

Contact: Jonathan Goodwill

Ref: DA0014/17

8 June 2017

KOPWA Ltd
C/ Smyth Planning
Lv4,S 67, 330 Wattle Street
ULTIMO NSW 2007

Dear Toby

Application No.:	DA0014/17
Proposed development:	Demolish existing structures and staged construction of a residential aged care facility comprising 102 beds, basement car parking and associated landscaping works - State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 - heritage conservation area
Property:	12, 14 & 16 Trafalgar Avenue ROSEVILLE NSW 2069

We have undertaken an assessment of your application, in summary the following significant issues have been identified:

- i. The 2-3 storey scale of the street elevation is not compatible with the predominantly single storey character of The Grove Heritage Conservation Area.
- ii. The massing of the proposed buildings does not respect the characteristic rhythm and built form spacing of the streetscape.
- iii. The proposal results in compromised amenity for residents and poor design outcomes due to excessive excavation which reduces solar access, daylight access and results in private rooms for which their only outlook is to retaining walls.

We advise that the following issues are required to be addressed:

1. Heritage

The Heritage Impact Statement has been reviewed, the following comments are made:

- i. The HIS does not reference the design principles in Part 3 of the SEPP. The SEPP requires that development 'retain, complement and sensitively harmonise with heritage conservation areas'. The proposal is not consistent with this requirement.
- ii. The HIS references the statements of significance for the relevant HCAs but does not contain an adequate response to the design controls and objectives of the DCP nor adequately identify the characteristics of the HCAs which relate to its character.
- iii. The HIS does not adequately examine the characteristic height, built form spacing, facade length and landscaped character of the HCA. The HIS states that the immediate context of the site has a two storey character, however the character of the western side of Trafalgar Avenue is predominately single storey. The Urban Design Report provides a more comprehensive analysis streetscape character, however the streetscape context drawing should be extended to include the entire length of the street block.
- iv. The HIS describes Nos. 8, 14, and 18 Trafalgar Avenue as large and high scale buildings, however the survey shows that No. 8 Trafalgar Avenue is a single storey building with a height of approximately 6m. The proposed building at the southern end of the frontage adjacent to the single storey building at No. 8 Trafalgar Avenue has two storeys of accommodation above a basement door and a 6m wide driveway. The character of this building does not sensitively respond to the character of the HCA in a manner consistent with the design principles of the SEPP.

Please refer to the attachment which includes details of suggested amendments to the development.

2. Neighbourhood character

Development objectives of KDCP_LC 19D.1; 19F.1 objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; 19F.4; 19G.18 objectives 1, 2, 3 and controls (6) and (7) have not been satisfied. Impacts on the HCA are significant. Impacts on topography are significant. Generally, the building types are unsympathetic with the subdivision pattern, and unsympathetic to the heritage significance of the subdivision pattern.

The proposed two-storeys along the entire Trafalgar Avenue frontage is a building type and scale that is unsympathetic to the urban character of The Grove and Clanville Heritage Conservation Areas, which is predominantly single storey detached dwellings.

The built form has expressed each of the communal spaces as 'linking' or 'bridge' elements between each of the groups of resident rooms or 'accommodation pods'. These bridging elements have flat roofs that are intended to sit below the eaves of the pitched roofs of the accommodation pods. This strategy in principle may be successful where the pods are expressed as distinct fingers to the street/boundaries to better replicate the existing subdivision pattern and rhythm of built-form to space/landscape of the HCA however the design fails to achieve this because the bridge elements are large, insufficiently set back from the primary building line and read as elements of similar scale as the rest of the built form.

The impact of bulk on the streetscape will be significant due to the site being elevated at the south-eastern corner. The eaves height of the first floor level (approx. RL108.6) is 5.8m higher than the eaves height of No. 8 Trafalgar Avenue. Amendments are required at the southern end of the frontage to reduce the height to single storey to provide an appropriate transition to the adjacent dwelling house. There also may be opportunities at the eastern corner to remove retained soil, reinstate natural ground levels, and lower the proposed development and better use the topography to minimise excavation elsewhere on the site.

The urban design report refers to a minimum DCP side and rear setback requirement of 6m. The DCP rear setback requirement of 6m only applies to forms of development that are prohibited in the R2 Low Density Residential zone, namely multi-dwelling housing and residential flat buildings. The rear setback requirement for a dwelling house on an allotment with a depth of more than 48m is 12m. Adjacent dwellings at 2-8 Trafalgar Avenue and 1-11 The Grove exhibit rear setbacks of considerably greater than the 6m setback proposed for the buildings in Stage 1. The provision of generous rear setbacks which contain open space and landscaping is a desirable element of the locations character. Consideration should be given to increasing the rear setback for that part of the building adjacent to the rear boundaries of Nos. 9 & 11 The Grove.

