

ITEM No 4.2

Date of Panel Assessment:	30 June 2021
Address of Project:	11-17 Mosbri Crescent The Hill
UDCG No:	2019/00003.01 – DA2019/00061
No. of Buildings:	Three plus residential housing
No. of Units:	161
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	No conflicts
Attendees:	<u>Applicant:</u> Richard Anderson Melissa Thomas Steve Zappia Mark Purdy Keith Stronach <u>Council:</u> Amy Ryan William Toose

Background Summary

The Planning proposal has been developed from previous submissions which established design principles for residential development of the site. The previous submissions proposed alignment of multi-level apartment buildings against the upper boundary of the site with terraced rows of town houses to the lower level of the site, separated from the larger structures by a landscaped corridor.

June 30, 2021

The UDCG reviewed the development in February 2019 and found, subject to the addressing some identified areas of concern, the proposal generally was capable of satisfying the objectives of the DCP. The design for the project has been modified further to incorporate easement issues and to address issues identified.

Context and Neighbourhood Character

Panel's earlier comments:

The irregular shaped site, located at the head of a short west sloping valley, is currently occupied by the NBN Television Studios and car parking. To the east and set above the site is the heavily wooded Arcadia Park with The Obelisk crowning the top of the hill to the east of Arcadia Park. Below the site the curved alignment of Mosbri Crescent incorporates an open park directly opposite the site sloping to the western outlook over the City. Lower areas of the valley and the flanking slopes accommodate freestanding residences and small apartment buildings, most of two storey heights.

June 30, 2021

No change to context and neighbourhood character

Built Form and Scale

The Applicant has made several amendments to the design to overcome site issues and as a result of continued design development.

These include:

- Increased building setbacks from the boundaries to the north and east at Ground level and Level 1.
- Overall reduction in building heights on buildings A, B and C varying from a 0.35m reduction to a 1.6m height reduction.
- Slight amendments to floor plans.
- Pergolas added to level 2 west facing apartment decks.
- Additional balconies have been added.
- Other balconies have been deleted.
- Amendments to communal open space and landscaped areas.
- Reductions to boundary retaining walls and fence heights.
- Other minor amendments which do not impact on the bulk and scale of the development.

Generally, the Panel was supportive of the changes. The Panel noted that the roof of Building A was marginally above the height control, which was considered potentially acceptable, given the very limited exceedance of the roof itself above the height plane. However, the lift over-runs and any plant located on the roof, particularly for the higher, eastern section of Building A, should be carefully considered and kept to a minimum. To that end, a reduction in the footprint of the roof top plant areas appears to be possible and would reduce the visual bulk of the

roof top. The view of the development from the Obelisk is particularly important, and therefore minimizing the size of the roof top plant area is essential to protect this view to the west.

While the form of the front townhouses was considered an attractive contemporary design, the bright white colour of the stair element which is very close to the Mosbri Crescent frontage as illustrated in the photo montage, is too dominant in the streetscape. This finish should be toned down and will be assisted by the proposed street trees along the footpath, which are omitted from the photomontage.

Density

The amendments have resulted in a very minor increase in FSR and GFA but still within the allowed limits. The changes are due to improving the amenity for the residents in common areas. The floor area of apartments and numbers have not changed.

Sustainability

The additional pergolas on the west facing balconies will reduce the impact of the afternoon sun on these apartments.

The Panel requested that solar compliance with the ADG is checked, as none of the townhouses are shown to achieve the recommended solar access.

Landscape

Panel's earlier comments:

Given the removal of established trees on the site, the replacement of these with substantial planting and general allowance for deep soil planting needs to be incorporated in the design. Protection of the root systems of existing trees outside the site, and any remaining trees for retention within the site, is essential.

June 30, 2021

No change to landscape context and neighbourhood character.

The Panel was supportive of the relocation of buildings and retaining walls away from Arcadia Park, which is essential to ensure the trees in the park can be maintained in the long term. It was recommended that a condition be included in any Development Consent requiring an arborist to monitor the works and any potential impacts upon the root systems of trees in the park.

