

Bayside Design Review Panel

REPORT OF THE BAYSIDE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 12 December 2019 at Bayside Council

[Panel members: Brian Zulaikha, Stephen Collier, Brendan Randles and Matthew Taylor]

ITEM 1

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of Panel Assessment: | 12 December 2019 |
| Applicant: | Iglu Pty Ltd/ Mecone NSW Pty Ltd |
| Architect: | Bates Smart |
| Property Address: | 13B Church Avenue and 6-8 John Street Mascot |
| Description: | Demolition of existing structures and construction of a twelve (12) storey building comprising of four hundred and thirty-five (435) bedroom student accommodation and associated landscaping |
| No. of Buildings: | 1 |
| No. of Storeys: | 12 |
| No. of Units: | 435 |
| Consent Authority Responsible: | Bayside Council |
| Application No.: | DA-2019/385 |
| Declaration of Conflict of Interest: | Nil |

The Panel inspected the site, reviewed the submitted documentation and met with representatives of the applicant including Guy Lake (Director, Bate Smart), Adam Brown (Devt Director, Iglu), Camilla Firman (Town Planner, Mecone), Joshua Mulford (Architect, Bates Smart), Patrick Nash (Council's Senior Development Assessment Planner) and Marta Gonzalez-Valdes (Council's Coordinator Development Assessment).

Comments in red italics were minutes of the previous Design Review Panel meeting held on 1 August 2019 relating to PDA-2019/27.

| 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><i>The neighborhood is undergoing a significant transformation. New buildings are generally 7 to 10 storey and built at or close to the street edge. Most are residential flat buildings.</i></p> <p><i>Ground levels are either residential or commercial. Negative characteristics to be avoided and mitigated are: predominance of electrical substations and 'blind' edges where screening for ground level residential are poorly resolved such as hedges and walls.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal broadly has the characteristics that should make it capable of a very positive character response to the context. This should be developed as the scheme moves forward.</i></p> <p><i>The scheme should make definite and positive moves toward making the rear lane a high-quality urban environment.</i></p> <p>The Panel considers that the applicant's design team has undertaken a comprehensive and well-considered assessment of the surrounding urban context, including the difficulties associated with the change in levels between the rear and the front of the property as well as existing and proposed development on adjacent sites.</p> <p>The Panel notes that the applicant has taken on board the suggestions and comments from the previous meeting regarding the rear lane. The Panel commends the design approach and the through site link.</p> <p>It was suggested that the applicant consider differentiating the ground-floor façade on the side laneway and John Street (West and South elevations respectively) with a different treatment (either through a change of colour in the reveals of the windows or set-back of glass). This would help to reinforce the urban legibility and role of the through-site link and the connection between John Street and the side lane. Note: This is just a suggestion for the architects to consider. It is not a requirement. The Panel is confident to leave this to the architects' discretion.</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 presentation of the scheme to John Street is similar width and height to other nearby buildings.</i></p> <p><i>The presentation of the scheme toward the west is significantly longer and taller than other nearby buildings. The impact of this is somewhat mitigated by the rebated joining elements between the buildings, however the overall effect (height combined with length) may be over scaled for the mid-block position of this mass.</i></p> <p>The Panel commends the way the architects have responded to the site with three distinct building volumes and the manner in which these volumes relate to the surrounding character of the street and its buildings. There is a clear built form strategy and this has been developed into a convincing and compelling architectural outcome. The Panel particularly commends the articulation of the roofscape and the sequence of (external and internal) spaces that are proposed over the ground and lower ground floors.</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</p> | <p><i>The proposal is for a high-density development. The context is considered appropriate for high-density given the range of transport and services nearby.</i></p> <p><i>The panel considers that a corollary of the appropriateness of high density development should be that each development adds to the high-quality urban environment, this particularly relates to the fine-grain and activated public domain network.</i></p> |

