to be located at ground level and the large retaining wall around the boundary of the site be replaced with an open palisade fence.*

*The Panel notes that the amenity block has been relocated to the east side which is an improvement.*

Comment: The DRP viewed the scale as appropriate given the existing and approved neighbouring developments along Forest Road, whilst recommending the removal of the

former northern building. The deep soil to the rear of the site has been increased and the solid retaining wall is considered to be appropriate.

## **Built Form**

*The reduction in the built form is noted and relies upon floor layout changes including elimination of a fire stair. These changes will necessitate a fire engineered solution and BCA report, which was not available at the meeting. While the changes to the built form and massing of the building are an improvement the viability of this approach and its achievement is subject to the supply of the above reports supporting the design modifications.*

*Refer to aesthetics for comments on the appearance of the building.*

*A Traffic report has not been provided. The Panel is concerned with the ramp width, radius and the signal configuration including subsequent traffic queuing. This should be demonstrated on the drawings, which should depict both swept paths and queuing locations. The applicant needs to confirm parking requirements for the now proposed mix of units and ensure they do not exceed Council's minimum requirements.*

Comment: The proposal has been substantially amended with a further reduction in floor area, whilst improving its internal amenity and overall appearance. The deep soil to the rear of the site has been increased and the solid retaining wall is considered to be appropriate.

The proposed building will rely on an alternative solution to the Deemed To Satisfy (DTS) provisions of the BCA provisions, given the proposed height of the building and its design of a single stairwell. Notwithstanding, Council's Senior Building Surveyor has investigated this issue given the applicant has signalled the intention to use an "alternative solution " by engaging a fire engineer to prepare a fire engineering brief, which is the initial stage of the development of a fire engineered solution, in accordance with the international fire engineering guidelines.

Further the new requirements under the BCA 2013, effective from 1 May 2013, introduces the new concept of using lifts as a means of escape for occupants in a fire situation, this is primarily motivated by the increased heights of modern buildings, particularly internationally. In addition it is seen as facilitating the evacuation of occupants who may have a disability.

Whilst, this methodology may not be used, the applicant's fire engineer will be required to convince NSW Fire Services (NSWFRS) that an alternative solution satisfies the performance requirements and the applicant is well aware that a major redesign will be required should the alternative solution not be supported by NSWFRS.

Council's Senior Traffic Engineer has assessed the revised Traffic Report, the overall basement parking and general vehicular access as being satisfactory.

## **Density**

*The Panel notes that the floor space ratio has been reduced from 3.87:1 to 3.08:1. The Panel is of the opinion that little would be achieved in terms of environmental impact or amenity in further reducing the FSR to comply with the 3:1 control. The Panel is concerned that achieving compliance might reduce the internal amenity of apartments.*

Comment: The proposed density is viewed to be acceptable as the variation to FSR is considered a minor variation.



## **Resource, energy and water efficiency**

*Refer to Landscape section for comments for deep soil zones.*

*Subject to Basix report.*

Comment: The proposal is supported by a satisfactory BASIX certificate.

## **Landscape**

*The Panel notes the deep soil zones have been provided at the rear of the lot in accordance with the recommendations from the previous Design Review panel; however, the proposed deep soil zone should be located at existing ground level and not at the first floor level podium. The boundary wall should be removed from the basement level and around the extent of the rear of the property in accordance with the comments provided under context. The proposed tree planting in the deep soil zone should be tall and of an appropriate scale for the space (for example gum trees) rather than magnolias.*

*The Panel notes that the layout of the landscaped podium has been modified and is an improvement. However it is recommended that the raised planter adjoining the private courtyards be widened significantly (2.5 metres) to improve privacy and the raised timber deck be relocated.*

*No detail has been provided on landscape plans indicating the location of services such as stormwater, pipes, irrigation or OSD tanks. These services should not be located in deep soil zones and landscape plans should be coordinated with all other consultants.*

Comment: The proposed deep soil at the rear has been increased, the raised planters adjoining the private courtyards to the north have been widened to 2.5m to improve privacy and the adjoining timber deck has been lowered to ensure privacy to the courtyards are maintained.