3. Clause 4.6 variation to the development standards in clause 26

Clause 2 of the Seniors SEPP states:

(1) This Policy aims to encourage the provision of housing (including residential care facilities) that will:

- (a) increase the supply and diversity of residences that meet the needs of seniors or people with a disability, and*
- (b) make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services, and*
- (c) be of good design.*

As clause 26 sets a standard in relation to the distance between a seniors living development and infrastructure (bus stop or train stations) and services (clause 26 (1) (a) to (c)) it is considered that the development standards in clause 26 of the SEPP also

relates to the objective of making efficient use of existing infrastructure and services. It is stated in the clause 4.6 variation that the majority of the residents will not leave the facility unless they are accompanied, accordingly it appears likely that the majority of trips to and from the facility will be generated by employees and visitors. The clause 4.6 should include consideration of objective (b) and explain whether the private bus service will also be available to transport employees and visitors. As the distance of the premises from nearby bus stops and the Roseville train station does not comply with the 400m distance requirement the clause 4.6 variation should also explain how the facility will accommodate visitors who are unable to drive a private vehicle. Proposed operating hours/timetable for the bus service should be provided, this could be incorporated into an amended Plan of Management.

4. Solar access to courtyards

Courtyard 1 appears to be substantially impacted by self-shadowing while Courtyard 2, which achieves the best solar amenity and is a larger courtyard, has minimal interface with communal rooms and general access. Solar access diagrams do not appear to have taken into account the significant excavation along the north-western boundary and level changes at the eastern corner in particular. Amended plans which demonstrate reasonable solar access to courtyards (i.e. equivalent to the requirements for the communal open space of residential flat buildings) are requested.

5. Overshadowing

Overshadowing to the north-western elevation of No. 8 Trafalgar Avenue is significant between 12pm and 3pm in mid-winter. The reduction in solar access is required to be quantified by way of half hourly elevation shadow diagrams for mid-winter. Compliance with the solar access controls for dwelling houses should be demonstrated. The DCP requires 4 hours solar access to all north facing (between 30 degrees east and 20 degrees west of true solar north) windows and all living areas.

6. Excavation

The extent of excavation fails to satisfy the objectives and design controls in Clause 6.1 'Earthworks' of the LEP and Part 21 'General Site Design' of the DCP which seek to minimise excavation and retain natural ground levels. The development contains three lifts so there are many opportunities for an alternative design that better engages with the topography by stepping down the site. This would improve the general relationship to ground of many of the rooms and assist with reducing the impact of bulk and scale, and achieve a more sympathetic relationship to the predominantly single storey HCA where amendments to overall scale are incorporated.

Excavation and additional retaining walls may also be avoided or minimised by raising the ground floor level of the building in Stage 2, so that it better relates to the ground floor level (RL105.8) of the existing building.

7. Subterranean accommodation

There is a significant amount of excavation that will result in at least 5 rooms of the rooms in the accommodation pod at the southern corner along the south-western boundary being significantly below natural ground level with no outlook and no solar access. The view from one of these rooms will be impacted by a proposed rainwater tank.

8. Waterproofing

All walls used to retain soil are to be physically separated by a drained cavity (of a dimension that enables a person to service the drainage) where the internal floor level of areas used for storage, services and/or any habitable areas are accommodated as a result of excavation.

9. Rooftop terrace junction

The proposed roof of the northern pod where it intersects with the rooftop terrace and planters will be difficult to waterproof and may adversely affect habitable spaces below. This can be addressed by changing the roof form so there is a part gable end with the gable wall to a height above the planter to ensure water can be shed away from the building. Any planters adjacent to the buildings generally are to be accommodated within separate structures so no part is in direct contact with the external wall or roof where storage, services and/or habitable spaces are below.

10. Structural depth

A general observation is that there has been no realistic allowance for structure in the section drawings. This does not demonstrate that falls for drainage, head height clearances in the basement and the like are achieved.