The Panel suggested that the three retaining walls between the eastern boundary and the proposed easement could be visually softened if made somewhat more curvilinear rather than three long, closely-spaced parallel walls, as proposed.

The high retaining wall adjacent to the stormwater easement at the southern boundary is proposed as a rock-filled gabion structure. The Panel questioned the

durability and longevity of the wire cages if galvanized mesh were to be used. The site is salt exposed, and it was suggested that a more durable structure was warranted than zinc-coated mild steel – given the height of the wall and the obvious expense and difficulty that would be involved in the wall's replacement. Stainless steel mesh may be one option to address this. Safe access for landscape maintenance is essential to all areas, including the section of land within the site at the top of the gabion wall.

The Panel had previously raised the issue of landscape treatment of the area between the proposed townhouses and the apartments to their east. As the plan form of the townhouses arcs closer to the apartments particularly, the intervening narrowed space becomes largely hardscape, which would benefit from additional plantings, possibly within the private courtyard spaces, that could provide some additional foliage screening to this area.

Amenity

One of the apartment buildings does not have natural light and ventilation to the corridor. A minor amendment to the layout could achieve this.

The Panel recommended that the glare off the townhouse rooves should be minimized in the material colour and selection, with a mid-tone matt finish suggested. A planted 'green roof' would be a very desirable option.

Where possible skylights to internal bathrooms on the top level should be included in all buildings.

The Panel recommended swapping the toilet and the store in the Ground level communal pavilion so that the door to the toilet could be accessible from the outside.

The Panel reiterated the request for each apartment block to have a communal open area on the roof. The Applicant advised that privacy concerns overlooking Newcastle East Public School to the north and heritage concerns resulted in just the one larger communal area on the roof of Building B. The Panel considers that any privacy issues in relation to the school could potentially be resolved by orientation and screening of the communal spaces and reiterates its recommendation that each block should be provided with such facilities.

The views from the two units in Block A looking south to Block B needs to be improved as well as the view back from the end of the corridor in Block B which would potentially cause privacy issues for the units in Block A. The north wall of Block B needs more articulation and perhaps greening in order to improve the view for the 12 units looking at it. The window in the end of the corridor in Block B should be modified to not look straight back to the units in Block A. The adjacent bedroom to the east could be modified to allow this to happen.

Balcony balustrades should provide privacy for residents, especially at lower levels. These should primarily be solid (opaque) possibly including some areas of frosted glass balustrading.

Design of the balconies should ensure that balustrades or screens provide protection from strong winds as well as adequate privacy. The Panel questioned the perforated metal screens and the proximity to the breaking surf. While the applicant advised they would be aluminum, perforated aluminum may still be an issue with the required protective cover not being achievable for perforated metal.

Safety

Currently the lifts open up directly into the carpark. The Panel suggests that a small, glazed foyer should be created to provide safety for young children running out from the lift.

Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

A good range of different units is achieved across the site.
See comments under 'Amenity' in relation to communal space.

Aesthetics

The stark white of the townhouse stairwells should be modified in tone to be less dominant in the streetscape. Otherwise, satisfactory.

Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality

Those items listed under Built form and Scale; Amenity and Landscape headings should be incorporated along with Safety issues identified. Care should be taken with final colour selections to reduce the impact on adjoining neighbours and residents within the development.

Summary Recommendation

The modified development resolves most of the issues previously of concern to the Panel. Providing the remaining issues identified under the headings above are satisfactorily addressed, the proposal is supported.



URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

ITEM No. 8

Date of Panel Assessment:	21 February 2019
Address of Project:	11-17 Mosbri Crescent The Hill
Name of Project (if applicable):	N/A
DA Number of Pre-DA?	DA 2019/00061
No. of Buildings:	Five
No. of Units:	172.
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Nil.
Attendees:	<u>Applicant</u> Kate Isaacs Richard Anderson Mark Purdy Steve Zapia Melissa Thomas <u>Council</u> William Toose Gareth Simpson

This report addresses the nine Design Quality Principles set out in the Apartment Design Guide (2015) under State Environmental Planning Policy No.65. It is also an appropriate format for applications which do not include residential flats.

