

ATTACHMENT 3

Council's Architect Referral Comments (JRPP Terms of Deferral)

The DA was referred for consideration to the Joint Regional Planning Panel on 30 March 2017, where the matter was deferred. The terms of the deferral are individually addressed below.

- *Removal of the top level of the northern building.*

Comment

The top level of the northern building (Building B) has been removed and now complies with height controls.

There remains two levels of non-complying height located on the northern part of southern building (Building A) where it does not result in adverse overshadowing of adjoining sites. On balance this is considered an acceptable response to the constraint of the split zone.

- *A fresh and independent review of the façade composition being undertaken (with suggestion this occur by a separate architectural practice akin to an independent peer review), addressing the following matters:*
 - *Seeking a cohesive and simpler design aesthetic and solution, particularly at the street elevation and side elevations;*

Comment

The design of the building has been significantly amended. The former perforated metal screens and green feature panels have been removed and the buildings now utilises projecting and recessed sections, variation in materials and colours, and small scale details to disguising bulk and adding visual interest.

The provision of complying deep soil zones and significant trees contributes further to the aesthetics and contextual fit.

- *Revision of the front screening element, which if retained in any form, be detailed to ensure appropriate internal amenity, neutrality of colour, longevity and a maintenance regime;*

Comment

The former perforated metal screens and green feature panels have been removed resulting in balconies and living areas now having improved solar access and outlook. The removal of metal elements is expected to reduce long-term maintenance requirements.

- *Measure to ensure an appropriate definition of the base of the building an modulation, façade treatment and measures for an appropriate visual relationship between the upper and lower levels of the buildings;*

Comment

The base of the building has been defined by a three level podium that projects forward and to the sides of the upper levels to define a lower scaled street-front across both buildings. The fourth level is further recessed with a change in finish to further define the podium.

The length of the podium has been divided vertically with regularly spaced three storey columns between recessed balconies to create a rhythm and proportion consistent with the height of the podium to further disguise the scale of the buildings.

The upper portions of both buildings have been divided with vertical recessed panels between the projecting balconies. The southern building (building A) has a deep vertical recess with the southern part constructed of dark brick with irregular column spacings and the northern section with regular projecting framed balconies to complement the lower northern building (building B)

- *A review of materials and proposed colours;*

Comment

The materials and colours have been significantly amended to simplify the appearance and to disguise the scale of the development.

- *Differential treatment of the northern and southern buildings to provide some visual separation and interest, yet in a complimentary way;*

Comment

The north and south building have been given a different treatment and materials but are unified by the use of the recessed fourth level, vertical recesses, the podium level across both buildings and the unified landscaping.

- *Review of the presentation of the development at street level, including walls, entries and detailing to appropriately activate the street, while addressing internal amenity;*

Comment

The street front is acceptable with both buildings having generous and easily accessible entry foyers and ground floor units activating the street.

The use of two vehicle entries is unfortunate, but it is acknowledged that this is necessitated by the drainage easement. The visual impact of the two vehicles entries on the street-front has been minimised by reducing the width of the carpark access to Building A, setting the vehicle entries and doors back behind the main façades of the buildings and landscaping the front setback.

- *Provision of a brief report associated with the above review to address the provisions related to design excellence in Clause 8.5 of Gosford LEP explain the design philosophy and approach, with plan, sketches and details to ensure realisation of design excellence in construction.*

Comment

The development application is consistent with the design excellence provisions of Clause 8.5 of the *Gosford Local Environmental Plan 2014* (GLEP 2014).

The proposed development minimises all adverse environmental and amenity impacts such as overshadowing, solar access, outlook and privacy on adjoining sites and the public domain. This is considered particularly important as residential flat buildings with poor internal amenity and detrimental impacts on adjoining sites or the public domain are inconsistent with design excellence, no matter how visually attractive they may appear.

The development application also exhibits a high standard of architectural design, material detailing, built form and scale and landscaping consistent with the nine Design Quality principles in SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide.

- *Provision of a revised and comprehensive Clause 4.6 Variation Request following the amendment to the northern building and also ensuring any rooftop plant is considered.*

Comment

This matter is addressed in the Assessment Report.

- *Consideration of the parking allocation, having regard to the nature of the site and applicable controls.*

Comment

This matter is addressed in the Assessment Report.