11. Plan details

- i. A photomontage without any existing/proposed trees should be provided. Views should be taken from the northern and southern corners of the development and include at least one adjoining building.
- ii. A north-east elevation (without No. 18 Trafalgar Avenue) is requested.
- iii. Impacts of bulk and scale are to be clarified by a street elevation showing the proposed development in context with the HCA showing a minimum of 3 neighbouring properties on both sides of the subject site along Trafalgar

- Avenue. The elevation should include eaves and ridge RLs for the proposal and the adjacent buildings.
- iv. The Plan of Management should specify the location, hours and days for deliveries and garbage collection.
 - v. For ease of reference, numbering of rooms and naming of accommodation wings is requested.
 - vi. An east-west section through the 3 storey component and showing the design elements (i.e. terraces, planter beds etc) that will disguise the ground floor level (RL102) is requested.
 - vii. Fully dimensioned architectural plans and sections are to be submitted consistent with EP&A Regulation Schedule 1 cl 2 sub-clauses 2 and 3, in particular to provide more detail about the location of the building so that proposed articulation, wall lengths and courtyards are defined and incorporated into any future approved design.

12. Structural feasibility

The basement plan shows contiguous piers which appear to have minimal setback from the external walls of No. 14 Trafalgar Avenue. A north-south section through the basement, at a scale of 1:50 is requested. The provision of a letter from the structural engineer attesting to the feasibility of the proposal despite the minimal setback from the footings and external walls of No. 14 Trafalgar Avenue is requested.

13. Laundry and Kitchen exhausts

The location of the exhausts for the basement level laundry and kitchen do not appear to have been identified on the plans. The plans should be amended to identify the location of these structures and demonstrate that they are appropriately integrated into the design of the roof.

14. Green buildings

The proposal does not comply with the provisions in Part 23.2 Green Buildings of the DCP. The proposed reliance on BCA performance standards, no provision for alternative energy sources and unspecified commitments regarding building commissioning is not equivalent to the ecologically sustainable development performance of a Green Star certified building. In the subject case, it is not considered that the alternative 'scheme' offered by the applicant achieves the objectives of the Green Star requirement. Accordingly the proposal is required to be amended to demonstrate compliance with the design controls in Part 23.2 Green Buildings of the DCP. The additional documentation should set out the requirements for construction certificate, occupation certificate and post occupation stage.

15. Sawn cobblestones

It is unclear whether the recommendations of the access report are likely to be achievable for a cobblestone finish. It is recommended that the paving be changed to a smooth slip resistant finish.

16. Water management

- i. Further information on rainwater retention and re-use is required. The stormwater report does not assess whether Council's objectives of a 50% reduction in runoff days will be achieved by this level of rainwater re-use and since only irrigation is proposed, this is unlikely.
- ii. The purpose of rainwater re-use is not to reduce water usage on the site, but to reduce the total volume of water leaving the site and entering the downstream waterways. If runoff from the other roof areas is not collected this will not be achieved. Further discussion and justification is required. An additional rainwater tank(s) is recommended. Also for this reason, a mains top-up should not be provided for the rainwater tanks.
- iii. The plan area of the rainwater tank scales off at about 4.5 metres. To achieve a volume of 28,000 litres as proposed, a depth of 6 metres is required. Is this really proposed? A realistic outline should be shown.
- iv. Collection of runoff from all landscaped areas is not required. Refer to Part 24R.6-1 of the Local Centres DCP. Shedding of runoff from paths onto landscaped areas is also acceptable, and is a form of treatment. Many of the grated inlet pits in the landscaped areas can be removed from the plans, as requested by Council's Landscape Officer.

17. Waste management

- i. Confirmation from the private contractor of the maximum size (height and length) of vehicle to enter the basement for waste collection.
- ii. Longitudinal section along the driveway, through the basement and to the waste collection area demonstrating that adequate headroom will be available for the vehicle.
- iii. There should be recognition in the Waste Management Plan that clinical waste will be generated at the site and details of its storage and collection.

18. Vehicular manoeuvring

- i. Turning path diagrams for the ambulance in the porte cochere area are required.
- ii. Confirmation that the waste collection vehicle can drive onto the turntable while the minibus is parked in space 29.

19. Roof level plant rooms

Inadequate details of proposed roof level plant rooms have been provided. Two 1:100 scale sections through each of the plant rooms are requested. Details of the material used for the louvre roof of the plant rooms should be included in the external finishes schedule. The feasibility of the proposed plant rooms and exhausts should be verified by a mechanical services engineer.