Background Summary

The Development Application has been submitted subsequent to previous preliminary options, which established design principles for residential development of the site. The current submission has responded to comments and recommendations provided by the Group in previous Pre-Da submissions. The design option chosen for the development application combines multi level apartment and town house form buildings against the upper boundary of the site with terraced rows of town houses to the lower level of the site separated from

the larger structures by a landscaped corridor. A public access way through the site has been relocated to the western end of the proposed development.

1.Context and Neighbourhood Character

The NBN Television Studios and car parking currently occupy the irregular shaped site, located at the head of a short west sloping valley. To the east and set above the site is the heavily wooded Arcadia Park with The Obelisk crowning the top of the hill to the east of Arcadia Park. Below the site, the curved alignment of Mosbri Crescent incorporates an open park directly opposite the site sloping to the western outlook over the City. Lower areas of the valley and the flanking slopes accommodate freestanding residences and small apartment buildings, most of two-storey height.

2. Built Form and Scale

Following previous review of development options responding to the FSR and height controls applicable to the site, the preferred development option has been progressed forming the basis of the development application.

This option provides two storey town houses within curved terraces fronting Mosbri Crescent with basement car parking and dedicated direct stair and /or lift access to each town house. Three larger buildings set against the eastern and northern slope incorporate townhouses sleeved forward of a two level podium car park with a mix of 1-3 bedroom units above. Carparks to the larger buildings and the townhouses are accessed from a common entry/exit portal at the western end of the site.

The development maintains the previous setout of the large northern building [Building A] paralleling Kitchener Parade, stepped down Kitchener Parade and orientated to the north and south with a narrow separation from a central building [Building B]. Previous concerns raised by the Group have been addressed by relocation of the public movement path proposed between these buildings to the western end of the site.

Following previous discussion, the separation between buildings A & B has been addressed by the applicant with reorientation of southern apartments facing this space toward the east and detailed landscaping of a meandering pathway through the separation gap.

The amendment of vehicle entry to a single entry/exit point at the western end of the site responds to previous recommendations by the Group. Previous recommendation that a canopy over this entry extend as far forward as possible with appropriate detailing has not been identified in the Development Application.

Several areas of the proposed development exceed allowable height. These are primarily on Building A where the eastern portion is 700mm over the height control and the eastern portion up to 200mm over. Elements of Building C also

exceed the height control, these being predominantly plant areas located at roof top and recessed from outer edges of the building.

The Group noted impact of these exceedences was substantially limited to the actual development site, and appear acceptable

3. Density

The Floor Space Ratio of the site is 1.5:1. The proposed development is 1.46:1 this being compliant with the maximum prescribed FSR.

4. Sustainability

The design chosen from previous options provides better solar access at different times of the day to the setout in the DCP. Compliance with the ADG has been demonstrated in the supporting documentation.

It is further recommended that top floor apartments have overhead vented skylights to internal bathrooms and laundries.

Whilst recycling of water has been identified, the scale of the development would also benefit from PV Cells located on roof areas.

5. Landscape

The location of the through site link to the western end of the site is supported as to route and form.

It was previously noted that the space between townhouses and buildings B and C appears to limit the viability of this narrow space particularly when private courts are proposed to both sides of the space. The nature and treatment of the narrow green space in the Development Application continues to be compromised by the number and width of paths and the height of fence lines separating private and common areas.

Given the removal of established trees on the site, the replacement of these with substantial planting and general allowance for deep soil planting needs to be clarified in the design. The provision of large tree species shown on the landscape plans is limited due to the extent of underground parking. Protection of the root systems of existing trees outside the site, and any remaining trees for retention within the site, is essential.

The provision of substantial planter beds to or between the outer west facing deck areas of apartments in Buildings B & C would substantially contribute to the greening of the site.