## **Amenity**

*The Panel notes that the residential entrance has been amended to have a setback not exceeding one (1) metre in accordance with the recommendations of the previous Panel.*

*The Panel notes that all units have a northern aspect which improves opportunities for solar access.*

*The amended drawings show no storage in the carpark levels or for the apartments. A detailed schedule is to be supplied setting out storage provision both in the carpark and in the apartments in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the RFDC.*

Comment: The amended plans now indicate storage provisions in the carpark and in the apartments in accordance RFDC.

## **Safety and security**

*Refer to comment on residential entrance door in Amenity.*

Comment: The residential entrance has been amended with one (1) metre setback in accordance with the recommendations of the DRP.

## Social, dimensions and housing affordability

*The modified proposal depicts five (5) adaptable studio apartments at levels 10 – 14. The Panel believes that the distribution of adaptable apartments should be more reflective of the overall apartment mix.*

Comment: The amended plans now indicate three (3) studio units as adaptable units and two (2) bedroom units as adaptable units.

## Aesthetics

*The Panel supports the improved front façade. The Panel recommends wrapping the colours or slab edge articulation around the south east corner. This corner of the building is highly visible along Forest Road and is likely to remain visible for a long time. Therefore, more resolution of the building in the round is required.*

*The Panel acknowledges the proponent has sought to improve the retaining wall along the western boundary. The addition of the raised planter with multiple doors will result in maintenance issues and is highly problematic and should be removed.*

Comment: Minor amendments to the plans now indicate the south eastern corner of the building modified to continue the colours and textures from the front facade. The raised planter with multiple doors has been removed from the western elevation.

## RECOMMENDATION

- *The modified proposal is supported subject to the above comments.*
- *Provision of a fire engineered solution and BCA report, that demonstrate deemed to satisfy compliance is essential.*

Comment: It is considered the amended plans have addressed all the issues raised by the Design Review Panel. The proposal is now considered to provide a high quality design with respect to the design quality principles and generally satisfies the State Environmental Planning Policy SEPP No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Development. The approval of the proposal will be subject to recommended conditions of consent regarding the provision of a fire engineered solution as an alternative solution to the Deemed To Satisfy (DTS) provisions of the BCA provisions.

### Greater Metropolitan Regional Environmental Plan No 2 – Georges River Catchment

The site is within the area affected by the Greater Metropolitan Regional Environmental Plan No 2 – Georges River Catchment. The proposal, including the disposal of stormwater, is consistent with Council's requirements for the disposal of stormwater in the catchment.

## 2. Draft Environmental Planning Instruments

### Draft Hurstville City Centre Local Environmental Plan 2011

Exhibition of the Draft Hurstville City Centre Local Environmental Plan (HCCLEP) 2011 has concluded under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and Regulations as proposed and was resolved by Council at its meeting on 30 November 2011.

Further, at the Council meeting of 12 April 2012, Council resolved to adopt the Draft HCCLEP 2011 with a number of amendments.

The Department issued a Gateway Determination to permit the formal public exhibition of the draft HCCLEP 2011 on 23 November 2011. The timeframe in the Determination for completing the draft HCCLEP 2011 is 18 months, i.e. 30 May 2013. This will allow the TMAP study to be finalised and its findings addressed in the draft HCCLEP 2011, prior to finalisation of the draft Plan by Council. At this stage, the Draft HCCLEP 2011 is not imminent and certain.

Under the Draft HCCLEP 2011, the site is proposed to be rezoned to B4 Mixed Use Zone. Development for the purposes of retail/commercial premises and residential flat buildings are permissible in the zone with Council's development consent.

Under the Draft HCCLEP 2011, the maximum building height for the site is 23m with a maximum FSR of 3.0:1. The proposal is not consistent with the draft controls for maximum height and the maximum floor space ratio with a proposed height of 46.2m and total floor space ratio of 3.08:1, which is discussed further in the report under the section, Development Control Plan.

#### State Environmental Planning Policy (Competition) 2010

The aims of this policy are to promote economic growth and competition and to remove anti-competitive barriers in environmental planning and assessment.

Under Clause 8 of this policy, the commercial viability of proposed commercial development is not a matter that may be taken into consideration by a consent authority for the purposes of determining a development application under Part 4 of the Act to carry out the proposed development. Accordingly, the proposed development under the provisions of such a policy would be acceptable.

