Panel's Comments:

Built form, mass and articulation:

- *The proposed development exceeds the maximum permissible building height of 18m at Bachell Street. Further modulation of the mass to address this heigh requirement is required, stepped setbacks to Bachell Street will promote a more harmonious relationship with the surrounding context.*
- *Please design height breaches out of the proposed design – there is no clear reasoning behind why these are required.*
- *The proposed FSR of 3.21:1 exceeds the maximum permissible FSR of 3.0:1.*
- *Describe the massing of the development what strategy have been deployed to allow daylight into the central courtyard. There is a risk this space will be dark and windy.*
- *Layout of uses is generally ad-hoc and confusing- it lacks integration between uses and with the local area. Consider how someone visiting the development will want to move around and design to make it as easy (and efficient) as possible. The layout of light industrial uses appears odd – 'back of house', disconnected from the development, yet demands expensive ramp infrastructure to access Level 2. Is there a reason why these uses can't be all on ground floor?*
- *Location of day care on level 5: Likely to have different hours of operation to the rest of the development – how will access be controlled? Lifts to Level 5 are somewhat hidden. How do parents with prams access the ground floor/lifts? Appears to be stairs at each approach. Where is the parking for parents to stop and drop? Question the inclusion of movement corridor as part of the 7sqm play space. Play space at the southeast will be in shadow most of the day.*
- *Doggy daycare on Level 9. Is this an appropriate location given the only access is via shared lift? Also appears that there is no outdoor space.*
- *General orientation of built form will preclude solar access to the plaza area at ground floor.*
- *Plaza concept, whilst noted as an attempt to create an integrated design, will create issues for safety. Passive surveillance is not strong.*
- *Security management will be difficult with so many different uses and hours of operation.*

Applicant's response:

Our response to height against Councils RFI earlier in this submission. The exceedances in height relate to a large sloping site, are minor in nature, and don't contain any habitable space.

It is noted that the central space is more akin to a laneway, not a plaza or courtyard. The design promotes activation of the site, emphasising vertical and horizontal connectivity. This space works as a transition between buildings and is an important circulation area for the development.

The central courtyard is akin to a laneway and is punctuated by the separation of the buildings at ground level and this thereby provides opportunity for natural light and ventilation. In addition, being open air there is no impediment to light access from above. This space works as a transition between buildings and is an important circulation area for the development.

The location of the light industry along the northern boundary at ground level and to the east at the rear is a deliberate positioning to demarcate the activities associated with the light industrial use. Continuing the light industrial use onto level 2 follows through with the ground floor concept of locating this use to the rear of the site for many factors including noise attenuation, pedestrian safety and safe vehicular movement responding to this use. To locate this use entirely on the ground floor would cluster the units closer to the pedestrian focussed uses and the outcome would be detrimental to the amenity of the ground floor.

The development is comprised of several uses. Many of these are set up to operate independently dependant on the user's familiarity with the precinct.

Access to the daycare will be secured via pin code or security passes as is the norm for child care centres. The lifts to level 5 are not hidden, rather they are positioned within a weather protected alcove that is known to the people working and accessing the commercial uses housed in the building along the northern boundary. Pedestrian access to the lifts is via a safe pedestrian pathway part of the central courtyard circulation space. It is an appropriate location for this segregated use

Car parking is designated for the child care centre use under the building and there is a designated lift for access. Access to the childcare centre will be by lift. Two lifts connect the childcare lobby with the ground floor and the childcare parking area in the lower ground floor. Access from the level 5 lobby will be controlled by staff.

Light studies have been undertaken in the design development of the laneway and these studies demonstrated that there is light access available to this lower level. Full solar access is encouraged on the roof level where public and building user activities and amenities are provided.

It's believed that passive surveillance is achievable as the majority of the retail units are double sided and there is activity to both sides of these units.

A comprehensive plan of management has been prepared to accompany this application. It captures management over the site and the varied uses.

