

Bayside Design Review Panel

MINUTES OF MEETING

REPORT OF THE BAYSIDE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday 2 April 2020 via Teleconference

Panel members:

Matthew Taylor
Brendan Randles
Stephen Collier
Paul Walter

ITEM 3 – DESIGN EXCELLENCE

Date of Panel Assessment:	Thursday 2 April, 2020
Applicant:	Da Vito Ferro Apartments Pty Ltd
Architect:	Squillace
Property Address:	16-18 John Street, Mascot & 23 Church Avenue Mascot
Description:	Retention of part of Church Street facade, demolition of all remaining structures, excavation for basement parking levels and construction of two (2) x thirteen (13) storey mixed use buildings comprising ground level commercial and 122 residential units and rooftop communal open space
No. of Buildings:	2
No. of Storeys:	13
No. of Units:	122
Consent Authority Responsible:	Bayside Council
Application No.:	DA-2019/359
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Nil

The Panel inspected the site, reviewed the submitted documentation and met via video link with representatives of the applicant including Vince Squillace and Stephen Kerr. Marta Gonzalez-Valdes for Council.

Comments from DRP Meeting of 20 June 2019 in Green

Comments from DRP Meeting of 12 December 2019 in Blue

Design Principle	Comments
<p>Context and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is the key natural and built features of an area, their relationship and the character they create when combined. It also includes social, economic, health and environmental conditions.</p> <p>Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of an area's existing or future character. Well-designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood.</p> <p>Consideration of local context is important for all sites, including sites in established areas, those undergoing change or identified for change.</p>	<p>The proposal outlines an engaging concept that seeks to provide an expression of the current use of the site, the telling of its local story and seeks to engage the broader community through an interpretation of this within the development proposal. In addition, the proposal seeks to provide the potential for a site-through pedestrian link to enhance the connectivity between Church Avenue and John Street.</p> <p>The above two elements of the proposal have the potential to help enhance neighborhood character.</p> <p>The Panel appreciates the concept that the Applicant wishes to pursue of responding to the historic use of the factory for steel fabrication. However, the partial retention of the factory building and its intrusion into the developing street alignment by the new building was of concern and not supported.</p> <p>The Panel was supportive in principle, of the site-through link however concerns outlined in below sections will need to be addressed to ensure pedestrian safety and functionality of the link can be achieved. Further information on the operation and security within this area would need to be carefully considered in relation to the varying requirements of the residential and retail uses.</p> <p>While the cross site link has been amended since the last Panel meeting, it is not well resolved. Significant issues such as security, pedestrian safety, open space amenity, landscape, access to light, integration with built form above, etc. severely constrain both the new link and adjacent retail space from achieving an acceptable level of amenity, let alone the kind of amenity described by the Applicants.</p> <p>A more informed response to the Context and the Panel's prior comments could :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - relocate the retail frontage to John Street - provide one two way vehicular access point only from Church Avenue - relocate loading and waste management to basement - completely separate pedestrian and vehicular movement - make the cross site link as public, amenable, open to the sky, and active as possible - redesign the built form above podium level to significantly increase light and ventilation to the cross site link <p>While some minor modifications have been undertaken since the last panel meeting, the proposal is much the same as previous iterations.</p> <p>Rather than relocating loading and waste to basement – as suggested – and having vehicular entry from one side only, the cross site link continues to facilitate vehicular movement right throughout the site with loading facilities at grade. Hence, an acceptable level of urban design quality, amenity, safety and pedestrian comfort has not been achieved. The severe constraints and vehicular dominance of the space was confirmed to the Panel by the fly through presented at the meeting.</p> <p>As advised previously, the Panel is especially concerned that lobbies are located at a considerable distance from the street, requiring all residents at day and night to traverse this space. This is a major issue for the entire proposal.</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>Despite two different Panels' recommendations, the existing brick building still protrudes into Church Street. The panel does not agree with the Heritage Architect's assertions that this is a good outcome for the evolving street context – for reasons previously tabled.</p>
<p>Built Form and Scale</p> <p>Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Good design also achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type, articulation and the manipulation of building elements.</p> <p>Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.</p>	<p><i>The Panel would be supportive of a heritage interpretation of both the building and steel fabrication elements within the new building. The current proposal, to demolish, reconfigure and rebuild much of the factory over a new basement structure with a tower above diminishes the integrity and justification to retain the building in the current street alignment.</i></p> <p>The Panel agrees that the partial retention of the existing brick frontage and creation of a new steel framed space - with basements levels under and towers above – is lacking in integrity and “justification to retain” as proposed. It is therefore not supported.</p> <p>Although a Heritage Architect has added his support for the proposal, the Panel does not support the retention of the brick façade for the reasons stated above.</p> <p><i>The Panel supports in principle the use of glass and steel but would prefer that there was a more consistent design expression across the whole of development</i></p> <p>The Panel agrees that a more consistent approach to composition and expression is required. Perhaps due to their excessive length and awkward alignment with the existing brick frontage, the proposed residential towers fail to meet the podium gracefully. Residential towers above should be redesigned as more compact forms, elevated off the podium and arranged to reduce excessive circulation and building length and to increase light and air to the cross site link.</p> <p>At ground level, it would be better for a single material – such as brick - would enhance the expression, scale and materiality of the former building right throughout the podium and cross site link.</p> <p>The proposal's expression and the meeting of towers to podium is largely unchanged.</p> <p><i>The concept of a providore use within the "retained" industrial component is supported. The providore space should be further explored to demonstrate the impacts associated with the tower above and services requirement for tenants within this space.</i></p> <p>The Panel believes that the arrangement of residential towers is liable to adversely impact on future retail tenants, mainly by compromising the amenity of the cross site link. With constrained light and air, the link is liable to be noisy and heavily impacted by vehicular traffic and loading. It does not appear to be sufficiently contiguous with the public domain to attract pedestrians, is not continuously activated along its length and is closed in the evening to provide safe passage to residential lobbies.</p> <p>The proposed link, its urban design quality and amenity (both retail and residential) and its impacts on retail potential is unchanged.</p> <p><i>This tenancy space also needs to clearly outline the supporting</i></p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p><i>services and amenities typical of a retail use and ensure the design has adaptable and flexible uses so that it is not solely designed on the basis of a providore or single tenant usage.