#### **Any other matters prescribed by the Regulations**

The Regulations prescribe the following matters for consideration for development in the Hurstville Council area:

Safety standards for demolition and compliance with AS 2601 - 2001 apply to the demolition of any buildings affected by the proposal.

### **3. Development Control Plans**

#### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN No. 2 - HURSTVILLE CITY CENTRE

The table below is a summary of the compliance with controls from Council's Development Control Plan No 2, Section 4.2. The site is identified as Block 2 and site 2B in the Hurstville City Centre.

<b>DCP No. 2 – Hurstville Town Centre: Section 4.2 Built Form Controls : Block 2 Site 2B</b>	<b>Required</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Complies</b>
Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retail/commercial</li> <li>▪ Retail/ residential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Commercial / Residential</li> </ul>	Yes

Height	23m Design Principles: Build to Forest Road with seven storeys with party wall to adjacent sites, form smaller building in rear with landscaped space between the two.	46.2m	No (1)
FSR	3.0:1	3.08:1	No (2)
Awnings	N/A	N/A	N/A
Balconies	Minimum 1 balcony per unit with min. 8sqm	Min. 8sqm each min. 2.0m dimension	Yes
Vehicle Parking <u>Min. % on site / Use / Rate (sqm)</u>	min. 70% on site / Commercial / 1 per 50sqm : req = 2 min. 70% on site / Retail / 1 per 25sqm : req = 2  min. 100% on site / Resid. / 1 per 100sqm, req = 39  Visitors / 1 per 4 units Total req'd = 14 spaces  Total required: 56 <u>57 req'd with 67 spaces in total provided</u>	Commercial car spaces provided: 2  Retail car spaces provided: 2  Residential car spaces provided: 51  Residential visitor space provided: 14  Total provided: 67  Note, total no. of car spaces comply whilst spaces to be redistributed to appropriate use.	Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes

As can be seen from the table above, the proposal complies with the Development Control Plan No. 2 with the exception of variations discussed below.

#### (1) Height

The height requirements for site 2B in the DCP is a maximum of 23m, which is equivalent to approximately seven (7) storeys in height. The maximum height as proposed is 46.2m or 15 storeys. The proposed height controls of seven (7) storeys on the site was restricted on the site, given the constraints of the site being narrow, the requirements for parking to be provided on the site and to minimise the impacts of a development to the adjoining neighbours.

The applicant has argued that he could respond with a higher built form with minimal impacts to neighbouring land, hence a built form of seven (7) storeys between existing and

future buildings of twice the height would not provide for a suitable streetscape. The applicant has made considerable effort to comply with the advice of the DRP and Council with three significant amendments to the proposal. The original design of two separate towers was reduced to one building with the floor space ratio reduced to near compliance and the further provision of well considered built form and additional landscaping to benefit not only the residents of the subject site but the residents of all surrounding properties.

The proposed built form is considered to be well designed in proportion to the adjoining built and desired development and results in minimal impact to adjoining properties as previously discussed and as such is considered acceptable and recommended to be supported.

## (2) Floor Space Ratio

The DCP permits a maximum floor space ratio on the site of 3.0:1 for a 23m high building . The proposed development has been reduced to a total floor space ratio of 3.081:1, which is considered to be a minor variation. Hence, full compliance is considered to result in amenity issues to the building design. Accordingly the proposed density in this case is considered to be appropriate and acceptable.

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN NO 2 – SECTION 6.3: ACCESS AND MOBILITY

This development guidelines requires 1 adaptable dwelling for the first eight units and then 1 for every 10 units after that, or part thereof. This equates to a total of five (5) adaptable dwellings to be provided in the development with a total of three (3) parking spaces for adaptable use in accordance with AS1428.2. The proposal complies with Section 6.3 of DCP.

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN NO 2 – SECTION 6.4 CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

The proposal is deemed to satisfy the requirements of Development Control Plan No 2 - Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) by addressing CPTED principles. These are discussed below.