The treatment of the eastern border with Arcadia Park as a closed boundary is supported. The Group discussed the proximity of mature trees in Arcadia Park in terms of fire separation. The Applicant clarified that all necessary Protection

Zones would be created within the subject site, and the Applicant did not seek to establish an APZ in the reserve.

Given previous recommendation that all construction be set back from the Arcadia Park boundary, the applicant's argument that the vehicle ramp structure abutting the park is unable to be relocated is noted with the recommendation that an arborist report on sustainability of trees within Arcadia Park in close proximity to the ramp structure is to be submitted. It was indicated by the Applicant that only one tree – a palm – would be impacted by the basement in the nil-setback area.

The landscape plan shows a band of landscaping along the eastern rear area of the site. It was recommended in previous assessments that this be a passive zone with access limited to maintenance. Section I-I of the application [Landscape Drawing P17] shows this as an active turfed area, an aspect not supported by the Group.

6. Amenity

The Group noted the Development Application achieves previous recommendation that orientation toward neighbouring residences be limited.

The cross ventilation of townhouses in the podium was previously discussed as limited due to the location of car parking. The indicated overall compliance of 60.2% of units with natural cross ventilation represents a minimum rather than an exemplary provision of natural ventilation. It is recommended that top floor apartments have overhead vented skylights to internal bathrooms and laundries.

Previous recommendation that ventilation of the car park levels, whether natural or mechanical, needs to be addressed in the aesthetic treatment of the development does not appear to have been identified in the elevations.

The lap pool shown on Level 7 of Landscape Drawing P19 does not appear conducive to exercise given the short length and setting within surrounds of open decks for lounge chairs. A reduced deck area and longer pool would better serve this purpose whilst maintaining visual amenity.

The deletion of a spa from the southern communal area is supported

7. Safety

Passive surveillance of the public thoroughway has been provided to a limited degree by window to the western end of Building A.

8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

The range of residential forms is considered to provide satisfactory diversity in housing types.

It is recommended that a small outdoor communal space and enclosed area be provided on the lower western section of the roof of Building B to serve the residents of that block, since access to the facilities in Block A is indirect.

9. Aesthetics

The articulation of the upper residential levels of Buildings A and B could be enhanced by more considered use of solids and voids to minimize the appearance of stacked, flat plate structures. Greater use of solid wall panels; varied materials; solid upstands to balustrades; and variation in the roofline should be provided in conjunction with dedicated planting recesses.

The western elevations of the town houses should vary the ratio of face brick to painted render with increased height to the base brickwork to lessen the vertical dominance of the painted end panels.

Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality

The relatively minor detailed issues identified above under Sustainability, Landscape, Amenity, Housing Diversity & Social Interaction, and Aesthetics.

Summary Recommendation

The proposed development generally satisfies the objectives of the DCP, and would potentially provide an attractive residential environment. It is recommended that the issues identified above be addressed by way of amendments to the Development Application or conditions to any consent.



URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

ITEM No. 8

Date of Panel Assessment:	19 September 2018
Address of Project:	11-17 Mosbri Crescet The Hill
Name of Project (if applicable):	N/A
DA Number of Pre-DA?	DA
No. of Buildings:	Five 177 residences comprising 11 townhouse in a crescent , 14 townhouses sleeved to front of underground car parks and 142 apartments of varied forms [studio – 3 bed] in three buildings.
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Nil.
Attendees:	<u>Applicant</u> Kate Isaacs Richard Anderson Mark Purdy Steve Zapia Laura Parengkuan Samuel Newman <u>Council</u> Melissa Thomas Gareth Simpson

This report addresses the nine Design Quality Principles set out in the Apartment Design Guide (2015) under State Environmental Planning Policy No.65. It is also an appropriate format for applications which do not include residential flats.

