

MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING

LANE COVE COUNCIL

Thursday 9th September 2021

DEP PANEL MEMBERS:

Peter St Clair (PSC)	Chairperson	Architect	
	Brendan Randles	Panel Member	Urban Designer
Digby Hall	Panel Member	Sustainability consultant	
Aldo Raadik	Panel Member	Architect	

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

Na

COUNCIL STAFF:

Mark Brisby	Executive Manager, Environmental Services
Rajiv Shankar (RS)	Manager Development Assessment
Greg Samardzic	Senior Town Planner
Lara Fusco	Strategic Planner
Angela Panich	Panel Secretary

COUNCIL OBSERVERS:

None

APOLOGIES:

None

ITEM DETAILS:

Property Address: 13-19 Canberra Avenue St Leonards NSW 2065 (Area 5)

Council's Planning Officer: Greg Samardzic

Owner: Hyecorp Property Group

Applicant: Hyecorp Property Group

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, construction of a 15-storey residential flat building comprising approximately 91 apartments, 4-6 storey basement car parking, provision of east-west pedestrian link and associated stairways and landscaping and green spine/communal open space on ground level and other associated landscaping.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

The meeting was an online documentation review by the DEP and council officers. The meeting was not attended by the Applicant.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Panel members had separately indicated that there were no conflicts of interest.

3.0 PRESENTATION

There was no presentation by the Applicant.

4.0 DEP PANEL COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This design review forms part of the St Leonards South pre-DA process. The Panel is engaged by Council to provide independent and impartial advice on the design of development proposals and applications to lift the design quality of projects. The Panel's comments and recommendations are intended to assist Council in their design consideration of an application against SEPP 65 principles and where relevant the requirements of the St Leonards South Landscape Masterplan (the Masterplan) dated October 2020, Lane Cove LEP 2009 and Lane Cove DCP amended 2016. This review also assesses compliance with the LEP design excellence requirements Parts 7.6. The absence of a comment under a particular heading does not imply that particular matter to be satisfactorily addressed, more likely the changes are suggested under other principles to generate a desirable change.

Your attention is drawn to the following;

- SEPP 65, including the 9 Design Quality Principles and the requirements for a Qualified Designer (a Registered Architect) to provide Design Verification Statements throughout the design, documentation and construction phases of the project.
- The Apartment Design Guide, as published by Planning NSW (July 2015), which provides guidance on all the issues addressed below.

Both documents are available from the NSW Department of Planning.

1. To address the Panel's comments, the applicant may need to submit amended plans. Prior to preparing any amended plans or attending additional Panel presentations, the applicant must discuss the Panel's comments and any other matter that may require amendment with Council's assessing Planning Officer.
1. When addressing the Panel's comments by way of amendments, if the applicant does not propose to address all or the bulk of the Panel's comments and wishes to make minor amendments only, then it should be taken that the Panel considers the proposal does not meet the SEPP 65 requirements. In these instances it is unlikely the scheme will be referred back to the Panel for further review.

4.2 Introduction

The Panel thanks the Applicant for their updated reports and designs. These are the SJB Design Response Report dated 9 August 2021 and the Site Image Design Response Report dated 6 August 2021.

4.3 DEP comments and recommendations

4.3.1 East elevation

Additional articulation has been provided to the East elevation tower and podium improving the overall built form and legibility. This is supported by the Panel.

4.3.2 Lift position and cafe

The lift has been relocated to be within the apartment building envelope improving the visual outcome. The resulting circulation at Level 1 has been improved providing more flexible access from the community facility to the communal open space. The Ground level retail space has been extended towards the street improving its visibility. These strategies are supported by the Panel.

The Panel notes however that Level 1 access to the communal open space from the building is required to occur through the lift car (serving as a passageway). A separate dedicated doorway should be considered.

4.3.3 Communal open space and amenity

The Design Report suggests that the Level 1 child play space could form part of the communal open space offering to this building. The Panel does not believe this is a realistic proposition as the design requirements for the child play area and communal open space would be significantly different. In addition there may various security and insurance concerns related to this.

The Design Report also identifies all communal open space across the St Leonards South master plan as being accessible to the residents of Area 5. The Panel does not believe this is the intention of the master plan, where instead access to communal open spaces would be limited to the residents of immediately bounding Areas. Therefore the actual availability of communal open space to this project remains limited.

The Panel continues to be of the view that there is inadequate communal open space provided at the high levels of the building. The communal open space/roof garden provided to Level 12 should be enlarged.

4.3.4 Child care provisions

The Panel understands that Lane Cove Council, the architect and Applicant have been meeting separately to resolve a variety of operator concerns regarding the proposed childcare provisions. Whilst this is beyond the scope of this DRP, additional space could be provided to the childcare area by reducing the apartment numbers to Level 1. The Applicant may also consider re-planning this level to reposition the community facility to the south-west corner fronting the child play area, thereby providing a more flexible arrangement that could be used for both childcare and community purposes. This may have the effect of enlarging the indoor childcare space without needing to increase the GFA or reduce apartment numbers.

4.3.5 Terrace houses

The elevational treatment of the terrace houses has been improved through the introduction of alternative balustrade, thereby improving the proportions of the podium and providing more legible terrace houses. The Panel continues to be of the view that the terrace house living areas at the upper ground level, are unacceptable and do not comply with the ADG amenity standards. These rooms should be re-planned to improve their amenity including their access to direct daylight, solar access and natural ventilation.

4.3.6 West elevation

The elevations provide a more layered design outcome with improved integration between the podium and towers. This approach is generally supported by the Panel. It is assumed that external roller blinds continue to be proposed for purposes of sun shading. This is not supported by the Panel for the reasons outlined at previous reviews.

4.3.7 Solar access and cross ventilation

The Panel recognises the proposed solution to naturally ventilate apartments to the North east corner whilst simultaneously providing visual privacy and supports this general approach.

However the Design Report does not appear to provide clear evidence of 2 hours of solar access being provided to the balconies and interior of living spaces to the required number of east facing apartments. The Panel requests additional detail describing the penetration of sun into these spaces in accordance with Objective 4A-1 and related Design Guidance (Section 4A of the ADG).

4.3.8 Facade architecture

The general approach to the facade design is consistent with the ADG. Concerns regarding the use of roller blinds for solar shading are described elsewhere.

4.3.9 Roof articulation

The articulation of the roof top as seen from the surrounding streets and communal open spaces appears to be unresolved and reliant on roof vegetation overhanging the parapet/roof hob.

The Panel notes that any vegetation at this location may have a limited lifespan given the challenges of maintenance access. The Panel recommends additional design development be completed to provide a visual cap to the building.

The provision of solar panels is commended and supported by the Panel.

4.4 Summary of Panel recommendations

The Panel recommends that the Applicant:

Provide additional access to the Level 1 southern gallery circulation and communal open space by means of a separate doorway that does not depend upon the elevator serving as a passageway.

Provide additional communal open space to Level 12 and demonstrate how this space could be utilised and achieve some solar access.

Re-plan the living/family rooms to the upper ground level of the terrace houses to provide satisfactory amenity consistent with the ADG.

Consider alternative solar-shading techniques with reduced maintenance requirements such as externally mounted fixed sunshade blades, canopies or screens.

Consider alternative floor planning arrangements for the childcare areas at Level 1 that provide dual usage for the community facility and/or reduced apartment numbers and circulation.

5.0 OUTCOME

The Panel has determined the outcome of the DEP review and provides final direction to the Applicant as follows:

- . The Panel recommends that the architectural drawings and schedules be further developed in accordance with the above recommendations and returned to Council for consideration.