

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

### ADDENDUM TO REPORT

TO: **Sydney Central City Planning Panel – 18 September 2020**

<b>Application lodged</b>	14 April 2020
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr C Gorton
<b>Owner</b>	Merrylands Investment Co Pty Ltd
<b>Application No.</b>	DA2020/0220
<b>Description of Land</b>	233 Merrylands Road, MERRYLANDS NSW 2160 249-259 Merrylands Road, MERRYLANDS NSW 2160 52-54 McFarlane Street, MERRYLANDS NSW 2160
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Construction of mixed use development comprising 5 mixed use buildings, including retail and commercial tenancies, childcare facility and 790 residential apartments, over 4 levels of basement parking, associated stormwater, public domain and landscaping works - Integrated Development (Water Management Act 2000)
<b>Site Area</b>	12,418m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Zoning</b>	B4 Mixed Use & SP2 Infrastructure (Local Road)
<b>Disclosure of political donations and gifts</b>	Nil disclosure
<b>Heritage</b>	The site is not a heritage item and is not within a heritage conservation area
<b>Principal Development Standards being varied</b>	Height of Building FSR Residential FSR
<b>Issues</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development standard variations to maximum building height, maximum FSR and maximum residential FSR</li> <li>• ADG non-compliances</li> <li>• DCP non-compliances</li> <li>• Submissions – 2 submissions received</li> </ul>

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

### SUMMARY

The following information is provided, as an addendum to the Report for DA2020/0220, for the consideration of the Sydney Central City Planning Panel (SCCPP).

In Panel briefing notes dated 16 June 2020, a series of urban design and architecture matters were raised for consideration and discussion. These issues and the responses provided have been collated into the following table.

Please note that the below responses should be read in conjunction with the plans at **Attachment 2 – Architectural Plans Part 2**, which illustrate the design amendments discussed below.

Issue	Applicant Response
<b>Landscaping:</b> for example the basement extends under the proposed Eat Street and there does not appear to be any allowance to accommodate the proposed street trees.	<p>The proposal has been designed to ensure that there are sufficient soil depths to achieve the tree plantings proposed.</p> <p>Taylor Brammer have reviewed the comments and confirmed that <i>‘there is already soil depth over basement slab for tree planting as shown in Eat Street Section (on page 11 of Landscape Plans). There is approximately 1200mm of deep soil available to this area’</i>.</p> <p>Please refer to page 11 of the landscape set for further detail on this aspect. In addition a landscape section for Eat Street is provided at Attachment 1 to this Addendum Report.</p> <p>Further, it is acknowledged that the ADG nominates a soil depth of 1m for a medium tree and 1.2m for a large tree (above 12m)- noting the trees proposed are 10m and only require 1m- noting 1.2m is provided.</p>
<b>Activation of the Eat Street:</b> particularly to the western side, consider a double-sided active street for optimal surveillance. Also consider whether the ‘narrowness’ of retail tenancies could impact their ability to contribute to street activity.	<p>Turner have prepared an analysis of the activation achieved to Eat Street (page 2) and confirm that the depth of the retail tenancies are considered suitable in enabling street activity.</p>

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

Issue	Applicant Response
<p><b>Permeability:</b> for example, consider whether the lobby for the Northern Building could connect to Treves St to improve activity to that street.</p>	<p>Turner have prepared an analysis of this element of the proposal (page 3) noting that the design as proposed is considered the most suitable, noting the Market Lane linkage that is currently proposed. The provision of a lobby would reduce the active frontage and would compress the width of the Market Lane connection point.</p> <p>The design is considered appropriate as designed and it is acknowledged that Figure 2 of the HDCP 2013 (Merrylands Town Centre) does not require any through link to Treves Street through the central portion of the street block-as is proposed by the Market Lane link. Therefore, the extent of permeability is much greater than that envisaged by the DCP provisions. It is also noted that Figure 9 indicates that the lane is to be the street address.</p>
<p><b>Design excellence:</b> consider the adequacy of the articulation of Building B and the extent of the roof overhangs to Building A and C.</p>	<p>Please see the response by Turner (Page 4 and 5), noting amendments have been made to reduce the extent of the overhang as noted by Turner and shown on the amended plans.</p>
<p><b>Interior layouts:</b> the panel seeks consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The narrow width of the residential lobbies of Building C;</li> <li>▪ The limited depth to light for some of the kitchens;</li> <li>▪ In some of the studios the bed areas appear to be excluded from access to natural light and direct ventilation due to walls between the bed area and living area;</li> <li>▪ The narrowness of dining areas to Units such as A201;</li> </ul>	<p>Please see the response by Turner (Page 6), noting amendments have been made to increase the lobby width from 1.8m to 3.35m to provide a more generous lobby space and to respond to this comment.</p> <p>Please see the response by Turner (Page 7), noting amendments have been made to ensure that the 1 Bed Type 06 Unit achieves the 8m control from glazing to the back of the kitchen to resolve this comment.</p> <p>Please see the response by Turner (Page 8 &amp; 9), noting amendments have been made to provide an operable window to the bedroom.</p> <p>Please see the response by Turner (Page 10), noting the proposal meets the ADG minimum requirement of 4m- being 4.2m. However the furniture layouts have been adjusted to show the functionality of the spaces.</p>

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Acoustic issues for the beds of Units in Building B adjacent to the COS in Building B/C;</li></ul>	Please see the response by Turner (Page 11), noting the proposal is designed with a 4.5m privacy and noise buffer between the apartments in Building B and the COS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Building B appears to have no natural light to its circulation areas above the podium.</li></ul>	Please see the response by Turner (Page 12), noting the proposal has now provided a window to the end of the circulation areas.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Eat Street Landscape Section



EAT STREET

SECTION

