



**Ken Dyer**

56 Adelaide Ave  
Umina Beach  
NSW 2257

M – 0437 202 257  
E – ken\_dyer@bigpond.com

---




Independent Design Review

For Central Coast Council

DA - 49565

76 Hills Street; 35, 37 & 41a Dwyer Streets;  
372, 374, 393, 395 & 397 Mann Streets  
North Gosford

Report Title: Independent Design Review  
Report No: DDC\_040  
Issue No: v2.0  
Date: 27.02.20  
Prepared: Ken Dyer  
Page: 2 of 11

Control				Checked	
Rev	Issue Date	Status	Remarks	Initial	Sign
1.0	23.04.19	Final	Issued to Council	KD	
1.1	03.05.19	Final	Revised to include summary/conclusion	KD	
2.0	27.02.20	Final	Revised report based on amended plans	KD	

## 1. General

### Purpose

The purpose of the Independent Design Review is to consider the proposal against the 9 Design Quality Principles contained in State Environmental Planning Policy 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings and the Apartment Design Guide.

When considering the Design Quality Principles, the review will also have regard to plans and policies, including Local Environmental Plans, Development Control Plans, urban design strategies and the like.

The report will identify any aspects of the design which do not achieve the one or more of the Design Quality Principles. The original report will be revised as noted to include updates based on the revised documentation.

### Details of Proposal

**Property Address:** 76 Hills Street; 35, 37 & 41A Dwyer Streets; 372, 374, 393, 395 & 397 Mann Streets, North Gosford.

**Applicant:** CKDS Architecture Pty Ltd

**Architect:** CKDS Architecture Pty Ltd

### Description of development

Proposed mixed-use development – Shop Top Housing, Café, Restaurant & Six (6) towers, with two (2) located on the eastern side of Mann Street, and the remaining four (4) on the western side of Mann Street. The two (2) main towers are sited on the eastern and western sides of Mann Streets (towers 2 & 3) providing ground level commercial and retail uses with residential units above. The remaining towers, being Towers 1 and 4-6, are residential only comprising a mix of one (1), two (2) and three (3) bedroom units. Basement carparking provided across both the east and west sites'

### Documents Reviewed (as provided via onedrive link downloaded 27.02.20)

- 00 - RFI Response Letter

Report Title: Independent Design Review  
Report No: DDC\_040  
Issue No: v2.0  
Date: 27.02.20  
Prepared: Ken Dyer  
Page: 3 of 11

- 02 - Statement of Environmental Effects
- 04 - Waste Management Plan
- 05 - Traffic & Parking Report
- 06 - Letter from Traffic Consultant
- 07 - Cost Estimate
- 08 - Landscape Plans
- Architectural Plans
- Notification Plans

### **Planning Controls**

- New South Wales Government (1979) Environmental Planning & Assessment Act
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007
- State Environmental Planning Policy 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development.
- State Environmental Planning Policy 71 – Coastal Protection (now repealed)
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Gosford City Centre) 2018
- Gosford Local Environmental Plan (2014)
- Gosford Development Control Plan (2013)

## 2. Review

Apartment Design Guide.