	Design requirements	Proposal	Compliance (yes, no, N/A)
<b>Fencing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Front max 1m, unless open type</li> </ul>	No fencing is proposed	Yes
<b>Blind corners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct pathways with permeable barriers</li> <li>Mirrors around corners</li> <li>Glass/steel panels in stairwells</li> </ul>	Blind corners generally avoided, good viewing to and from street. Glass balustrade at disabled ramp.	Yes
<b>Communal/public areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Habitable rooms adjacent to areas</li> <li>Good visibility to stairwells, entries, elevators</li> </ul>	Habitable rooms face on to street. Good views from street to pedestrian entrances and from living areas to the street	Yes
<b>Entrances</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Max one entry point per 6-8 dwellings</li> <li>User can see into building before entering</li> <li>Entrance clearly recognisable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- N/A for mixed use development of this nature.</li> <li>- Clearly recognisable entry point with good</li> </ul>	Yes

		views from the street	
<b>Site and building layout</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main entrance orientated towards street, and not from rear lanes</li> <li>• Habitable rooms at front of dwelling</li> </ul>	- Main Entrance from Forest Rd, and clearly visible from the street - Habitable rooms at front.	Yes  Yes
<b>Landscaping</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low hedges and shrubs or high canopied vegetation</li> <li>• No continuous barrier of dense growth</li> <li>• Ground cover or 2m clean trunks around children's play areas, car parks and pedestrian pathways</li> <li>• Prickly plants used as barriers</li> <li>• Avoid vegetation that conceals building entrances</li> <li>• Large trees next to second storey windows or balconies</li> </ul>	Landscaping proposed avoids dense medium height shrubs.	Yes
<b>Lighting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of diffused and/or movement sensitive lights</li> <li>• Access/egress routes illuminated</li> <li>• No glare or dark shadows produced</li> <li>• No lighting spillage onto neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Users can identify a face 15 metres away</li> <li>• Use of energy efficient lamps/fittings/switches</li> </ul>	To be conditioned	Yes
<b>Building identification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each individual dwelling numbered</li> <li>• Unit numbers provided on each level</li> <li>• Building entries state unit numbers accessed from that entry</li> </ul>	To be conditioned	Yes
<b>Security</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intercom, code or card locks for building and car park entries</li> <li>• Door and window locks comply with AS 220</li> <li>• Security access to basement parking via main building</li> <li>• External storage areas well secured and lit</li> </ul>	To be conditioned	Yes
<b>Maintenance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for the speedy removal of graffiti and repair/cleaning of damaged property</li> <li>• Provision of information advising where to go for help and how to report maintenance or vandalism</li> </ul>	To be conditioned	Yes

As can be seen from the above assessment, the development complies in full, or may be conditioned to comply in full with the requirements of Council's Development Control Plan no.2, Section 6.4 - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.

#### Hurstville Section 94 Contribution Plans

Council's Section 94 plans applies to the proposal. Conditions requiring relevant contributions would be included, if the application was recommended for approval.

## **DIVISIONAL REFERRALS**

### **4. Impacts**

#### **Natural Environment**

It is considered unlikely the proposal will significantly impact the natural environment, given the existing setting is a highly built up environment. A geotechnical report is recommended to ensure soil stability and no impact on drainage in the immediate area.

#### **Built Environment**

The proposed building is considered to be of a quality design that has architectural merit and vastly improves the streetscape, further the height and density as previously discussed is considered appropriate on the site

#### **Social Impact**

The proposal provides for an appropriate mix of unit sizes, which will provide at least five (5) adaptable units for disabled persons and is considered unlikely to create any adverse social impacts to the community.

#### **Economic Impact**

The proposal will create employment during the demolition and construction phases of the development and further increase generally employment opportunities during the use of the commercial units.

#### **Suitability of the Site**

The preliminary investigation of the land has recommended that the site can be made suitable for the proposed mixed use development after remediation of the land. A condition of consent is recommended that any remediation of the site be undertaken prior to the commencement of works on the site. It is considered there are no attributes to the site that render it unsuitable for the proposed development.

## **5. REFERRALS, SUBMISSIONS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST**

### **Resident**

The proposal was publicly exhibited on two (2) separate periods in accordance with statutory requirements. During the first advertising and notification period, four (4) individual submissions were received and one signed petition with thirty two (32) signatures. During the second advertising and notification period, five (5) individual submissions were received for the proposal in its current amended form, which are summarised below.

