

INDEPENDENT URBAN DESIGN REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL ON BEHALF
OF GEORGES RIVER COUNCIL

SUBJECT SITE: 58-68 REGENT STREET, KOGARAH NORTH (DA2017/0451)



Summary

The design is generally consistent with the principles of the Kogarah North Urban Design Strategy. However, there appear to be a number of inconsistencies with the ADG. Further information is required in relation to building separation, cross ventilation and solar access. A clause 4.6 variation is required for the FSR if it exceeds 4:1 when the GFA is correctly calculated.

Context and Neighbourhood Character

The landscaped street edge to Stanley Lane is supported. The landscaped zone at street level should be adjusted to incorporate a 1m footpath within the site boundary, as an extension of the existing footpath, with a 1m landscaped zone at street level. Consider increasing the building setback to 5m.

The substation along Regent Street is not supported. This should be located within the building or along Stanley Lane.

The boosters and service cupboards along Regent Street are not supported. These should be relocated in the laneway or integrated into the building's architecture.

Built Form and Scale

The front setbacks and landscape treatment at ground level along Regent Street are supported.

The zero setback above the 4th storey at the corner of Regent Street and Stanley Lane is supported. However the setbacks along Stanley Lane does not comply with the ADG – 6m, 9m and 12m from the centre of the laneway. The applicant needs to demonstrate that this will achieve minimal impact on the future development of the neighbouring site at 54-56 Regent Street.

In relation to apartment stacks 03 and 04 on Levels 5 – 8, consider providing an 8m setback from the boundary above the 4th storey to the upper levels along Regent Street of the building to be consistent with the Urban Design Strategy. We understand this is trying to be achieved through the differentiation of materials but don't believe this reduces the bulk and built form sufficiently. Alternatively consider removing the zero setback balconies to apartment stack 03 to achieve better articulation of a four storey street wall.

The rear setbacks to Stanley Lane and the side setbacks to the eastern boundary do not comply with the ADG. The applicant should demonstrate that this will achieve minimal impact to the future development or proposed designs of the neighbouring sites on Stanley Lane.

The roof top design and integration into the architecture is supported. Provide further details on all roof plant and sizes and how these will be screened and integrated into the design.

Building Height exceeds 33m. No height plane is shown on the elevations or within the Clause 4.6 Variation Statement.

Urban Structure

The pedestrian access to Stanley Lane and the ground floor apartments is supported.

The apartment floor levels below street level along Regent Street and Stanley Lane should be reconsidered, particularly Unit 106.

The entry ramp down from Regent Street to the foyer is a concern for future flooding to the site. Raising the ground floor level would eliminate the above two issues.

Density

The common lobby areas on levels 2-11 are not included in the GFA calculations. We do not support this interpretation; these are internal areas and should be included in the GFA calculations. This interpretation increases the bulk and scale of the development, refer to *Built Form and Scale* above. A Clause 4.6 variation report will be required for the exceedance in the FSR.

Landscape

Landscaped courtyards to the ground floor apartments are supported.

The roof top communal open space is supported. 50% of the roof area should be soft landscaping.

The landscape plan should clearly demonstrate the delineation of private and public open space at roof level.

Amenity

The assessment of solar access assumes extended hours to 3:30pm. Applicant to confirm number of apartments that achieve sun between 9am-3pm. Include floor plans indicating which apartments achieve solar access. Provide solar access report referred to in the SEPP 65 Statement.

Cross ventilation appears not comply with the ADG. Cross ventilation diagrams have not been provided nor has this been addressed in the SEPP 65 Statement or any alternative solution been provided. Further details should be provided to show how this proposal will comply with SEPP65.

Apartments 107 and 106 need to demonstrate means of achieving privacy whilst not impacting the levels of daylight into these apartments.

The ground floor communal open space looks directly into Apartment 101. Further details should be provided on how privacy and solar access into this apartment will be achieved.

The entry arrangement to the building requires further consideration. There is no ground floor lobby. The width of the building entry is also not sufficient for the size and number of apartments in the building. The front door of Apartment 106 is also directly in front of the building entry doors. These factors provide poor amenity and a more generous building entry should be provided.

Fire egress from the fire stairs adjacent the core on ground level egress past apartment openings. Provide further detail on how fire separation will be achieved without impacting the amenity to the apartments.

Aesthetics

The proposed material schedule is supported.

This document is preliminary unless approved by a Director of City Plan Strategy & Development.

Revision	Date Issued	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Verified by
01	13/12/17	Lotti Wilkinson <i>Project Planner</i> Paul Walter <i>Director,</i> <i>Atlas Urban</i>	Juliet Grant <i>Executive Director</i>	Juliet Grant <i>Executive Director</i> 