</i></p> <p>With new allowances for back of house facilities and loading facilities retained at ground floor level, the retail space is irregularly shaped, very deep and facing into a marginalized link (see above). Therefore, it is difficult to envisage how this space could be successfully subdivided into autonomous high quality retail tenancies.</p> <p>The proposed retail space, its depth and access to amenable outdoor space is unchanged.</p> <p><i>The Panel was in principle supportive of the site-through link, however does not support the site-through link in the current form or height and notes that, in its current form, it does not provide clear visual continuity. Concerns were also raised in relation to the John Street end, the exposure of the link to car parking and arrangement of services that dominate this space.</i></p> <p>Although it has been amended since the last Design Review Panel meeting, the Panel still believes that the cross link does not provide sufficient visual and physical continuity between Church Avenue and John Street to ensure that an amenable and vibrant public pedestrian space will result. While the Panel support the proposed 6m. width, all cars and loading must be completely removed, activation, light and air significantly increased and the public nature of the link more clearly expressed.</p> <p>The Panel believes that John Street is a more appropriate frontage for the major retail facility, with services and a single access point for vehicles and loading relocated to Church Avenue.</p> <p>Rather than relocating loading and waste to basement and having vehicular entry from one side only, the cross site link continues to facilitate vehicular movement right throughout the site with loading facilities at grade. Hence, its urban design quality, amenity, safety and pedestrian comfort – remains a significant concern.</p> <p><i>Provision of active uses to the majority of the length of the link will be critical to its success and safety. The Panel supports the activation of the link by the future tenancy in the current warehouse location but is concerned about the lack of activation along the rest of the link.</i></p> <p>The Panel believes that relocating all vehicles and loading to basement levels, redesigning built form above the link so it is more to the sky, allowing more light and air into the space and retaining its 6m clear width, will increase its contiguity with both streets.</p> <p>With increased public character and a rationalized retail layout, a more continuous activation of the link could be provided, with greater flexibility for large and smaller tenancies along its length.</p> <p>Loading and waste are still at grade and the cross site link continues to facilitate vehicular movement right throughout the site. Activation</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>along the length of the link has not been attempted. This is not supported.</p> <p><i>The Panel considers the low level of definition and presence given to both lobby entries provides poor internal amenity, usability and interface at the ground floor level. Similarly, consideration for visitor arrival, drop off and connection to the Lobby entries needs resolution.</i></p> <p>The Panel agrees that the proposed lobby locations greatly constrain their respective amenity, street address and security. However, both lobbies would be greatly improved with a more public and activated cross site link with all vehicles removed. To increase the street presence of each lobby, the Panel recommends that residential towers above are redesigned as more compact forms with lobbies located closer to each street frontage. This would allow more direct residential access including drop off, from adjacent public streets.</p> <p>Lobbies remain in the same locations, which is not supported. While alternative plan options were flagged, there has been limited investigation of alternative tower forms.</p> <p><i>The arrangement of planter beds to an undercroft with no natural light or rainfall, in addition to irrigated beds is not supported as an appropriate sustainable built form outcome.</i></p> <p>Apart from significantly increasing visual access to the sky and removing cars and loading from the cross site link, the Panel agree that any proposed planter beds should be open to the sky.</p> <p>Larger voids have been provided above planters. However, this has marginal impacts on overall amenity and urban design quality of the cross site link.</p> <p><i>The dive structures for access to car parking should be at 90 degrees to the link through site or offset completely.</i></p> <p>As stated above, all vehicles should be removed from the cross site link and a single access point for basement level vehicles and loading should be relocated to Church Avenue.</p> <p>The cross site link continues to facilitate vehicular movement right throughout the site. While this may resolve vehicular movement and servicing, it severely impacts on the capacity of the link to function as a publicly accessible pedestrian thoroughfare.</p> <p><i>Relocating the podium level courtyard between the buildings so that it is at ground level and part of the link would result in a much stronger design solution and internal 'public domain' experience as well as allowing the warehouse to be appreciated from the rear and potentially providing the opportunity for deep soil to be accommodated to allow for large scale canopy trees.</i></p> <p>While having a rear focus to open space may be beneficial to the retail space, it may introduce further complications in terms of</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>management, privacy, control of noise and other impacts to residents at upper levels. More importantly, the provision of open space will depend on how successfully the redesign of the proposal can successfully address all the issues outlined in this report. Hence, the location and character of the proposal's open space – at ground or podium level - will need to be well integrated with :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an activated and public cross site link, amendable and flexible retail space and high quality safe and visible residential entries at ground level; - more compact residential towers above allowing light and air to lower levels; and/ - a compliant provision of amenable residential communal open space at upper levels. <p>Communal open space and tower forms are largely the same as originally proposed.</p> <p><i>The current podium level courtyard does not support meaningful communal open space, is poorly positioned for solar access and largely functions as a thoroughfare. The penetrations looking into the loading dock and bin storage areas are not supported.</i></p> <p>While the courtyard has been modified since the last Design Review Panel meeting, it still falls well short of what is required for a residential population of this size, in terms of use, outdoor amenity and landscape quality. It is heavily overshadowed and limited in spatial definition. Rather than remove apartments at this level for communal uses, circulation meanders around dwellings, creating excessively long and indirect paths that will most likely create adverse privacy impacts.</p> <p>On reflection, it may be better that the amount of soft landscape provided at this level is greatly increased in bulk and scale to create more substantial visual barrier between the tower forms. Alternatively, the podium could be removed altogether, upper level communal terraces greatly increased and public open space provided at ground level (see notes above).</p> <p>Communal open space is largely the same as originally proposed.</p> <p><i>The John Street wing should align with the built form at 18A John Street and 12 John Street</i></p> <p><i>The Church Street building should be extended south to better align with the middle building at 19-21 Church Avenue and should build upon rather than ignore the existing indent in 27 Church Street</i></p> <p><i>The layout of the towers present a number of design issues in relation to SEPP 65:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>open breezeway attached to light wells would be counted as GFA</i> - <i>open breezeway adjacent to the window of bedrooms onto lightwell also creates issues of amenity and acoustic privacy</i>