#### *Overshadowing and block air due to proximity of building*

*The proposal will block the sunlight during winter to the building at 313 Forest Road.*

Comment: The shadow diagrams for the winter period indicate that the proposal will have minimal impact for the building at 313 Forest Road and that solar access will be acceptable.

Further the proposal is considered unlikely to impact airflow to the building at 313 Forest Road.

*Reduction in property values due to loss of views of city.*

Comment: There is no evidence to indicate that the proposal if approved will result in a reduction in property values due to loss of any views.

*Traffic generation and parking problems will increase and loading inadequate.*

Comment: Traffic generation has been addressed in the report as being acceptable and the proposal satisfies the parking/loading requirements of Council.

*Privacy concerns to the building at 313 and 438 Forest Road.*

Comment: The proposed building is well designed to minimise privacy issues with including appropriately treated windows facing adjoining buildings. Further the building separation between the proposed building and the adjoining development is considered to be adequate with regards to privacy.

*Noise increased in area.*

Comment: Noise emission from construction works will be required to comply with standard conditions of consent regarding restrictions to the permitted hours of any works carried out during the day to any approval granted.

*Overdevelopment with excessive bulk and scale:*

Comment: The height and density of the proposed development is considered acceptable as addressed in the report.

*The proposal will increase the population density.*

Comment: The proposal will provide additional housing in the area, which is considered to have a positive impact.

*The proposed building will impact the stability of the adjoining buildings due to the proposed excavation.*

Comment: Any approval granted will be subject to a dilapidation report and a geotechnical report prior to the issue of a construction certificate to ensure the proposed works will not impact the stability of neighbouring buildings within close proximity to the site.

*Whether there is adequate access for emergency services.*

Comment: The approved development will be required to satisfy the standards of the BCA or alternative solutions as previously discussed in the report.

## **Council Referrals**

### Manager - Development Advice



Council's Manager of Development Advice had no objections to the proposal subject to recommended conditions of consent for stormwater.

#### Senior Health and Building Surveyor

The Senior Health and Building Surveyor has advised of the following:

*As indicated the Deemed To Satisfy (DTS) provisions of the BCA require a building with an effective height of more than 25m to have a minimum of 2 exits.*

*The proposed building has an effective height of 42.7m, and therefore if a DTS solution is proposed then an additional staircase is required.*

*The BCA is a performance based document and as such the applicant is at liberty to propose an "alternative solution" to the DTS provisions as a method of complying with the performance requirements.*

*The applicant has signalled the intention to use an "alternative solution " by engaging a fire engineer to prepare a fire engineering brief, which is the initial stage of the development of a fire engineered solution, in accordance with the international fire engineering guidelines.*

*Traditionally NSW Fire and Rescue Service (NSWFRS) have not supported "single staircase" buildings at such an excessive height above 25m, as the capacity to rescue occupants at these heights is limited.*

*NSWFRS rescue capability is up to 14 storeys and this development has 15 storeys.*

*BCA2013 which is effective 1 May 2013, introduces the new concept of using lifts as a means of escape for occupants in a fire situation, this is primarily motivated by the increased heights of modern buildings, particularly internationally. In addition it is seen as facilitating the evacuation of occupants who may have a disability.*

*Whilst this may not be the methodology that will be used by the fire engineer, the BCA is a performance based document , the applicant appears to have engaged an accredited fire engineer who believes he can design an alternative solution. It is incumbent on the fire engineer to convince NSWFRS, the alternative solution satisfies the performance requirements.*

Council as the Consent Authority, is considered to have taken the necessary steps as required at the Development Assessment stage in alerting the applicant to this requirement of the BCA, and the possibility of a major redesign required, should the alternative solution not be supported by NSWFRS.

#### Senior Traffic Engineer

No objection was raised to the proposal on traffic and parking grounds subject to recommended conditions of consent.

#### Manager, Environmental Services

No objections were raised to the proposal subject to recommended conditions of consent.

.

#### **External Referrals**

#### Roads and Maritime Services

No objections were raised to the proposal subject to recommended conditions of consent.

