

2015SYE134 – 133-139 Jannali Avenue, Sutherland

DA15/1148

## ASSESSMENT REPORT APPENDICES

Appendix	A	Sutherland Bus Interchange and Services Map
	B	Architectural Review Advisory Panel Report dated 22 October 2015

# Sutherland Bus Interchange and Service Map



## Architectural Review Advisory Panel

Proposal:

**Stage 1 - Demolition of three existing dwellings and construction of a three storey addition to an existing residential aged care facility over basement car parking and Stage 2 - Alterations and additions to an existing residential aged care facility with a portion of the rear to be demolished and extension of basement car park**

Property:

**133, 135, 137 & 139 Jannali Avenue SUTHERLAND NSW 2232**

Applicant:

**Gerendas Family Trust**

File Number:

**DA15/1148**

The following is the report of the Architectural Review Advisory Panel Meeting held on 22 October 2015 at the Administration Centre, Sutherland Shire Council, Eton Street, Sutherland. The report documents the Panel's consideration of the proposed development described above.

**"4. DA15/1148 – Demolition of Three (3) Existing Dwellings & Construction of a Three (3) Storey Addition to the South of the Existing Residential Aged Care Facility over Basement Car Parking (Stage 1) and Upgrading of the Existing Residential Aged Care Facility (Stage 2) at 133, 135, 137 & 139 Jannali Avenue, Sutherland – JRPP Application**

Council's Peter Brooker, Justine Tame, Luke Murtas, Barbara Buchanan and Claudia Miro outlined the proposal for the Panel, including providing details of Council's relevant codes and policies.

Lara Calder, Donald Maseh, Derek Hill, Les Gerendas and Robert Goldshaft addressed the Panel regarding the aims of the proposal and the constraints of the site.

### **Description of the Site and Proposal**

This development application is for demolition of three (3) existing dwellings and construction of a three (3) storey addition to the south of the existing residential aged care facility over basement car parking (stage 1) and upgrading of the existing residential aged care facility with a portion of the rear to be demolished – basement car park to be extended (stage 2).

The site is zoned R2 – Low Density Residential (SSLEP 2015)

The site is located at 133, 135, 137 & 139 Jannali Avenue, Sutherland

### **Key Controls:**

Sutherland Shire Local Environmental Plan 2015 (SSLEP 2015)

Sutherland Shire Draft Development Control Plan 2015 (SSDDCP 2015)

### **Applicant's Submission**

The Panel notes that the proponent has attended a PAD (15/0006) with Council. The proposal provides for a staged development process which will allow the three storey complex, together with basement car parking to be developed initially and provide for a seamless decanting of residents from the existing Lark Ellen facility.

The second stage will involve the demolition of existing development to the rear of the Lark Ellen primary building and the construction of further basement car parking, together with two levels of retirement facilities.

### **PRINCIPLE 1 – CONTEXT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER**

The site is located on the western side of Jannali Avenue not far from an intersection with Leonay Street. The site sits within an established residential area and adjoins a 'restoration' zone of the Shire's Greenweb associated with the rail corridor across the street from the site. The street is characterised by one to two storey houses and sporadically located trees. To the rear of the site are predominantly single level houses with some dual occupancy dwellings creating smaller rear gardens.

The proposed development involves the substantial retention of a heritage building known as the 'Lark Ellen' Nursing Home. A single storey rear wing of this building is to be demolished and replaced with a new two-storey rear wing that will be connected to a new three-storey nursing home wing that will be constructed on the three southern blocks. The overall built form has been driven by a clear functional internal logic but is also mindful of impacts on neighbours.

The expansion of the complex will introduce a larger built form into an otherwise low-scale existing context. While some variations to the proposed layout were discussed, the Panel considers that the proposed expansion and its additional bulk have been reasonably handled. In order to minimise potential adverse physical and visual impacts however, it is strongly recommended that some form of scaling element is introduced along the street elevation to provide a sense of architectural continuity with adjacent houses.

While this has been attempted by the introduction of repetitive rectangular bays, the resultant elevation is heavy and appears over-scaled. The Panel suggested that the architect could investigate a revised built form approach with more reference to the horizontal band of the ground floor and large, sheltering roof-form of the existing building as a means to a more successful composition and better contextual fit.

A further approach could be to adjust the mass of the new wing at each end to achieve more fluid transitions to the existing building and the residence to the south.

### **PRINCIPLE 2 – SCALE AND BUILT FORM**

The proposed additions to the heritage-listed building are of a respectful scale and the required retention of the Lark Ellen main building ensures a consistency with context. However the new three-storey element is of a scale and form that is at variance to the more domestic character of the area. As described above, the



manner in which the proposal resolves its relationship to adjacent buildings is not successfully handled at present.