Design Principle	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>habitable rooms are only to have secondary windows onto lightwells rather than relying for primary outlook, light and ventilation</i> - <i>deeply indented slots that are deeper than they are wide will not function successfully for cross ventilation and also create issues of acoustic privacy</i> - <i>snorkel bedrooms are not supported</i> - <i>solar access to living room and balcony is questionable</i> <p>While there have been some modifications to the residential towers, the overall form and layouts proposed are largely unchanged.</p> <p>Hence, there are numerous amenity and compliance issues that remain :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - excessive length of both buildings adversely impacts on ground floor level and its capacity to gain solar access and natural ventilation - excessive “open” circulation on each level increases visual bulk and should be counted as GFA - given its expansive area, the “open” circulation on each level will create practical maintenance issues and will most likely not be cleaned on a regular basis - the layout of each building necessitates very deep and narrow light wells which are liable to be dark, noisy and lead to privacy issues between circulation and habitable rooms - as light wells cannot be the primary source of light and air to bedrooms (see ADG 4A-2), a significant number of the proposed units are non-compliant - the facing of the majority of units to the east impacts on their internal amenity, outlook, building separation compliance and visual and acoustic privacy - elongation of both buildings pushes their lifts further into the site, resulting in residential access issues at ground level <p>The tower forms – their length, their excessive open circulation, their potential maintenance issues, light wells, ADG compliance, outlook constraints and access issues - are largely the same as originally proposed.</p> <p><i>The proposal is deficient in provision of communal open space and the opportunity should be explored to utilise the rooftops for this purpose. Winter gardens appear to be proposed to all balconies facing John Street and would count as GFA.</i></p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site is highly constrained by existing high scale built form to the west with existing light wells facing the site’s western boundary. It is also acknowledged that achieving compliant mid-winter solar access is very difficult.</p> <p>However, with so many significant urban design, amenity and compliance issues raised over two DRP meetings, the Panel</p>