## Urban Design Review Panel

The comments of the Urban Design Review Panel been previously discussed in an earlier section of this report.

### **6. CONCLUSION**

The proposed development has been assessed under the relevant Section 79C (1) "Matters for Consideration" of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 and against Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 1994 and Council's Development Control Plan No.2 – Hurstville City Centre.

The proposal has implemented the advice of the Urban Design Review Panel and Council Officers to amend the plans, where issues regarding design have been raised. The proposed building is now considered to be of a quality design that has architectural merit and is considered to generally comply with Council's requirements with the exception to the height and floor space ratio, which are considered to be acceptable as addressed.

It is considered that the proposed development is in the public interest and that the application be approved subject to the recommended conditions of consent.

### **Appendix:**

<b>Date of Panel Assessment:</b>	16 August 2012
----------------------------------	----------------

454-456 Forest Road, Hurstville 12/DA-201

<b>Number of Units: Breakdown:</b>	54 Residential Units 7 x 1br; 36 x 2br; 11 x 3br	<b>Floor space ratio:</b>	Overall 4.08:1
<b>Commercial Floor space:</b>	269.25m FSR: 0.21:1	<b>Height:</b>	Front - 15 storeys:45.1m Rear - 8 storeys: 25.2m

### **Context**

A comprehensive context plan and elevation analysis is required showing all of the existing and proposed adjacent buildings.

Given the building height allowed for adjacent sites under the new LEP the height of the proposal on Forest Road appears reasonable. However, being well in excess of both the new LEP's proposed height and FSR requirements the proposal must demonstrate that it is an excellent response to its current and future context. This should be argued through the provision of well considered built form and landscape to benefit not only the residents of the subject site but the residents of all surrounding properties and the street.

Currently the north building creates adverse impacts on surrounding dwellings and open spaces and will marginalize the subject site's proposed open space. We therefore suggest the removal of the north building and the incorporation of those dwellings as far as possible into a more efficiently designed southern building.

## **Scale**

The scale is appropriate given its existing and approved neighbouring developments along Forest Road. However, the scale of the northern building is considered inappropriate.

## **Built Form**

Currently, the northern building is considered inappropriate (See above comments). The panel suggests that the depth of the southern building should be maintained but in its re-design, its footprint should be widened to accommodate four apartments per floor with a reduced area accommodating lobby and core, allowing for solar access to the rear of Forest Road dwellings.

The Panel also believes that the building should maintain the stepped profile currently proposed (ie. Incorporating one step only) allowing an additional accessible north facing communal space at higher levels and rooftop.

The base of the building should read as a unified double height on Forest Road. Access to the first floor commercial level should not be via the residential lobby.

## **Density**

As the density is well in excess of LEP requirements the Panel cannot support the proposal in its current form. To be acceptable the proposal must demonstrate that the design achieves all of the objectives described above (see above comments), and must result in an intelligently, resolved and attractive residential building with well considered built form, complying with the SEPP 65 "rules of thumb" and excellent landscape amenity.

## **Resource, energy and water efficiency**

Cannot be considered until the above amendments have been undertaken.

## **Landscape**

The current landscape provision is not acceptable due to the above comments.

A landscape plan is to be submitted and must comprise;

- Clearly nominated facilities and amenities.
- Large trees providing shade.
- Areas of turf.
- Well designed paths and courtyards.
- Shade structures, benches and lighting.
  
- The panel recognises the potential to incorporate a communal swimming pool.

## **Amenity**

The building layout is unacceptable in its current form and should be amended as above. Many of the internal spaces in current plans are awkward and undersized. Bedrooms and living spaces should be amended to meet size and amenity standards.

The residential lobby should align with the front entry doors providing clear visual access from the street.

Retail at the ground floor could be integrated with entry lobby to enhance and activate its architectural character.

## **Safety and security**

Cannot be considered until the above amendments have been undertaken.

## **Social, dimensions and housing affordability**

Cannot be considered until the above amendments have been undertaken.

## **Aesthetics**

As a prominent high scale building it is crucial that the design of its front façade and side walls is undertaken at a high level, to contribute to the streetscape of Forest Road.

Currently, the buildings architectural language and articulation is undeveloped and requires significant refinement in composition and detail.