Panel's Comments

Structure / Buildability / Maintenance

- *Considering the difficult, triangular shaped site, clean, consistent structural system is recommended. The presented design indicates the need of transfer structure above LGF, however there are further structural misalignments on the upper floors as well.*
- *The indicated 300mm wide columns in the basement are not realistic – in case of a 12 storey (3 basement + 9), with type A construction, considering all the load and the required fire rating the columns will be much wider than 300mm. As there is no tolerance left in the design, the 2600mm visitor spaces will be quite likely compromised. Early structural engineer involvement is recommended.*
- *Over articulation of the courtyard circulation areas and building mass leads to poor weather protection and maintenance issues. Rain-water to be handled on open corridors – glass balustrades act as water-trap – open balustrades cause linear dripping/flowing of water.*
- *The amenities / wet areas are scattered, not aligned. From a buildability / construction cost point of view well aligned wet areas would be beneficial.*

Applicant's response:

We have undertaken a structural engineering review and incorporated the necessary requirements for a DA level documentation set.

Outdoor spaces will be provided with well designed drainage systems that will collect water before it becomes a hazard and channel it to the on-site stormwater system. Balustrades will prevent overflow into the areas below and outdoor perimeter walkways will be covered to provide all weather access to internal spaces.

The applicant has aligned the amenities/wet areas as per the Panel's comments.

Panel's Comments:

Parking, circulation and servicing

- *Clarification required on justification for excluding the basement self storage from FSR calculation*
- *Future EV charging not noted, consider fire protection.*
- *Justify the use of tandem spaces.*
- *Loading of Self Storage only by B99 is not realistic. Business model to be confirmed by specialist consultant.*
- *52 bicycles parking on B1 and B2, but only 28 on LGF. Is it possible to have all bicycles on LGF? Or even on GF?*
- *Aisle width of 6m is not sufficient for SRV turning / loading. Refer to AS 2890.2 Off-street commercial Parking*
- *Locating 18 bicycle on the bottom of the driveway on LGF raises safety issues.*
- *Locating loading bay on the bottom of the driveway of LGF raises safety issues.*
- *SRV Loading on LGF blocks GYM entry*
- *Fire exits, fire egress merging clearances, lengths, night-time exits through after hours controlled access points etc. to be reviewed and resolved.*
- *The exhaust system will likely be required for heat and smoke exhaust as well – the location of the proposed exhaust above the GF street frontage footpath is to be reviewed and coordinated, not only from carpark ventilation, but also from fire, health and acoustic point of view.*
- *Proposed accessible car parking spaces: B2: 1/218, B1: 1/191, LGF: 7/133. Total: 9/542. To be reviewed, especially in light of the medical use in the building. Accessible spaces headroom requirements to be checked (can be critical on B1 and B2)*
- *Ambulance access to medical use is not clear. The indicated corridor is about a 1m wide, long corridor, which is not sufficient for stretcher or bed transport.*
- *Ambulance bay + corridor headroom to be checked*
- *Circulation of MRV Loading 14 is not sufficient.*
- *Passing bay is blocking BG.05 loading*
- *After hour access lines to be reviewed.*
- *Vehicle access / turning of B2.01, B2.06, B2.07 is not sufficient*
- *Egress from Northern terrace of child-care to be checked*
- *Commercially operating a dog daycare on the top of the building can be challenging – especially for the office users and the babies and kids on the floors below. Acoustic report and advise recommended.*
- *Child-care centre drop-off, fire, acoustic, and servicing requirements to be coordinated and checked*
- *Does the ramp up to level 2 provide appropriate clearance for the type of vehicles expected to utilise it?*

Applicant's response:

It is not envisaged that the medical uses will require bed transport. The provision of ambulance facilities are to futureproof the tenancies, not based on expected demand. The widest stretcher utilised by the NSW Ambulance service is 750mm (https://www.ambulance.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/552907/Stretcher-and-Vehicle-Dimensions-NSWAmbulance.pdf) more than capable of being accommodated within the 1m corridor. Notwithstanding, the corridor width has been increased from 1m to 1.5m in width.

Every component of the site, each building is accessible via lift and there is ramp access off Bachell Avenue. The ground floor RL is established by the Flood Planning Level, therefore, direct access from the footpath needs to be via ramps and or stairs. Each tenancy which fronts Bachell avenue is afforded direct stair access to ensure activation of the frontage. However, a second, accessible entry is provided from the internal plaza.

There is a designated pedestrian pathway to the AG series of units. A pedestrian entry door is provided adjacent to the roller door access and this will be designed in accordance with AS 1428.1. The loading zone to the south of the BG units can potentially provide a pedestrian collection area with a safe enclosed waiting area created for collection of goods.