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>cannot agree with the architect that the strategy proposed “is the only way” to meet the Proposal’s objectives. The Panel strongly recommends that the surrounding sites are reassessed and physically modeled, not only to understand the context better and examine alternative massing strategies but also to provide a stronger basis on which to provide a comprehensive design strategy for the site.</p> <p>A better massing alternative for the residential towers would more directly relate to podium and ground levels – allowing light and openness to the new cross site link - while achieving amenable apartments at a similar yield with compliant solar access and natural ventilation. Lifting and stepping of built form may allow for communal terraces at different levels while enhancing use potential and outdoor amenity.</p> <p>Rather than elongating the tower forms and facing apartments to the eastern boundary, it may be better to consider multiple forms joined by wide clearly defined open breezeways. This could control impacts on side boundaries and eliminate light wells, while meeting the ADG’s solar access requirements. Ideally, a combination of orthogonally organized compact forms – with different alignments and heights - could respond to the existing adjacent light wells, without simply mirroring the adjacent buildings’ length and orientation.</p> <p>Apart from three simple diagrams flagged at the meeting, there is no evidence of further investigation of how new built form can complement and respond to adjacent built form. Hence, the tower forms’ excessive length and open circulation, potential maintenance issues, light wells, ADG compliance issues, outlook constraints and residential access issues at grade are largely the same as noted by the previous Panel.</p>
<p>Density</p> <p>Good design achieves a high level of amenity for residents and each apartment, resulting in a density appropriate to the site and its context.</p> <p>Appropriate densities are consistent with the area’s existing or projected population. Appropriate densities can be sustained by existing or proposed infrastructure, public transport, access to jobs, community facilities and the environment.</p>	<p>The Panel notes that the permissible FSR at 3.2:1 is exceeded and that exceedance of the FSR is a consistent design outcome in the immediate Mascot area. The FSR of the proposed development is 3.72:1.</p> <p>In consideration of the clearly demonstrated constraints on the site, extent of enclosed but open circulation proposed and numerous amenity and urban design issues yet to be addressed, the Panel does not support any excess on the permissible FSR of 3.2 : 1.</p> <p>The Panel does not support density in excess on the permissible FSR of 3.2 : 1 – especially in view of the many unresolved issues in the proposal, almost all of them exacerbated by increased density.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p>Good design combines positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.</p> <p>Good sustainable design includes use of natural cross ventilation and sunlight for the amenity and livability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling</p>	<p>The Panel was not made aware of sustainability initiatives and notes that there are further opportunities for exploring initiatives in the design above and beyond those required by BASIX, such as solar energy generation that could support all communal lighting, rainwater harvesting for irrigation, deep soil areas within the subject site for ground water penetration, large scale canopy trees and inclusion of productive communal garden spaces.</p> <p>The use and reuse of recycled materials within the proposal is supported and would support the reinterpretation of existing</p>