Background Summary

The Planning proposal has been submitted subsequent to previous submissions which established design principles and options for residential development of the site. The current submission has responded to comments and recommendations provided by the Group in previous Pre DA submissions. The

option chosen for design development combines multi level apartment and town house buildings against the upper boundary of the site with terraced rows of town houses to the lower level of the site separated from the larger structures by a landscaped corridor. A public access way through the site has been relocated to the western end of the proposed development.

1. Context and Neighbourhood Character

The irregular shaped site, located at the head of a short west sloping valley, is currently occupied by the NBN Television Studios and car parking. To the east and set above the site is the heavily wooded Arcadia Park with The Obelisk crowning the top of the hill to the east of Arcadia Park. Below the site the curved alignment of Mosbri Crescent incorporates an open park directly opposite the site sloping to the western outlook over the City. Lower areas of the valley and the flanking slopes accommodate freestanding residences and small apartment buildings, most of two storey height.

2. Built Form and Scale.

Following previous review of development options responding to the FSR and height controls applicable to the site the preferred development option has been progressed. This forms the basis of the 19th September submission to the Group.

This option provides two storey town houses within curved terraces fronting Mosbi Crescent. The townhouses have direct access to basement car parking and incorporate provisions for future lift installations to each townhouse.

Three larger buildings, set against the eastern and northern slope, incorporate townhouse form apartments sleeved forward of a two level podium car park with a mix of studio, and 1-3 bedroom units above.

All carparking is accessed from a common entry/exit portal at the western end of the site. This eliminates a second entry exit portal at the centre of the site. The amendment of vehicle entry to a single entry exit point at the western end of the site responds to previous recommendations by the Group. Details of the canopy over this entry should be addressed in design development.

The development maintains the previous setout of the large northern building paralleling Kitchener Parade, stepped down Kitchener Parade and orientated to the north and south with a narrow separation from a central building to the eastern side of the site. Previous concerns raised by the Group have been partially addressed by relocation of the public movement path proposed between these buildings to the western end of the site. The group recommended further amendment of the central apartments facing this narrow gap to enable improved outlook.

Several areas of the proposed development continue to exceed allowable height. These are up to 400mm over on Building A and 1.8m at the end of Building C. Reduction in these heights is necessary in design development.

3. Density

The FSR of the site is 1.5:1. The options investigated range from 1.5:1 to 1.51:1 the preferred Option 3 being 1.51:1.

4. Sustainability

The preferred Option 3 provides better solar access at different times of the day to the setout in the DCP. Compliance with the ADG has not been detailed at this stage.

5. Landscaping

The relocated through site link is supported in location and form.

The Group does not support direct access to Arcadia Park from the eastern boundary of the development and recommends that this is deleted in favour of access to the east via Kitchener Parade.

The indicative landscape plans have improved screening of properties to the south of the site.

Treatment of the narrow planted area to the east of the three large residential buildings retains a meandering pathway. Whilst this has removed previously proposed communal areas, the group recommends that access to this area is limited to a minimal service path with re-establishment of transitional planting between the new buildings and the dense planting of Arcadia Park

Preservation of tree roots to established trees in Arcadia Park is an important consideration, in particular their critical root zones must be protected. This would in particular necessitate the creation of a set back of the vehicle ramp within the carpark located adjacent to the eastern boundary. The applicant noted this could be achieved in conjunction with amendments to the alignment of the western elevation of Building C.

The nature and treatment of the narrow green space between the terrace rows has been further illustrated in the current application. The relationship of the proposed pool and spa to the rear of the southern townhouses was not discussed at this stage but needs careful planning in terms of amenity /privacy of the townhouses and adjacent sites to the south. The location of the outdoor kitchen area towards the south western corner of the site precludes usefully scaled tree planting and landscaping as a buffer to the adjacent properties. This should be relocated within the site.

As previously noted the removal of established trees on the site and replacement with substantial planting and general allowance for deep soil planting needs to be

incorporated in the design. At present the indicative plantings would not be sufficient in extent and scale to produce a similar leafy landscape outcome to that shown on the attractive presentation renderings. Plantings should be revised to ensure this is the outcome. Protection of the root systems of existing trees outside the site, and any remaining trees for retention within the site, is essential.