The proposed two storey wing at the rear of the heritage building will release outdoor space that can be used for landscape and outdoor recreation.

The proposed two-storey link between the proposed new development and the retained heritage building should be carefully designed to create an appropriate integration in scale and detail.

### **PRINCIPLE 3 – DENSITY**

While the proposal slightly exceeds the LEP density controls, it has been submitted under the SEPP Seniors Housing with which it complies. It is noted that the minimum landscape area requirement of Council's DCP is not achieved.

### **PRINCIPLE 4 – SUSTAINABILITY**

The proposal appears to provide adequate light and ventilation via perimeter glazing and a series of small courtyards. The retention of deep soil zones should be provided to ensure large trees remain and new trees can be viably introduced. Other sustainable measures are not apparent in the drawings but should include water collection and solar panels for both domestic hot water and power.

### **PRINCIPLE 5 – LANDSCAPE**

Whilst the proposal provides for landscape planting in courtyards and around the perimeter of the site, it does not provide sufficient area of open space to comply with Clause 48c of the SEPP.

The development ultimately does not sit within an appropriate landscape setting, as the main entry remains as a shared driveway and car-park.

The rear open space is narrow and a number of trees have been removed from the western boundary. These should be replaced with appropriate trees for a 'Restoration' Greenweb area, and also provide screening to neighbours.

To address these problems, it is suggested that the design of the existing street frontage car-park and driveway could be reconsidered in order to create a pleasant sunny forecourt that also has the capacity to act as an appropriate landscape setting and curtilage for the heritage building. Parking spaces lost in this arrangement could possibly be added to the car-park under the Stage 2 addition or other discreet locations.

The design of a new forecourt could include elements that reference the former garden, as seen in the images in the heritage report.

The internal courtyards require more detailed consideration and the planting selection needs to include aromatic and colourful flowers that are suited to the compact and shaded locations.

The use of *Waterhousia floribunda* as 'green avenue' planting may not conform to the 'restoration' Greenweb requirements. The use of exotic deciduous trees may also need to be negotiated with Council. There is a particular need to plant shrubs

that will attract birds in both the courtyards and the northern and western garden beds.

#### **PRINCIPLE 6 – AMENITY**

The planning strategy focuses a number of resident rooms and many other spaces into the small courtyards, which may be disappointing unless the courts are enriched with carefully considered architectural detail, privacy screens and landscape.

The layout generally improves the indoor and outdoor amenity of the facility and provides for a number of pleasant, small garden spaces for residents to enjoy. The floor plans are extensive and complex, and the architect must ensure that access to natural light and outlook is regularly available for residents and staff who occupy the building for long hours every day.

In the arrangement of courtyard rooms, care should be taken not to face beds onto adjacent walls, as currently occurs in the northern and southern rooms to the east of the dining room on level one.

The staff courtyard and terrace do not offer sufficient amenity and it is not clear whether there is a continuous walkway for the dementia patients.

#### **PRINCIPLE 7 – SAFETY**

Not discussed. Security for residents using outdoor spaces is a key consideration.

#### **PRINCIPLE 8 – HOUSING DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL INTERACTION**

The proposed development provides for a range of nursing home accommodations and the grouping of common facilities around landscaped courtyards with clear corridor paths.

The café and main forecourt could encourage more social interaction opportunities with the surrounding community.

#### **PRINCIPLE 9 – AESTHETICS**

Suggestions were made by the Panel that an alternative built form might be considered to achieve an enhanced relationship between the scale of the retained heritage element and the new building. The potential ways of achieving that objective are discussed in Principles 1 and 2 above.

The façade expression of the new wing facing Jannali Avenue is not supported by the Panel in its present form, as it has a heavy, institutional quality that is at odds with the refined, delicate residential character of the heritage item.

The development provides an opportunity to resolve landscape aesthetics with the heritage curtilage. The understorey planting palette is not sensitive to period landscape aesthetics, and should further explore the role of plants in courtyards of nursing homes.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCLUSIONS:**

The Panel supports the general form and pattern of the proposed development including the proposed two storey extension to the rear of the existing Lark Ellen heritage building.

There was support for the general layout of the new three storey building complex, however its architectural massing and detail should be re-considered.

The Panel recommends a further design study that looks to integrate the scale, linearity and roof volume of the heritage building with the new built form.

The two storey link between the new building and the existing Lark Ellen building requires design sensitivity and consideration of detailed options, perhaps through study models.

The main entry forecourt is too dominated by vehicles, and strategies for creating a more suitable balance with increased landscape presence appropriate to the heritage values of the site should be considered.”

Tony Caro  
Deputy ARAP Chairman

12 November 2015