Design Principle	Comments
<p>reducing reliance on technology and operation costs. Other elements include recycling and reuse of materials and waste, use of sustainable materials and deep soil zones for groundwater recharge and vegetation.</p>	<p>unique materials including the existing signage within the new built form.</p> <p>Sustainability was not discussed at the recent DRP meeting. However, the Panel believes all the comments made by the previously panel demand a clear and robust response.</p> <p>No additional sustainability measures were discussed at the most recent meeting.</p>
<p>Landscape</p> <p>Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in attractive developments with good amenity. A positive image and contextual fit of well-designed developments is achieved by contributing to the landscape character of the streetscape and neighbourhood.</p> <p>Good landscape design enhances the development's environmental performance by retaining positive natural features which contribute to the local context, co-ordinating water and soil management, solar access, micro-climate, tree canopy, habitat values and preserving green networks.</p> <p>Good landscape design optimises usability, privacy and opportunities for social interaction, equitable access, respect for neighbours' amenity and provides for practical establishment and long term management.</p>	<p>The Panel notes that no landscape plan was provided at the meeting and requests that a detailed landscape plan by a qualified landscape architect be provided for assessment. Subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposal is deficient in the provision of deep soil and the Panel considered that the design proposal can be improved given the excess of car parking spaces which could enable deep soil zones within a revised design layout and the potential for ground level planting areas. • The current podium level landscape as the only communal space is not supported on the basis that it is shaded, acts as a thoroughfare and provides little passive or active recreation space and therefore is not considered to provide appropriate communal open space. <p>The Panel considered a better design outcome to be the provision of rooftop communal opens spaces, in place of private spaces with a variety of uses, treatments and landscape embellishments.</p> <p>At ground level, landscape treatment in place of the podium level would enable a better design response, interface to the pedestrian site through link, enable the potential for deep soil zones within the site and provide for the planting of large scale canopy trees.</p> • The landscape to the ground floor level indicating planter beds to the undercroft and green walls is not supported in the locations shown due to lack of natural light and access to water and a concern that they will not survive. The documentation indicated green walls to the adjoining property and this is not supported. A trellis and climber system would be preferred over a green wall system as a long term design solution in conjunction with a variety of layered landscaping. • The documentation is ambiguous in relation to the retention or removal of an existing tree (<i>Cupanopsis sp.</i>) to Church Avenue. The Panel would be supportive of the retention of this established tree. <p>The Panel agrees with the former panel that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deep soil requirements should be addressed - podium communal open space is inadequate - roof top communal terraces may better serve residents

Design Principle	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - planters within undercroft spaces should be removed - green walls to adjoining properties are not possible and/ - the retention of existing street trees is favoured - open space amenity along the cross site link is very poor <p>As noted above however, there are significant built form and amenity issues that impact on the streetscape, ground floor and podium levels of the proposal. It is therefore recommended that substantial changes are made to the built form to address these concerns; these changes would be expected to radically change the proposed landscape.</p> <p>Besides substantially improving the open space and visual amenity of the streetscape and cross site link, these changes should influence the design quality of the podium landscape; it may be that a revised layout may more concisely address whether the space between the towers is better proposed as public space at ground level or communal space at level one. See notes above in Built Form.</p> <p>With the review of Built Form, the Panel encourage the architect to also rethink the open space structure of the entire scheme. In such a congested location, the provision of light, air, openness to sky, evocative plantings and high quality open spaces cannot be overstated in terms of communal gathering, retail success and ecology.</p> <p>The built form and resultant open space structure is largely the same as originally proposed.</p>
<p>Amenity</p> <p>Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive living environments and resident well-being.</p> <p>Good amenity combines appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.</p>	<p>The Panel noted the following amenity concerns, in addition to comments made in Built Form and Scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor internal to external relationship, wayfinding ability and arrangement of residential Lift Lobbies and entrances • The arrangement of services on the ground floor should be further explored, noting the opportunity for some of these services to be located within basement areas that currently have an excess in required parking • The Pedestrian Link on the ground floor does not provide for a high level of amenity as per the notes above • Vehicular flows and arrangement through the site provide for a poor relationship with other site uses and should address concerns as outlined above. Additional improvements should consider the interface between pedestrians and vehicular movements to the residential lobby nearest Church Avenue, Accessible visitor parking drop off and arrival location should be provided and the relationship between service vehicles, pedestrian and warehouse uses further explored to ensure a high level of amenity within the ground floor level • The current arrangement of apartment floorplates and their relationship with adjoining sites provides for a series

