

2013HCC024 – DA/1892/2013

40-48 Burton Road, Mount Hutton

Appendix B:

SEPP65 Recommendations

SEPP 65 Urban Design Review Panel Recommendations

Property Details:	40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290, 48 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290 Lot 11 DP 830292, Lot 12 DP 830292
SEPP Application No.:	SEPP65/8/2013
Development Application No.: (if applicable)	DA/1892/2013
Proposal:	Seniors Living
Responsible Officer:	Michelle A Bisson
Applicants Name:	ELEEBANA SHORES RETIREMENT LIVING PTY LTD
Applicants Address:	C/- Coastplan Group Pty Ltd, PO Box 568, FORSTER NSW 2428
Panel Members Present:	David Ryan John O'Grady Alison McCabe Phillip Pollard
Applicant/Proponents Present:	John Streeter – EJE Architecture Gavin Maberly-Smith – Coastplan Consulting Mark Dixon – Eleebana Shores P/L
Council Officers Present:	Michelle Bisson John Andrews Trevor Ryan David Pavitt
Apologies:	Robert Denton
Chair:	David Ryan

Date of Meeting:

12 March 2014

Introduction

The Design Review Panel (the Panel), comments are to assist Lake Macquarie City Council in its consideration of the development application.

The absence of a comment under any of the principles does not necessarily imply that the Panel considers the particular matter has been satisfactorily addressed, as it may be that changes suggested under other principles will generate a desirable change.

The Panel draws the attention of applicants to the Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC), as published by DIPNR (September 2002), which provides guidance on all the issues addressed.

Panel Comments

The Panel acknowledges the applicant's genuine efforts to respond to the Panel's previous concerns with the original scheme.

Of the 4 alternative schemes now presented, the Panel considers that Alternatives 1 and 2, whilst improving on the current DA, do not sufficiently address the Panel's previously expressed concerns.

The Panel considers that Alternative 4 best encapsulated the preferred open planning approach, however accepts that the form of 3 storey apartment housing may not be viable or practical in the near term.

The approach demonstrated in Alternative three (3) is acceptable. However further design resolution is required, particularly near the site boundaries and demonstrated by way of multiple cross sections, to illustrate capacity for adequate vegetation buffering and transition between the subject property and its neighbours.

The panel places significant weight on ensuring that the boundary conditions and transitions to the broader rural landscape and adjoining eco-tourism development are appropriate and need to be resolved as they are a fundamental aspect to the broad support of the approach.

In respect to the proposed swales, it is recommended that the landscape and engineering consultants further confer with Council's hydraulic engineers and landscape architect to establish the required detention and flow capacities. This will allow further design development which should focus on optimizing landscape beside and possibly within the swales, to create an attractive landscape outcome as perceived both within the subject property and from the neighbouring properties. Boundary tree planting should generally be of a larger scale, which reinforces landscaping on adjoining properties and provides the appropriate screen to the rural vistas.

In respect to the detailed road locations and building orientations, design development should explore introducing varieties in orientation and setback to create opportunities for planting and for visual interest.

The alignment of the roads should provide some visual variety and the orientation of the two western most residential flat blocks could be 'cranked' to run closer to parallel with the nearest section of the southern boundary. This would provide an element of contrast to the two eastern most blocks.

SEPP 65 Urban Design Review Panel Recommendations

Property Details:	40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290, 48 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290 Lot 11 DP 830292, Lot 12 DP 830292
SEPP Application No.:	SEPP65/8/2013
Development Application No.: (if applicable)	DA/1892/2013
Proposal:	Seniors Living
Responsible Officer:	Michelle A Bisson
Applicants Name:	ELEEBANA SHORES RETIREMENT LIVING PTY LTD
Applicants Address:	C/- Coastplan Group Pty Ltd, PO Box 568, FORSTER NSW 2428
Panel Members Present:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alison McCabe (Chairperson)• David Ryan• Philip Pollard• Robert Denton
Applicant/Proponents Present:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• John Streeter – EJE Architecture• Gavin Maberly-Smith – Coastplan Consulting• Mark Dixon – Eleebana Shores P/L
Council Officers Present:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Michelle Bisson, John Andrews• Trevor Ryan, David Pavitt
Apologies:	John O'Grady
Chair:	Alison McCabe
Date of Meeting:	Wednesday 12 February 2014

Introduction

The Design Review Panel (the Panel), comments are to assist Lake Macquarie City Council in its consideration of the development application.