20. Landscape works

- i. The proposed terracing and brick retaining walls, planter boxes and substation within the front setback are “institutional” in appearance and are not in keeping with the character of the HCA. Existing fencing, edging and retaining walls are to be retained where possible or as directed with any new hard landscape works to be in keeping with the surrounding heritage landscape setting.
- ii. The terracing of the front setback is to be reduced to allow sufficient space for canopy tree replenishment. (see comments regarding tree replenishment below)
- iii. The materials proposed to be used for the paving and walls within the front setback and where viewed from the public domain is not characteristic of the HCA in particular P1, P2, P3 and W2. Rough sawn “Sydney Sandstone, sandstone crazy paving and asphalt edged with common bricks are to be used.
- iv. Balustrading within the front setback shall be characteristic of the HCA.
- v. Retain the established trees and shrubs in front of the dwelling at No.14 Trafalgar Avenue in particular Tree 65 – *Chamaecyparis obtusa* ‘Crippsii’ (Golden Cripps Cypress). Tree 67 – *Camellia japonica* (Japanese Camellia) and the Camellia’s along the front boundary adjacent to the existing brick fence.
- vi. Retain and repair where necessary, the existing brick fence, gate and garden walls in front of No. 14 Trafalgar Avenue.
- vii. Relocate the main pedestrian path and steps within the footprint of the driveway on the south eastern side of the dwelling at No. 14 Trafalgar Avenue.
- viii. Retain Tree 58 – *Sapium sebiferum* (Chinese Tallow Tree), Tree 59 – *Acacia floribunda* (Gossamer Wattle) and the *Murraya paniculata* (Orange Jessamine) hedges on the front boundary adjacent to the existing driveway at No. 16 Trafalgar Avenue.
- ix. Remove the shrub planting within the garden on the nature strip forward of No. 14 Trafalgar Avenue.
- x. Retain Tree 77 as it will screen views from the first floor level of the south-east elevation.
- xi. The demolition plan should include the removal of Trees 30 and 33.
- xii. The demolition plan and the landscape plan should include the removal of paving within the existing clothes drying area and reinstatement of landscaping.

21. Tree replenishment

- i. In accordance with Part 4A.4 of the Local Centres DCP the site shall support a minimum of sixteen (16) trees that attain a height of 13 metres. Existing trees to be retained (Trees 10, 13, 32 and 74) qualify as canopy trees therefore an additional 12 trees will be required. At least 25% of the trees shall be locally occurring native species.
- ii. Seven (7) of the trees are to be evenly dispersed along the south-western boundary.
- iii. To provide additional deep soil area for canopy tree planting the rectangular section of paving with water feature adjacent to the south western boundary is to be deleted and the retaining walls relocated a minimum distance of 6 metres from the boundary, 2 of the 7 trees to be planted along the south western boundary are to be planted in this area.
- iv. At least 3 trees are to be planted in the front setback adjacent to Trafalgar Avenue.
- v. At least 2 trees are to be planted in Courtyard 2.
- vi. The depth of the soil for the podium planting within Courtyard 1 is insufficient for the establishment of the proposed tree and shrub planting. All planting beds within the courtyard are to be in accordance with Table 5 of Part 4P of the Apartment Design Guide.
- vii. The proposed stormwater works, substation, vehicle and pedestrian access points and the terracing within the front setback restrict the available space for the establishment of large canopy trees forward of No's 12 and 14 Trafalgar Avenue. The hard landscape works are to be reduced/relocated to enable the canopy trees to be evenly dispersed within the front setback.

22. Landscape plan details

- i. Full details of plant quantities are to be clearly indicated on the plans.
- ii. A black and white hard copy of the planting for Stages 1 and 2 are to be provided with the full matrix of species and quantities of plants to be planted.
- iii. Planting along the entire length of the south western boundary is to be indicated on the Stage 1 plan.

23. Stormwater plan

- i. The pump room and detention tank adversely impact on the deep soil area with the front setback. These are to be relocated out of the designated landscaped area. It is also noted that the pump room conflicts with the location of stormwater infrastructure identified on the Stormwater Management Control Plan.
- ii. The number of stormwater pits in the front setback are to be reduced as they will adversely impact on the deep soil area with the front setback.

We believe that the above issues may be resolved through the provision of additional information and amended plans. Should you choose to amend your application, you please provide us with five (5) sets of plans and written particulars identifying the changes made to the original application.

The submission of amended plans will result in an additional assessment and administrative fee (40% of the statutory DA fee) being \$18,332. This fee must be paid at the time amended plans are lodged. If any of the required information and/or fees are not provided, the amended plans will not be accepted.

Please provide us with the amended plans and additional information within 28 days of the date of this letter.

Should you have any further enquiries I can be contacted on 9424 0740.

Regards

Jonathan Goodwill
Executive Assessment Officer