

### **Report and Recommendations of the Design Review Forum Panel Sutherland Shire Council 11 April 2019**

Panel Members: John Dimopoulos (Chair), Harry Levine & Peter Brooker

Council Staff: Kylie Rourke (ROFF), Carolyn Howell (Team Leader), Stevie Medcalf (Landscape)

Applicant Team: Vic Lake, Vic Lake Architects – Architect  
Lisa Loi, Vic Lake Architects – Architect  
Lyndall Wynne, Wynne Planning – Town Planner  
Laura Featherstone, Wynne Planning – Town Planner  
Jeff Barton, Taylor Made – Applicant/Developer

DA No: DA19/0021

PAD No: PAD18/0043

Project Address: 1-7 Boyle Street, Sutherland

Proposal: Demolition of existing structures and construction of a mixed use development containing 43 units with stratum subdivision

#### **PREAMBLE**

A proposal for the site was previously reviewed by Council on the 12 June 2018, and the comments made have been taken into account in framing this report.

The site was visited by the Panel members prior to the meeting.

The proposal has been considered in relation to the Design Quality Principles of SEPP 65. Detailed matters relating to Principle 5 (Landscape) are not covered by the Panel and will be separately reported by Council Officers.

Issues considered relevant to the proposal are noted below.

## COMMENTS

1. Although the design presents a mature and interesting formal response to the site, the design seems to have not yet adequately addressed the main urban design issues [separate from issues of form] as observed in the previous PAD minutes, where it was noted that:

*“The treatment of all ground floor facades is important and addressing all four active or semi-active frontages is key to the success of the development of this site and the Sutherland centre” and that,*

*“Council considers the location of the site on the SCATL as an opportunity to address McCubbins Lane through an activated façade, whereas currently proposed the design presents only ‘back of house’ servicing to the lane.”*

The required fine grain urban design response can be limited to the following issues:

- *awning height and extent:* here the Panel felt that it suffers from being more of a design signature and less of a language that identifies and responds to specific contextual needs. For example, the need of a 2-level awning along the 3m setback of ‘Pub Lane’ might be an inappropriate scaling device compared to the grandness and commercial nature of Eton St - and thus that a hierarchy of heights and details should apply as the awning moves around the building.
- *the current proposed design of ‘Pub Lane’:* a better sense of urban retail edge should be designed that allows pedestrians to hug the perimeter of the retail façade rather than be separate from it by landscape strips, facilitating better connections and multiple opportunities in retail outcomes. Consider setting back the retail further than 3m to create pedestrian shelter along this interface. The Lane should be designed so that it can be operational before the adjacent site is developed.
- *the congested and confusing entries:* between the commercial and the residential lobbies, it is unclear which is which from the street. Consider relocating the commercial entry to the better suited Eton Street.
- *lane activation issues:* it was discussed that the design needs to improve its visual presentation to the corners of the retail component, engaging them more with McCubbins Lane, to better meet the objectives of SCATL. The Panel had no issue with the entry/exit driveways remaining as shown subject to Council Traffic Staff advice.

2. DCP + ADG set backs are to be further analysed, particularly with meeting building separation as shown on the Built Form Plan shown in the DCP [showing what looks like 5m to face of building from boundary].
3. The Panel finds amenity issues within the plans as per the following:
  - Snorkels- not permissible as shown.
  - Compliance with Cross ventilation is expected, and cannot be counted through snorkels.
  - Common circulation spaces and natural light to lobby is inequitable.
  - A basic but realistic structural plan should be included on drawings.
4. In relation to overall form, the Built Form Plan in the DCP [and as also noted in your sketchup model], indicates an organisation of base/middle/top that should be acknowledged in the design. It was discussed that this could help serve as also unifying the lower form with the taller form, with the balance in height be made via a material change.
5. The projecting balcony form on Eton Street with a 500mm setback seems visually uncomfortable, is non-compliant with setback controls, and should be reconsidered.
6. It is recommended that Council should consider that conditions be included in any development consent to ensure that design quality is carried through to the construction phase of the project. These would include provisions to ensure:
  - that prior to any proposed change to external materials and/or details as specified in the approved documents, such proposed change is to be submitted to Council for approval.
  - that the Architect of the DA is engaged to undertake regular site inspections and prepare independent reports to Council to verify that design intent is being met.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The issues noted above should be taken into account in a revised proposal to realise an outcome that could be supported by the Panel.

John Dimopoulos  
(DRF Chair)