For the residences opening onto the podium top areas, paved courtyard spaces should not be excessive in their area, with soft landscaping to take up the extent of the podium top beyond the private open spaces. Provision should be made for safe maintenance access to the landscaping.

6. Amenity

The amended application has minimized over sighting of sites to the south through deletion of windows to the southern side of Building C. This could be further improved in development of landscaping to the southern side boundary.

The proposed communal area above Building B should be supplemented by a similar area above Building A.

The alignment of the proposed penthouses to Building A should be revised to enable northern outlook to both penthouses.

As previously noted, cross ventilation of townhouses in the podium requires further consideration as these are shown enclosed on three sides.

Ventilation of the car park levels, whether natural or mechanical, needs to be addressed in the aesthetic treatment of the development.

7. Safety

Passive surveillance of the public thoroughway; of the pathways behind the townhouses and between Buildings A & B, needs to be incorporated in design development.

Safety issues in access from the podium car park through to townhouses should be addressed in design development.

8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

Not addressed at this stage.

9. Aesthetics

The appearance of the three large buildings seen from the west should be further developed with articulation reducing the appearance of a large unrelieved multi layered complex. Further use of vertical elements as employed in the lower level townhouses; less emphasis of exposed slab edges; substantial planting to west

facing podium decks and variation in external colours are potential means of reducing the apparent bulk of the complex.

The Group recommends provision of a link element between the two sections of the crescent townhouses, strengthening the address to Mosbri Crescent.

Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality

Design development should address the above identified issues and adhere closely to the ADG.

Summary Recommendation

The proposed development has substantially incorporated previous recommendations by the Group.

Incorporation of recommendations from the Meeting of 19th September will improve the overall proposal.

In particular the following should be further addressed:

- Height of Buildings A & C
- Amenity issues to townhouses in buildings A, B & C
- Landscaping to the east of the complex and to decks of townhouses and apartments.
- Separation of car parking from the eastern boundary.
- Articulation of Buildings A-C viewed from the west.



URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

ITEM No. 4

Date of Panel Assessment:	15 August 2018
Address of Project:	11-17 Mosbri Crescent The Hill
Name of Project (if applicable):	N/A
DA Number of Pre-DA?	Pre DA
No. of Buildings:	Five
No. of Units:	168-175 depending on option.
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Nil.
Attendees:	<u>Applicant</u> Kate Isaacs Richard Anderson Mark Purdy Steve Zapia Peter Crystal <u>Council</u> Melissa Thomas Gareth Simpson

This report addresses the nine Design Quality Principles set out in the Apartment Design Guide (2015) under State Environmental Planning Policy No.65. It is also an appropriate format for applications which do not include residential flats.

Background Summary

The Planning proposal has been submitted subsequent to a previous submission which established design principles for residential development of the site. The previous submission proposed alignment of multi level apartment buildings against the upper boundary of the site with terraced rows of town houses to the lower level of the site separated from the larger structures by a landscaped corridor and incorporating a public access way through the site.

1. Context and Neighbourhood Character

The irregular shaped site, located at the head of a short west sloping valley, is currently occupied by the NBN Television Studios and car parking. To the east and set above the site is the heavily wooded Arcadia Park with The Obelisk crowning the top of the hill to the east of Arcadia Park. Below the site the curved alignment of Mosbri Crescent incorporates an open park directly opposite the site sloping to the western outlook over the City. Lower areas of the valley and the flanking slopes accommodate freestanding residences and small apartment buildings, most of two storey height.

2. Built Form and Scale

The planning proposal presented options of massing and building alignment responding to the FSR and height controls applicable to the site. Option 3 of those provided was identified as that favoured by the applicant and formed the basis of the submission. This option provides two storey town houses within curved terraces fronting Mosbi Crescent with basement car parking. Three larger buildings set against the eastern and northern slope incorporating townhouses sleeved forward of a two level podium car park with a mix of 1-3 bedroom units above.