The absence of a comment under any of the principles does not necessarily imply that the Panel considers the particular matter has been satisfactorily addressed, as it may be that changes suggested under other principles will generate a desirable change.

The Panel draws the attention of applicants to the Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC), as published by DIPNR (September 2002), which provides guidance on all the issues addressed.

The 10 design quality principles to be addressed in SEPP 65 will be grouped together where relevant, to avoid the unnecessary repetition of comments.

Panel Comments

The 10 design principles as set out in SEPP 65 were considered by the panel in discussion of the development application. These are: **Context, Scale, Built Form, Density, Resource, Energy and Water Efficiency, Landscape, Amenity, Safety and Security, Social dimensions and Aesthetics.**

1	Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The panel believes that the site is in an appropriate location for a serviced self-care seniors living development.• The site is located in a semi-rural area comprising of clear and vegetated larger lots with single dwellings and is on the edge of an urban settlement.• The site is also located immediately adjoining a small ecotourism facility.• This context sets the parameters for the intensity and nature of the type of development that can be accommodated on site. <p>Given the location, it is the Panel's view that any building should result in a development that is set in a landscaped setting with buildings that are spaced with generous separation and landscape elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Panel is of the view that the current proposal is reflective of a more urban solution and does not appropriately respond to the sites context, constraints or opportunities.
---	----------------	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is evident in the proximity of apartment buildings to boundaries, the lack of opportunity to provide appropriate screening around boundaries and the lack of opportunity for community landscape pockets. The general layout does not respond to the topography or the elements of the surrounding urban subdivision pattern. <p>The Panel is concerned that the challenging interrelationship and requirements of engineering, landscape and built form have not yet been adequately resolved. Greater detail is required in the provided documentation (for example by way of additional through-site sections) detailing the proposed levels at and near site boundaries, and how these will interface with the rolling topography of the natural landform of the adjacent sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship with and transition to adjoining boundaries is not currently supported, particularly in respect to the location of the drainage swales to the south of the proposed apartment buildings and the freestanding dwellings along southern boundary generally.
2	Scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel is supportive of single storey development, appropriately located two storey and potentially three storey buildings. Any scale greater than two storey would need to be centrally located away from property boundaries, and set in appropriately scaled landscaping. It is suggested that the architect explore a greater variety of built form outcomes such as the use of duplexes or smaller scaled apartment type buildings.
3	Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site complies numerically. However, the site constraints are such that it will be difficult to achieve a development approaching the permissible density. The Panel's view is that the site may be able to accommodate the proposed level of floor space sought. However, it was considered that this could only be achieved with different combinations of built form, which permit a greater area of open space at ground level.
4	Built Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The façade and skillion roof forms with particular regard to the apartments would benefit from further design development. Further, it was suggested that the rigid symmetry of the front façade of the

		<p>apartment buildings was unnecessarily rigid in form. The Panel suggested also, that in respect to all the building typologies, the architect investigate varying elements of the design to be more integrated with the building structure and form, and to achieve architectural interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel would like to see demonstrated, given the size of the site, greater variety in the architectural expression to avoid visual monotony in the streetscape. • Similarly, it was suggested that the proposed street grid pattern did not respond to the topography, and site drainage, and a "looser", more attractive outcome would be generated by greater consideration of these forms and site boundary conditions.
5	Resource, Energy and Water Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to the apartments, the upper floor units would benefit from the provision of natural light to the bathrooms.
6	Landscape	<p>The following comments take on board notes provided by the Panel's Landscape Architect who reviewed the submitted documentation. as he was unable to attend the meeting. The Panel further considered the landscaping design proposed, and the comments below reflect the consensus of the overall panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hydraulics reports provided indicate that the site is to be generally filled and leveled to provide building platforms above local flood levels. The net result of the flood management strategy is that levels across the site will be altered to create a series of fabricated raised platforms surrounded by drainage swales. This wholesale change in the landform of the site will have two critical impacts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visual - depending on the height of fill, the developed site will be inconsistent in its landform with the surrounding landscape and may appear incongruous, particularly in views from existing dwellings on the adjoining properties. The creation of swales on all of the site boundaries may also appear artificial and incongruous as the swales will have little relationship with the natural drainage pattern of the locality. A more "organic" layout which better melds with the adjacent topography and which results in a more natural landscape appearance will provide a superior outcome.