Design Principle	Comments
	<p>of poor amenity outcomes. The Panel does not support the current arrangement noting the comments made in Built Form and Scale above.</p> <p>As stated above, all vehicles should be removed from the cross site link and a single access point for basement level vehicles and loading should be relocated to Church Avenue.</p> <p>Rather than relocating loading and waste to basement and having vehicular entry from one side only, the cross site link continues to facilitate vehicular movement right throughout the site with loading facilities at grade. Hence, its urban design quality, amenity, safety and pedestrian comfort – remains a significant concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The current arrangement of apartment floorplates and their relationship with adjoining sites provides for a series of poor amenity outcomes. The Panel does not support the current arrangement noting the comments made in Built Form and Scale above</i> <p>As stated above, the Panel recommends that residential towers are redesigned as more compact forms with greatly reduced lobby and circulation spaces and all light wells removed.</p> <p>The tower forms – their length, their excessive open circulation, their potential maintenance issues, light wells, ADG compliance, outlook constraints and access issues - are largely the same as originally proposed.</p>
<p>Safety</p> <p>Good design optimises safety and security within the development and the public domain. It provides for quality public and private spaces that are clearly defined and fit for the intended purpose. Opportunities to maximise passive surveillance of public and communal areas promote safety.</p> <p>A positive relationship between public and private spaces is achieved through clearly defined secure access points and well lit and visible areas that are easily maintained and appropriate to the location and purpose.</p>	<p>The Panels primary concerns relate to the ground floor. The arrangement provides for spaces of concealment and poor visual surveillance as well as areas of conflict between vehicular and pedestrian uses. The Panel is supportive of the concept of a site-through link and the positive relationship this can create for the subject site and broader community, subject to a revised design.</p> <p>See notes above about essential strategies that are required to improve the amenity of the pedestrian link, including removal of cars, increased light and openness to sky, increased contiguity with adjacent public domain, continuous activation, etc. The Panel believes that many of the failings at ground floor level are the result of poor massing at the upper tower levels; redesigned built form layouts will facilitate improvements to the ground floor level amenity.</p> <p>The cross site link and all its urban design and amenity issues, remain the same in the current proposal.</p>
<p>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</p> <p>Good design achieves a mix of apartment sizes, providing housing choice for different demographics, living needs and household budgets.</p> <p>Well-designed apartment developments respond to social context by providing housing and</p>	<p>The Panel was generally supportive of the apartment sizes and mixes however did not support the current proposed communal open space. A communal open space, beyond provision of appropriate solar access should provide a range of flexible spaces to encourage and support opportunities for communal interaction suggesting zoned spaces for passive and active recreation. The rooftop spaces (subject to compliance with development controls) would be a more appropriate location.</p> <p>The Panel believes that with so apartments oriented to the</p>

Design Principle	Comments
<p>facilities to suit the existing and future social mix.</p> <p>Good design involves practical and flexible features, including different types of communal spaces for a broad range of people and providing opportunities for social interaction among residents.</p>	<p>eastern boundary, their internal amenity, outlook, separation compliance and privacy are compromised.</p> <p>The Panel is also concerned that excessive circulation space introduces management issues at each level, with likely adverse impacts on the visual and physical amenity and safety of lobbies and circulation spaces throughout the building.</p> <p>As excessive circulation creates an over sized built form - impacting adversely on lower levels especially - the towers are also liable to constrain social interaction at ground levels.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that residential towers are completely redesigned as described above.</p> <p>The many issues previously raised and identified above remain.</p>
<p>Aesthetics</p> <p>Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the internal layout and structure. Good design uses a variety of materials, colours and textures.</p> <p>The visual appearance of a well-designed apartment development responds to the existing or future local context, particularly desirable elements and repetitions of the streetscape.</p>	<p>The Panel was supportive of the design ethos and intent to interpret the historical use and materials into a new design concept for the site. The Panel is seeking a more consistent design expression across the whole of development including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retention of the existing façade is not supported, an interpretation of this into a new façade would be a more appropriate design outcome • The use and expression of steel within the façade is encouraged to be further explored and expressed both in form and colour • The juxtaposition of square and curved forms, in the current iteration, is not supported • The current arrangement, expression and wayfinding to residential lobby entries should be further explored. <p>The Panel concurs with the above comments.</p> <p>The Panel still concurs with the above comments.</p>