Panel's comments:

Sustainability and environment:

- *The panel acknowledges the sustainability targets set for the project of 5.5 star NABERS energy and 2 star water rating and encourages further development of strong ESD principles for the project.*
- *Promising to see the consideration for the integration of good CEPTED principles.*
- *The rail corridor to the south of the site has the potential to provide borrowed landscape amenity to the development. Consideration should me made for this opportunity in the developing design.*
- *What strategies have been adopted to account for the flooding risk on site*
- *How is the stormwater channel going to be managed? Have you met with Sydney water?*
- *Proposed deep soil zone not clear*
- *Proposed canopy cover not clear*
- *General approach to landscaping lacks consistency and reasoning (for example, why is the pavement criss-crossed? If assisting in wayfinding this makes sense but there is no correlation which is confusing).*

Applicant's response:

The design developed the cutout courtyard as a response to similar pre-DA comments. the current amended drawing set has provided a setback at the lower levels of 1m to increase the opportunities for natural light.

The design developed the cutout courtyard as a response to similar pre-DA comments. the current amended drawing set has provided a setback at the lower levels of 1m to increase the opportunities for natural light.

The nature of development in the business zone differs from that in the residential zones. Due to the demands of the permissible uses, deep soil provisions are not typically considered. We understand that part C of the DCP echoes this sentiment and does not provision controls relating to deep soil.

The nature of development in the business zone differs from that in the residential zones. Due to the demands of the permissible uses, canopy cover provisions are not typically considered. We understand that part C of the DCP echoes this sentiment and does not provision controls relating to canopy cover.

Applicant has relocated the fire hydrant and gas meter away from the location of the proposed trees.

Panel's comments:

Street address:

- *The primary street addressing mass clad in brick is an visually attractive, contextual and human scale response to the street frontage.*
- *There is a good rhythm to the street a facing elevation which is not evident in the taller buildings at the rear.*
- *Understanding that the intention is that the ground floor tenancies are dual frontage, stairs and retaining walls at the street frontage are to be avoided. Review level of ground floor slab.*
- *Min. 3m wide green front setback recommended.*

Applicant's response:

The taller buildings to the rear are designed in response to the height controls and house a different use to the smaller street elevation buildings. The height of the rear buildings is beneficial to accessing views and daylight and also helps to vary the mass of the site.

The ground floor RL is set at the flood planning level. Additionally, there is approximately 4.5m fall along Bachell avenue. Along CG.01 to CG.06, retaining walls are required to the outdoor seating areas, punctuated by openings to draw people into the tenancies, providing activation. At the point where a retaining wall would be the highest, along AG.01 and AG.02, the shopfront glazing is brought down to the footpath level, with the height transition occurring within the tenancy. This provides for a display along the frontage, appropriately activating this end of the development.

The applicant has not provided a 3m wide green setback as the DCP does not require this.

Panel's comments:

- retaining walls at the street frontage are to be avoided. Review level of ground floor slab.
- Min. 3m wide green front setback recommended

Site access

- *Various entry points to the development will make it difficult for people to find their way into and around safely and conveniently.*
- *Access is generally convoluted – long, winding and indirect corridors may be unpleasant and unsafe. Pedestrian pathways/access along the north east edge is not clear.*
- *Potential for conflict at the merge of ramp system at the ground floor. Why does the building follow the curved driveway – this may present a collision issue.*
- *The access way between the tenancy and ambulance bay at the ground floor seems too narrow to take a stretcher and will require review*

- *Alignment of the carpark entry with the roundabout at Bachell street is legible and supportable.*

Applicant's response:

This was encouraged in previous design reviews and the entry points are correctly located to address each portion of the site. Upon entry into the site, it does become clear where a visitor is to go and there will be a wayfinding strategy implemented to assist.

We have designed the site to address and activate the street front. By providing several points of access we have avoided creating a long street front that turns its back to the street. We do not believe that creating several entries will be confusing, rather it breaks down the bulk of the development creating a street facade that feels like several buildings and creating an internal street network that will activate the different retail offerings.

The nature of the development on the site is that it is a long site. The pathways have been considered in their shortest length with other paths coming off them strategically to access another area of the development.

Panel's comments:

Presentation:

- *Strong context study.*
- *The legibility of plans, elevations and sections needs to be improved ahead of DA lodgement. Scale of annotations, levels, clear dimensions, hierarchy of colouring and hatches, presence of surrounding context.*
- *North points, RLs, legends please.*

Applicant's response:

The applicant has provided drawings to address the above.