



## **URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING**

### **ITEM No. 6**

Date of Panel Assessment:	20 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
Address of Project:	32 Industrial Drive, Mayfield
Name of Project (if applicable):	Seniors Living Development
DA Number or Pre-DA?	UDCG No 2018/ 00019
No. of Buildings:	3 Apartments & 1 Aged Care
No. of Units:	262 'Self care' & 216-bed Aged Care
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Glen Spicer
Attendees:	<u>Applicant</u> Phil Gardner Garry Fielding Barney Collins Bede Campbell Anthony Wilkins  <u>Council</u> Melissa Thomas

*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 applicant is seeking a 'site compatibility certificate' from the NSW Department of Planning and Environment to allow construction of an aged care development in accordance with the conditions of SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability). The site is zoned RE2 Private Recreation, which as such does not have any applicable statutory height or density controls.

The applicant proposes the construction of 262 seniors 'self-care' low-rise residential units on the land currently used as a training ground by the 'Newcastle Knights' football teams, and 216 beds for aged-care on presently vacant land to the western side of the existing club building. They argued that a reduction of parking numbers for club purposes is justified because the present gymnasium and pool will no longer be open to the public but reserved for the use of the future on-site residents.

The written submission states that “...this is a community development where the residents are likely to come from and remain in the West’s membership base. This places a higher expectation on the quality of the development.” (p.4)

### **1.Context and Neighbourhood Character**

The site is surrounded by low-density residential development to the east, south and west. These are all subject to a height control of 8.5 metres and an FSR of 0.6:1. To the east the club site is separated from these residential areas by William Street, and a row of magnificent mature trees along the boundary. To the north the site is separated from industrial and other activities by Industrial Drive, located on a wide road reservation. To the south there are also substantial trees within the subject site, although to the west the site immediately adjoins the residential zone.

The site is relatively flat and enjoys good sunlight. Although it is not within easy walking distance of urban facilities, there are good Club amenities on-site for meals and recreation, and there is a public bus service to the city on the adjoining Industrial Drive. It is also proposed to provide adequate on-site parking for ‘self-care’ residents.

Overall the amenity of the site would be reasonable and appropriate for residential uses.

### **2. Built Form and Scale**

The block accommodating beds for aged-care residents is proposed to be 7 storeys high, and located adjacent to Industrial Drive above a basement housing 29 cars and service facilities, and screened on the western side by a high patterned wall. It is considered that in principle this location would be acceptable, given that the existing hotel on the north-east corner of the site is already of similar height, and it would thus not be out of scale on this frontage. The only apparent possible concern is the visual bulk of this building as viewed from residential dwellings to the south-east of this site.. It is likely that this would be within acceptable limits but will need to be confirmed as part of any future DA submission.

The accommodation for 262 seniors’ self-care residents is located on the south-east part of the site, in buildings varying in height from 9 to 4 floors, in part over a new basement containing 300 cars, and in part over the existing above-ground car-park. The layout of these buildings is organized to provide inter-connected courtyards and is generally well-considered and acceptable in principle, although both the courtyards and some of the lower-level apartments would be substantially overshadowed in winter months. This is demonstrated by the submitted shadow diagrams, but overall it is considered that the level of amenity of residential units and the site generally could potentially be of good standard.

The developed scheme will need to provide a high standard of landscape design which will be critical on this large site.

### **3. Density**

The submission states that the FSR of the proposed scheme would result in an FSR of 1.036:1 which appears reasonable.

### **4. Sustainability**

The developed design should incorporate environmental sustainability measure. With the large roof areas available extensive solar collection and storage could readily be incorporated, as well as rainwater recycling for irrigation of this large site.

## **5. Landscape**

High quality landscape will be an essential and critical component of any developed submission.

## **6. Amenity**

The 'Architectural Design Statement' states that the layout is capable of satisfying ADG standards relating to solar access and cross-ventilation., and the DCP requirements for building separation. It would be very desirable in a 'senior's living' development for amenity to be well in excess of basic standards because the amount of time residents spend within apartments will typically be much longer than that in other situations.

## **7. Safety**

Satisfactory

## **8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction**

The design provides for a good mix of apartment sizes, and appears appropriate.

## **9. Aesthetics**

For consideration at next stage

## **Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality**

The design is acceptable for its purpose.

## **Summary Recommendation**

The 'masterplan and conceptual design' (Design Statement p.2) and the indicative apartment plans demonstrate that the proposed uses for the site and the accommodation proposed could result in an acceptable outcome, and an environment of good quality for residential units. It is considered that:-

- (a) The height of the buildings as indicated is the maximum which should be accepted on the site.
- (b) The amount of accommodation and density are also as dense as should be permitted.
- (c) Within these constraints any developed design should explore options for improving amenity of apartment, particularly in relation to solar access to a greater number of apartments. There are potentially other plan configurations which might achieve a better outcome
- (d) The design is supported in principle for the purpose of demonstrating that it would be reasonable for a 'site compatibility certificate' to be granted by the Department.