The preferred option varies the relationship of the northern apartment building to Kitchener Parade combining two elements defined in the DCP along the northern side of the site into a single building stepped down Kitchener Parade and orientated to the north and south with a narrow separation from a central building to the eastern side of the site. The Panel raised concerns over the relationship of these two buildings.

The Panel drew attention to the extent and depth of this separation [between buildings A & B particularly as this was the proposed route of public movement through the site.

The Panel recommended further resolution of car parking entries provided in Option 3. The central entry /exit is considered to substantially impact on the quality and amenity of the central green space. Relocation of this entry/exit to the southern side of the site with a further setback from the southern boundary is considered a more effective location for the central driveway.

Several areas of the proposed Option 3 exceed allowable height. These are up to 400mm over on Building A and 1.8m at the end of Building C. Reduction in these heights is necessary in design development.

3. Density

The FSR of the site is 1.5:1. The options investigated range from 1.5:1 to 1.51:1 the preferred Option 3 being 1.51:1.

4. Sustainability

The preferred Option 3 provides better solar access at different times of the day to the setout in the DCP. Compliance with the ADG has not been detailed at this stage.

5. Landscape

The through site link is not supported in its current form.

The nature and treatment of the narrow green space between the terrace rows needs development in the landscape plan.

Given the removal of established trees on the site the replacement of these with substantial planting and general allowance for deep soil planting needs to be incorporated in the design. Protection of the root systems of existing trees outside the site, and any remaining trees for retention within the site, is essential.

Planning for any passageway to or through Arcadia Park needs careful consideration and requires input from Council's landscape architect. The park should not be compromised by the introduction of multiple access-points or planning that encourages the creation of desire paths. Any access through the park will inevitably be required to consider the need for pedestrian safety, sight lines and the like. It is important that ill-considered multiple pathways and access points do not erode the dense established character of the foliage of the park and existing significant vegetation. These need to be reinforced with sympathetic planting.

The indicative landscape plan shows a string of gathering places along the eastern boundary of the site. These appear to impact on amenity of the apartments and the quality of the adjacent Arcadia Park. The spaces are also likely to be heavily overshadowed. Active use of these spaces is considered inappropriate.

The nature of the narrowed space between townhouses and buildings B and C appears to overestimate the viability of this narrow space particularly when private courts are proposed to both sides of the space.

6. Amenity

The panel accepted that the proposed Option 3 limited orientation toward neighbours although issues appear to remain with outlook to and from neighbouring buildings to the south of the site. Overshadowing is also a consideration.

Whilst not discussed at length in this preliminary stage, cross ventilation of townhouses in the podium will require considered design as these are shown enclosed on three sides.

The proposed semi-circular layout of the terraces is likely to result in poorer solar access than the adopted DCP. Design development will need to demonstrate how an acceptable performance can be achieved.

Ventilation of the car park levels, whether natural or mechanical, needs to be addressed in the aesthetic treatment of the development.

As with a previous submission, the panel noted that the nature and narrow width of the green space between the lower townhouses and the three larger buildings requires careful design. Design concept images continue to illustrate much wider situations than will actually exist.

7. Safety

Passive surveillance of the public thoroughway, wherever located, needs to be incorporated.

Safety issues in access from the podium car park through to townhouses should be addressed in design development.

8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

Not addressed at this stage.

9. Aesthetics

Not addressed at this stage.

Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality

Design development should address the above identified issues and adhere closely to the ADG.

Summary Recommendation

The proposed development generally follows the objectives of the DCP. Design development must improve the overall proposal rather than provide compromised response to identified deficiencies including the following:

- The nature of and location of the public access way through the site.
- The nature of the green space between the lower townhouses and the upper apartment buildings.
- The interface of works to the eastern boundary and the adjacent Arcadia Park
- The relationship of Building C to adjacent existing buildings.
- The alignment of buildings A & B.
- Entry and exit vehicle driveway locations
- Height of Buildings A & C