		<p>2. Loss of trees - wholesale changes in levels across the site will result in loss of most if not all existing trees, either immediately, or in the medium term due to changes in the local drainage regime. The existing trees at the site boundaries, particularly at the front (western) portion will be critical to mitigating the impact of this substantial development in views from Burton Road and properties to the north and south. Levels and the arrangement of swales should be reviewed to retain boundary trees in these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternate approaches to address flooding should be explored with a view to retaining existing trees on the site boundaries. Such treatments could potentially include gradually rising levels from the boundaries towards the centre of the site and the use of pier and beam construction on some dwellings near the boundaries to raise them above flood levels in lieu of the construction of homogenous raised platforms and relatively narrow boundary swales. • This approach involving less dramatic, shallower and wider drainage swales would also better accommodate screen tree planting at the site boundaries which is necessary to soften the visual impact of the substantial buildings proposed along each boundary. As proposed, the two storey apartments with half level basements along most of the southern boundary would have a significant impact on the existing local semi-rural character, particularly on the property directly to the south. • Greater setbacks and significant on site tree planting along the boundary is necessary to address this. It is considered that reliance on existing vegetation on the properties to the south and north for screening the new development is inappropriate. • The existing trees and shrubs on the adjoining sites to both the North and South need to be fully protected from impacts of the development. For example, drainage swales should not be constructed near the root zones of trees, and details of engineering and landscape proposals on the subject site need to fully demonstrate adequate protection has been achieved.
--	--	---

7	Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel raises concern in relation to the close proximity of the proposed free-standing dwellings, which have rear to rear yard relationships. Winter solar access and visual and acoustic privacy between dwellings appears to be potentially compromised by the lack of adequate rear setbacks to these dwellings. • The Panel is also has concerns with regard to the apparent narrowness of some internal roads and the lack of separation between building form, and very limited opportunity for usefully scaled street tree planting. • The Panel is of the view that the apartment buildings are located too close to the southern boundary.
8	Safety and Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment.
9	Social dimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel raises no issues providing the services proposed are provided.
10	Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the aesthetic character of the development will be determined by its landscaped setting. The Panel expressed reservations relating to the separation between buildings, very limited areas of open space within each "street" and the rigid geometric uniformity of the grid layout. • It was suggested that the semi-rural character of the site should inform the site layout and planning as well as the aesthetic treatment of the built form. • The Panel suggests that the palette of colours, materials and finishes be expanded somewhat to allow for more variety.

Note

It is suggested that the applicant may wish to provide a selection of design options for possible amendments to the proposal which would address the issues raised above. If the applicant chooses to provide sketch alternatives, these can be distributed to the Panel for further comment.

As the design progresses, the Application will need to be supported by more extensive documentation demonstrating how any proposed level changes and works on the subject site will be sympathetically integrated with the surrounding sites and their rolling topography.

Council Reference Number	Details	No. of Pages
D06873631	Property Constraints Report - SEPP65/8/2013 - 12 Feb 2014 - 40 Burton Road Mount Hutton	11
D06857092	DRP Overview Report - SEPP65/8/2013 - 40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290 - Development - LAKE MACQUARIE CITY COUNCIL	6
D06865503	Response to SEPP 65 Design Principles and Design Verification Statement - SEPP65/8/2013 - 40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290	57
D06865509	Visual Impact Assessment and Landscape Plans - SEPP65/8/2013 - 40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290	26
D06865511	Landscape Plans Report - SEPP65/8/2013 - 40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290	15
D06866778	Plans - SEPP65/8/2013 - 40 Burton Road, MOUNT HUTTON NSW 2290	21