Design Excellence – Clause 6.14(4) of RLEP 2011	
<p>In considering whether the development exhibits design excellence, the consent authority must have regard to the following matters:</p>	
<p>(a) whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved,</p>	<p>(a) The Panel is seeking more consistent design expression across the whole of development but is supportive of the concept of heritage interpretation within the material and architectural expression of the proposal.</p> <p>(a) For the reasons stated above, the proposal does not achieve a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location. The Panel recommends that the proposal be redesigned as described above.</p> <p>(a) Unchanged</p>

<p>(b) whether the form, arrangement and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,</p>	<p>(b) The partial retention of the factory building and its intrusion into the developing street alignment of new buildings was of concern and not supported. The Panel does not support the intrusion or retention of the existing warehouse into the public domain.</p> <p>(b) No – the form, arrangement and external appearance require substantial change if the proposal is to improve the quality and amenity of the public domain</p> <p>(b) Unchanged</p>
<p>(c) whether the development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,</p>	<p>(c) A view analysis of the potential impacts of the upper storeys should accompany the submission.</p> <p>The view corridor along Church Avenue is impacted by the intrusion and retention of the existing warehouse and is not supported.</p> <p>(c) While the Panel does not support the current massing and arrangement of built forms within the site, it is an infill site with a substantial height limit – not a view corridor.</p> <p>(c) Unchanged</p>
<p>(d) the requirements of any development control plan made by the Council and as in force at the commencement of this clause,</p>	<p>(d) The Panel has considered relevant DCPs when commenting on the design.</p> <p>(d) There needs to be a much more detailed explanation of how the proposal is achieving the principles of ecologically sustainable design – within an amenable built form.</p> <p>(d) Unchanged</p>
<p>(e) how the development addresses the following matters:</p> <p>(i) the suitability of the land for development,</p> <p>(ii) existing and proposed uses and use mix,</p> <p>(iii) heritage issues and streetscape constraints,</p> <p>(iv) the relationship of the development with other development (existing or proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form,</p> <p>(v) bulk, massing and modulation of buildings,</p> <p>(vi) street frontage heights,</p> <p>(vii) environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and</p>	<p>(e)</p> <p>(i) The suitability of the land has been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>(ii) The proposal does not clearly address the ground floor retail uses and mix and does not outline how the residential tower above impacts on the proposed space.</p> <p>(iii) The heritage issues and streetscape constraints have been satisfactorily addressed subject to achieving a consistent street wall frontage and consistent setback in keeping with the adjoining properties</p> <p>(iv) The relationship of the development with other development is unsatisfactory, subject to addressing the comments made in relation to Built Form and Scale and Amenity sections of this report</p> <p>(v) The design should be amended so that the bulk, massing and modulation of the building better responds to the adjoining sites</p> <p>(vi) The street frontage heights have been satisfactorily addressed subject to the repositioning of the Church Street Frontage to be consistent with the adjoining site to West</p> <p>(vii) The applicant should provide further consideration to</p>

<p>reflectivity,</p> <p>(viii) the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development,</p> <p>(ix) pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements,</p> <p>(x) the impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain,</p> <p>(xi) achieving appropriate interfaces at ground level between the building and the public domain,</p> <p>(xii) excellence and integration of landscape design.</p>	<p>environmental impacts both internally and externally</p> <p>(viii) The design should achieve a greater level of sustainable development than it does currently, with at least the addition of PV panels and rainwater capture and reuse, and potentially the use of rooftop productive gardens</p> <p>(ix) The proposal does not provide a positive relationship and layout to pedestrian and vehicular circulation and interfaces and should be revised subject to the comments made above</p> <p>(x) The Public domain treatment is to reflect the changes made to the built form and should be in harmony with the surrounding public domain. Retention of the existing tree to Church Avenue is to be clarified within the documentation and further explored</p> <p>(xi) The interfaces of the building and the public domain appear to be able to be achieved, subject to a revised proposal as per comments above.</p> <p>(xii) The Landscape Design, particularly in relation to the internal courtyard, site through link and exploration and use of rooftop communal open spaces needs to be further explored. No Landscape plan was provided to enable further assessment at this stage</p> <p>(e) Largely unchanged. It does not appear that the Proponent is willing to or able to agree with the Panel's comments.</p>
---	---

RECOMMENDATION

- The design cannot be supported in its present form and should be amended as outlined above for reconsideration by the Panel.

RECOMMENDATION – DESIGN EXCELLENCE

- The Panel considers that the proposal cannot be amended to achieve Design Excellence in accordance with *Clause 6.16(4) of BBLP 2013*.