Clause	Heading	Compliance Achieved		Comments
		Yes	No	
	<b>Apartment Design Guide</b>	-	-	
<b>Part 1</b>	<b>Identifying the context</b>	-	-	
Part 1A	Apartment building types	-	-	Hybrid development
Part 1B	Local Character and context	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation especially the desired future character and part of a strategic town centre.
Part 1C	Precincts and individual sites	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation especially large lot amalgamation, precinct redevelopment.
<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Developing the controls</b>	-	-	
Part 2A	Primary Controls	-	-	Refer the individual primary controls listed below
Part 2B	Building Envelopes	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential building envelope from controls not fully utilized</li> <li>Although variation is sort for exceeding the height limitations below</li> </ul>
Part 2C V2.0	Building Height - Gosford Local Environmental Plan (2014)	✓	✓	The building height setout in the LEP is exceeded and subject to a Clause 4.6 Variation included in the documentation could be supported on the following grounds - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission is well considered</li> <li>The simple numerical variations of the height limits in the table in Clause 3.9 suggest variations from +4 to +19%.</li> <li>If the variations are considered as a proportion of the overall building envelope/mass then the percentages of variation are further reduced and any perceived impacts equally reduced.</li> <li>Our approximate calculations of the height variations in relation to the overall building elevation would be as follows:-               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tower 1 – 4.9%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tower 2 – 1.4%</li> <li>○ Tower 3 – 9.4%</li> <li>○ Tower 4 – 5.9%</li> <li>○ Tower 5 – 1.8%</li> <li>○ Tower 6 – 5.9%</li> <li>• These calculations help to more realistically understand the actual 3-dimensional impact rather than just a numerical height value.</li> <li>• The inclusion of a 3D height study diagrams (drawing A613) further reinforce the overall minor height variation relating to bulk and form</li> <li>• Tower 3 exceeding the height limit is necessary to achieve a balanced “gateway” entry into Gosford along Mann St. between the two towers.</li> </ul>
Part 2D	Floor Space Ratio Gosford Local Environmental Plan (2014)	✓		<p>Floor Space Ratio complies with the bonus FSR under clause 4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites comply being under the required ratios.</li> <li>• Development is generally below the allowable GFA.</li> </ul>
Part 2E	Building Depth Gosford Development Control Plan (2013)	✓		<p>General objectives adequately addressed in documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Towers 2-6 comply</li> <li>• Tower 1 minor non-compliance because of split zonings but demonstrated that objectives of the control are met.</li> </ul>
Part 2F V2.0	Building Separation		✓	<p><i>Objectives not adequately addressed -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Representation of SEPP building setbacks on elevations indicate non-compliances</i></li> <li>• <i>These non-compliances not adequately addressed in the documentation especially the SEPP 65 compliance report.</i></li> <li>• <i>Need to demonstrate that the amenity is not adversely affected by confirming how the physical design achieve compliance with the objectives.</i></li> </ul>
Part 2G	Street set backs Gosford Development Control Plan (2013)	✓		<p>General objectives adequately addressed in documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controls of individual lots have street setbacks of 0 to 2.25m.</li> <li>• Non-compliance only with providing greater setbacks to improve amenity</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall master planning of the combined sites into its own precinct.</li> <li>Demonstrated that objectives of the control are met.</li> </ul>
Part 2H	Side and rear setbacks Gosford Development Control Plan (2013)	✓		<p>General objectives adequately addressed in documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Various non-compliances observed mostly minor in the overall site context.</li> <li>Minimal or no loss of amenity or privacy demonstrated</li> <li>Demonstrated that objectives of the control are met.</li> </ul>
<b>Part 3</b>	<b>Siting the development</b>			
Part 3A	Site analysis	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 3B	Orientation	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 3C	Public domain interface	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Part 3D V2.0	Communal and open space		✓	<p>Design Criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communal open space has a minimum area equal to 25% of the site/s – (East site = 891m<sup>2</sup> &amp; West Site = 1762 m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>Developments achieve a minimum of 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part of the communal open space for a minimum of 2 hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June (mid winter)</li> <li>Note communal open space should have a minimum dimension of 3m</li> </ol> <p><i>Design Criteria not meet -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No definitive area calculation provided in revised documentation. (delineation of private courtyard and common space)</i></li> <li><i>Note that a plan showing area calculation should be prepared and submitted.</i></li> <li><i>Not adequately addressed in the Design verification statement.</i></li> <li><i>Shadow diagrams don't support Criteria No.2 – further detail required.</i></li> </ul>
Part 3E V2.0	Deep soil zones	✓		Design Criteria minimum width 3m and area equal to 7% of the site.