This is particularly important at lower levels relating to the street.

## **CONCLUSION**

- It is recommended that proposal be brought back to the Design Review Panel Meeting.

## REPORT OF THE ST GEORGE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Monday, 17 December 2012

<b>ITEM 3 Date of Panel Assessment:</b>	17 December 2012
<b>Applicant:</b>	Elieti Pty Ltd
<b>Architect:</b>	N Lychenko
<b>Property Address:</b>	454-456 Forest Road Hurstville
<b>Description:</b>	JRPP- Demolition of existing buildings/structures and construct a fifteen (15) storey mixed use development with basement parking.
<b>No. of Buildings:</b>	One (1)
<b>No. of Storeys:</b>	Fifteen (15) storeys
<b>No. of Units:</b>	Fifty four (54)
<b>Consent Authority Responsible:</b>	Hurstville City Council
<b>Application No.:</b>	12/DA-325, JRPP Reference no 2012 SYE 108
<b>Declaration of Conflict of Interest:</b>	None

<b>SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Context</b></p> <p>Good design responds and contributes to its context.</p> <p>Context can be defined as the key natural and built features of an area.</p> <p>Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of a location's current character or, in the case of precincts undergoing a transition, the desired future character as stated in planning and design policies. New buildings will thereby contribute to the quality and identity of the area.</p>	<p>Due to the large buildings to the east and west of the site a strong case can be mounted to support the height proposed. The Panel notes that the relationship with the building to the east is significantly improved through the removal of the rear garden building. The site is considered constrained by the existing high rise building to the east and the proposed major development to the west and it can be accepted that some leeway should be given in assessing solar access. The Panel is aware that the development to the west of the site proposes a lane way adjoining western boundary of subject site. It would be a major advantage if this was a public right of way so that access to the residential development could be accommodated.</p>
<p><b>Scale</b></p> <p>Good design provides an appropriate scale in terms of the bulk and height that suits the scale of the street and the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Establishing an appropriate scale requires a considered response to the scale of existing development. In precincts undergoing a transition, proposed bulk and height needs to achieve the scale identified for the desired future character of the area.</p>	<p>Generally acceptable. The scale at the rear of the site does not read well from the lane however due to the length of the inactive car park wall and clumsy massing of the egress stair amenity block. This could be improved if it were proposed as a landscaped wall (with entries if possible) with the amenity block better integrated into the landscape plan and not on the wall.</p>
<p><b>Built Form</b></p> <p>Good design achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose, in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type and the manipulation of building elements.</p> <p>Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.</p>	<p>While the proponents have improved the scheme by compressing all apartments into the front building, they are still struggling to make the layout access and general amenity work within this scheme. It is suggested that further BCA and traffic advice is sought to condense the amount of space dedicated to egress and thereby rationalise and simplify layouts, lobby and egress stair on each residential level. Because the bulk of the building is built to both common boundaries so that the impact of the built form is over assertive. Subject to reduction in density (see comments below), and simplification of layouts as per above, this could be improved through more refined articulation and lowering of height of the northern block.</p>

<b>SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Density</b></p> <p>Good design has a density appropriate for a site and its context, in terms of floor space yields (or number of units or residents). Appropriate densities are sustainable and consistent with the existing density in an area or, in precincts undergoing a transition, are consistent with the stated desired future density. Sustainable densities respond to the regional context, availability of infrastructure, public transport, community facilities and environmental quality.</p>	<p>Currently the proposal is significantly over the LEP requirements. This cannot be supported as there are no apparent public benefits. The Panel suggests that the density be reduced to comply with the LEP by deleting the necessary number of floors from the northern wing of the proposal.</p>
<p><b>Resource, energy and water efficiency</b></p> <p>Good design makes efficient use of natural resources, energy and water throughout its full life cycle, including construction. Sustainability is integral to the design process. Aspects include demolition of existing structures, recycling of materials, selection of appropriate and sustainable materials, adaptability and reuse of buildings, layouts and built form, passive solar design principles, efficient appliances and mechanical services, soil zones for vegetation and reuse of water.</p>	<p>The efficiency of the scheme is predicated on access from Forest Road. However, the future construction of the proposed new lane on the west of the site could allow vehicular and even residential access from the lane itself. It would therefore be good for the proponent to demonstrate that a front tenancy could replace the driveway and access from lane be possible if the lane were built. Currently there is insufficient deep soil zones on the site (refer to landscaping). If car parking and FSR is complied with it will reduce as much as one level of car parking to meet current requirements and potentially the length, thereby allowing for greater deep soil.</p>