| Design Principle | Comments |
|---|---|
| <p>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 considers that the density is appropriate for the site.</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 liveability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling 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><i>The Panel notes that there are further opportunities for including sustainability initiatives in the design above and beyond those required by BASIX, such as solar energy generation, rainwater harvesting, etc. and that these should be clearly outlined in future documentation</i></p> <p>The Panel commends the sustainability initiatives that are proposed.</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><i>We anticipate that the landscape will be further developed as the scheme progresses. Noting that no detailed landscape plan was provided</i></p> <p><i>Lower Ground Plan: The 'landscaped area' in the lane may be difficult to manage since its 'ownership' is ambiguous. A deeper landscape treatment within the site would enable large scale canopy trees and meaningful deep soil to be achieved on both side of the central COS</i></p> <p><i>Upper Ground Plan: The "Landscaped Planter box" on the SW of the site seems to sub-optimally placed or utilised since it is a long narrow space with no windows facing and may necessitate a fence to John Street for security.</i></p> <p>The Panel believes that there is a high quality of landscape being proposed for the site.</p> <p>The Panel expressed some reservations about the community gardens that are proposed in the laneway but after discussion with the applicant, they accept that this is predominantly an issue of maintenance and "ownership". The Applicant accepts that they will need to manage the gardens and perhaps aspire surrounding residents will start to use them as an integrated community asset. The Applicant noted that the level of community involvement in these gardens is something that they will have to monitor.</p> <p>Note was made about the importance of the legibility and clear site lines associated with the laneway and that while the community gardens are a commendable concept, that they be located so to enhance the visual clarity and comprehension of the laneway's primary purpose as a through site link, thereby reinforcing CPTED guidelines.</p> |
| <p>Amenity</p> <p>Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive</p> | <p><i>The proposal broadly appears to offer good amenity for the residents and the surround. However, the next iteration of the scheme should address the matters raised elsewhere made elsewhere in this report.</i></p> |

| Design Principle | Comments |
|---|---|
| <p>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><i>The Panel considers amenity could be improved through the provision of a pedestrianised site through link. Amenity within the architectural plans and landscape plans should be outlined to COS</i></p> <p><i>The Panel is also concerned about accessibility within narrow internalized hallways that appear to inhibit wheelchair access and the ability to maneuver within corridors. Accessibility within all communal spaces is required.</i></p> <p>The issues raised at the previous meeting appear to have been properly addressed.</p> <p>There is some concern however about the extent of over-shadowing on the neighbouring residential building to the east. The Applicants indicate that they had addressed this and are confident that the impacts are negligible – shadows on the adjoining building should be prepared and provided to Council to verify this. The Panel is happy to endorse the scheme as long as shadow impacts can meet the Council's requirements.</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><i>The proposal broadly appears to provide for good passive surveillance and activation on John Street.</i></p> <p><i>The Panel is concerned about the presence of a 'blind alley' north of the site. This preliminary concept does not satisfactorily present how the area will be resolved.</i></p> <p>The Panel is happy that these items have been addressed in the developed scheme.</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 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><i>The surrounding context is dominated by 1, 2 and 3 bedroom residential apartments. The proposal is for a student accommodation development. As such, the proposal is for a type of accommodation which will bring diversity to Botany.</i></p> <p><i>The scheme has a strong emphasis on communal and shared facilities, both at the level of the whole project and at the level of grouped rooms. This presents a model of resource-sharing that is unusual in the precinct and will help to foster social interaction within the project.</i></p> <p><i>Improvements should be made the design of the laneway and its interface in in order to improve access, passive surveillance and to create a location for incidental and informal social interaction.</i></p> <p>The Panel is happy that these items have been addressed in the developed scheme.</p> |
| <p>Aesthetics</p> <p>Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the</p> | <p><i>It is too early in the design development process to assess aesthetics.</i></p> <p><i>The Panel commends the developed scheme and believes that it will provide a positive addition to the area.</i></p> |

| Design Principle | Comments |
|--|----------|
| <p>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> | |

| Design Excellence – Clause 6.16(4) of BBLEP 2013 | |
|--|--|
| In considering whether the development exhibits design excellence, the consent authority must have regard to the following matters: | |
| (a) whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved, | (a) The Panel is satisfied that the design exhibits a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing. |
| (b) whether the form, arrangement and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain, | (b) The Panel is satisfied that the form, arrangement and external appearance of the building will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain. |
| (c) whether the development detrimentally impacts on view corridors, | (c) The Panel is satisfied that the development will NOT detrimentally impact view corridors. |
| (d) the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development., | (d) The Panel is satisfied that the principles of ecologically sustainable development will be achieved. |

RECOMMENDATION

- The Panel supports the application subject to the changes described above. The application satisfies the design quality principles contained in SEPP 65.

RECOMMENDATION – DESIGN EXCELLENCE

- The Panel supports the application. The application achieves Design Excellence in accordance with *Clause 6.16(4) of the BBLEP 2013*.