				<p>Note also under Gosford DCP – Gosford City centre:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deep soil planting 15% of site preferably in continuous block, min 6m width.</li> </ul> <p>Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.  <i>Note conflict still exists between documentation – Landscape drawings show deep soil planting at 18.2% and SOEE states 15.4%</i></p>
Part 3F V2.0	Visual privacy	✓	✓	<p>Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation for external/neighbouring sites.  <i>Design Criteria &amp; Objectives not adequately addressed -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Representation of SEPP building setbacks on elevations indicate non-compliances, especially between Tower 1 &amp; 2 and Tower 3 &amp; 4</i></li> <li>• <i>These non-compliances not adequately addressed in the documentation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Need to demonstrate that the amenity is not adversely affected.</i></li> <li>• <i>No additional documents provided.</i></li> </ul>
Part 3G	Pedestrian access and entries	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 3H	Vehicle access	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 3J	Bicycle and carparking	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
<b>Part 4</b>	<b>Designing the building</b>			
	<b>Amenity</b>			
Part 4A	Solar and daylight access	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4B	Natural ventilation	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4C	Ceiling heights	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation

Part 4D	Apartment size and layout	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4E	Private open space and balconies	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4F	Common circulation and space	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4G	Storage	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4H	Acoustic Privacy	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation – refer acoustic report
Part 4J	Noise and pollution	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation – refer acoustic report
	<b>Configuration</b>			
Part 4K	Apartment mix	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4L	Ground floor apartments	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4M	Facades	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4N	Roof Design	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4O	Landscaping	✓		Design Criteria and Objectives adequately addressed in documentation
Part 4P	Planting on structures	✓		Objectives in general adequately addressed in documentation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>More detail may be required to ensure the deep soil planting over structures and the sustainability of planting on towers planter boxes.</i></li> </ul>
Part 4Q	Universal Design	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Part 4R	Adaptive Reuse	-	-	Not Applicable



Part 4S	Mixed Use	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Part 4T	Awnings and signage	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
	<b>Performance</b>			
Part 4U	Energy efficiency	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Part 4V	Water management and conservation	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Part 4W	Waste management	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Part 4X	Building Maintenance	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.

State Environmental Planning Policy 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development.

Clause	Heading	Achieved		Comments
		Yes	No	
	<b>SEPP 65 Schedule 1 – Design Quality Principles</b>			
Principle 1	Context and neighborhood character	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Principle 2	Built Form and scale	✓		Generally, the quality of design of the built form and scale meets the objectives of this principle except for variations noted above.
Principle 3	Density	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Principle 4	Sustainability	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.

Report Title: Independent Design Review  
 Report No: DDC\_040  
 Issue No: v2.0  
 Date: 27.02.20  
 Prepared: Ken Dyer  
 Page: 10 of 11

Principle 5	Landscape	✓		Generally, the quality of design of the landscaping meets the objectives of this principle except for variations noted above.
Principle 6	Amenity	✓		Generally the quality of design meets the objectives of this principle except for variations noted above.
Principle 7	Safety	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Principle 8	Housing Diversity and social interaction	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.
Principle 9	Aesthetics	✓		Objectives adequately addressed in documentation.

Report Title: Independent Design Review  
Report No: DDC\_040  
Issue No: v2.0  
Date: 27.02.20  
Prepared: Ken Dyer  
Page: 11 of 11

## Summary

The revised documentation still has not adequately addressed the issues above about building separation (privacy & amenity) and common area calculations (delineation of common/private, amenity especially in winter).

The external appearance of the building is well considered and highly articulated. The composition has a variety of building elements defining both vertical and horizontal elements. The façade has recessing and protruding elements that varies the scale and creates interest in the building. The proportions and arrangement of building elements are well resolved.

The building is composed into an articulated into a base middle and top. These elements are well utilized to ensure the building form steps with the topography. The building design elements express the variety and respect the internal uses at the more perceivable street edge. Delineation of townhouse, commercial, upper units, towers and roof level zones assist with the reduction of bulk and scale especially at the street level.

Although the proposal has requested a variation exceeding the height limits, this would appear minor in the context of the overall development bulk and scale, especially when considered as a proportion three dimensionally. The submission of additional 3D massing diagrams further supports the minor nature of this height variation. It is worth mentioning that the development complies with the FSR and is below the allowable GFA developable.

Towers two and three, designed as slim vertical elements establish a unique expression and composition in the city skyline successfully defining the "Gateway" status of the site. The development scale is then stepped down in bulk and scale away from the towers to blend the development into the adjoining zones.

Should you require any additional information, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Ken Dyer

Architect (B.Arch)  
NSW Reg No. 5838

**DYER DESIGN COMPANY**  
Trading for Dyer Family Trust  
ABN 67 787 548 438