<b>SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p>Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in greater aesthetic quality and amenity for both occupants and the adjoining public domain.</p> <p>Landscape design builds on the existing site's natural and cultural features in responsible and creative ways.</p> <p>It enhances the development's natural environmental performance by co-ordinating water and soil management, solar access, micro-climate, tree canopy and habitat values. It contributes to the positive image and contextual fit of development through respect for streetscape and neighbourhood character, or desired future character.</p> <p>Landscape design should optimise useability, privacy and social opportunity, equitable access and respect for neighbours' amenity, and provide for practical establishment and long term management.</p>	<p>The Panel recognises the submission of the landscape plans and they indicate a good range of facilities and suggest a high quality landscape podium. The Panel however, notes that there is very limited deep soil planting and recommends the length of the car park be reduced and a deep soil zone be provided equating to 7.5% of site area in accordance with SEPP 65 minimum requirements along the full width of the lot at the rear. This should also include provision of large scale trees minimum 100L at installation, improving privacy and future amenity for future residents. It is recommended that the driveway ramp be relocated as far as possible (ideally 6m) forward so that this full area between the ramp and the rear boundary can incorporate this deep soil planting zone. If the adjoining property to the west is developed as proposed with a right of way adjoining the subject site, the car park wall should be treated as a 'green wall'.</p> <p>The current landscape podium layout provides a number of different facilities. This could be consolidated to a centralised zone and a larger planting buffer be accommodated adjacent to proposed private open space.</p>
<p><b>Amenity</b></p> <p>Good design provides amenity through the physical, spatial and environmental quality of a development.</p> <p>Optimising amenity requires appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas, outlook and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.</p>	<p>Given the density of its context it may be argued that some relaxation on solar access may consider minimum 2 hours mid winter solar access as acceptable to living spaces. It is recommended that the entry doors are setback from Forest Road from the Forest Road alignment approximately 1 metre only to make the lobby generous and to minimise security concerns relating to deep external recessed spaces.</p>



<b>SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Safety and security</b></p> <p>Good design optimises safety and security, both internal to the development and for the public domain.</p> <p>This is achieved by maximising overlooking of public and communal spaces while maintaining internal privacy, avoiding dark and non-visible areas, maximising activity on streets, providing clear, safe access points, providing quality public spaces that cater for desired recreational uses, providing lighting appropriate to the location and desired activities, and clear definition between public and private spaces.</p>	<p>See front door comment in Amenity above.</p>
<p><b>Social, dimensions and housing affordability</b></p> <p>Good design responds to the social context and needs of the local community in terms of lifestyles, affordability, and access to social facilities.</p> <p>New developments should optimise the provision of housing to suit the social mix and needs in the neighbourhood or, in the case of precincts undergoing transition, provide for the desired future community.</p> <p>New developments should address housing affordability by optimising the provision of economic housing choices and providing a mix of housing types to cater for different budgets and housing needs.</p>	<p>Acceptable.</p>

<b>SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Aesthetics</b></p> <p>Quality aesthetics require the appropriate composition of building elements, textures, materials and colours and reflect the use, internal design and structure of the development. Aesthetics should respond to the environment and context, particularly to desirable elements of the existing streetscape or, in precincts undergoing transition, contribute to the desired future character of the area.</p>	<p>Unlike the many horizontally proportioned building that dominate the area, this is a large scale proposal that has vertical dimensions and an elegant proportion. However, it currently appears very flat and uninviting. It is encouraged that the appearance of the building is given a higher priority, in terms of its articulation, proportion and expression. The side walls are bland and over assertive. By reduction in height in the rear section, further articulation of the proposed construction material and changing the expression of the facades elevation with a vertical emphasis it may be possible to overcome this concern.</p>

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- The applicant is commended for the changes made since the original application,. However, the application cannot be supported unless the issues itemised above are resolved.