Council's Architect Referral Comments (State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 - Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development)

The amended proposal is also subject to *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 - Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development* (SEPP 65). SEPP 65 and has been assessed against the nine Design Quality Principles in the SEPP, the Design Criteria and Objectives in the Apartment Design Guide (ADG):

CONTEXT

The site is located on the western side of Hills Street. There are currently car sales yards and low rise commercial buildings to the west facing Mann Street with predominantly single residences and low rise residential flat buildings to the north, south and east on Hills Street though it is expected that future development will be similar sized multi-unit residential buildings.

The site has a drainage easement running from east to west. As well, a split zoning with the northern part comprising approximately 70% of the site having a height control of 23.4 metres and the remaining southern part a height control of 31.2 metres.

The development application proposes two buildings separated by the drainage easement. Building A, the southern building being 9 storeys and Building B, the northern building now being reduced to 7 storeys.

The development is consistent with the expected future context. It is divided into 2 separate buildings, setbacks comply with the ADG and includes deep soil zones with significant landscaping to provide screening to and from adjoining sites.

Facing the street it presents as a 3-storey podium with columns to break up the length, disguise the scale and provide a lower scale

BUILT FORM AND SCALE

The development is considered to have acceptable built form and scale.

The top level of the northern building (Building B) has been removed and now complies with height controls.

There is remains two levels of non-complying height located on the norther part of southern building (Building A) where it does not result in increased overshadowing of adjoining sites. On balance, this is considered an acceptable response to the constraint of the split zone.

The development application complies with setback controls in the ADG providing adequate building separation and allowing for deep soil zones and significant landscaping on all boundaries to further disguise the scale of the buildings and provide visual separation between adjoining sites.

There remains concern at the height of the rear parking podium however it is acknowledged that this is setback from the adjoining site and disguised by the adjoining deep soil zone and landscaping.

The width of the carpark access to Building A has been reduced to a single lane and the additional landscaped to reduce its visual impact on the street-front and is considered an acceptable response to Council's previous concerns.

The base of the building has been defined by a three level podium that projects forward and to the sides of the upper levels to define a lower scaled street-front across both buildings with the fourth level being recessed with a change in finish to further define the podium.

The length of the podium has been divided vertically with regularly spaced three storey columns between recessed balconies to create a rhythm and proportion consistent with the height of the podium to further disguise the scale of the buildings.

The upper portions of both buildings have been divided with vertical recessed panels between the projecting balconies. The southern building (building A) has a deep vertical recess with the southern part constructed of dark brick with irregular column spacings and the northern section with regular projecting framed balconies to complement the lower northern building (building B)

The podium is now clad in fibre cement panels. A more highly textured material and detailing that has a more human scale could be considered, however this is not considered essential.

DENSITY

The FSR complies and with the complying setbacks and landscaping is now considered acceptable.

SUSTAINABILITY

BASIX certificate supplied indicating compliance with mandatory energy efficiency standards. The use of solar hot water and photovoltaic cells should also be considered.

LANDSCAPE

The ADG requires the deep soil zone to occupy 7% of the site area and on sites over 1500m² to have a minimum dimension of 6 metres. The development application exceeds the 7% area and the parking area has been amended to increase deep soil widths to 3.5 metres on both sides and 5 metres at the rear. This now provides adequate areas for significant landscaping to screen the building and provide outlook and visual separation between this and future adjoining developments.

AMENITY

All apartments are well planned and comply with minimum sizes in the ADG. Living areas are limited in depth and comply with the height/depth recommendations in the ADG. All living rooms and bedrooms are located on exterior walls and face the sky or large balconies to maximise natural light.

Visual and acoustic privacy is acceptable with the majority of balconies separated from those of adjoining units.

It is acknowledged that the development has achieved required sustainability compliance and has been designed to ensure complying separation and visual privacy between the two buildings and to adjoining sites however the use of some larger windows to the north facing living areas of both building could be considered to improve solar access. This would need to consider privacy and shading requirements.

SAFETY

The development application has balconies and windows overlooking the street to provide surveillance.

Lift lobbies can be seen from the exterior of the building and there are no concealed spaces.

HOUSING DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

The development application provides 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units and includes accessible units to cater for a variety of occupants.

AESTHETICS

The design of the building has been significantly amended. The former perforated metal screens and green feature panels have been removed. The use of projecting and recessed sections, variation in materials and colours, and small scale detail, disguises bulk and adds visual interest.

The provision of complying deep soil zones and significant trees contributes further to the aesthetics and contextual fit.