

**MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
LANE COVE COUNCIL
Tuesday 1st February 2022**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS

Peter St Clair	Chairperson	Architect
Jason Cuffe	Panel Member	Landscape Architect
Lucinda Varley	Panel Member	Landscape Architect
Aldo Raadik	Panel Member	Architect

APPLICANTS REPRESENTATIVES

None

COUNCIL STAFF

Mark Brisby	Executive Manager, Environmental Services
Rajiv Shankar	Manager Development Assessment
Chris Shortt	Senior Town Planner
Terry Tredrea	Strategic Planner
Christopher Pelcz	Strategic Planner
Angela Panich	Panel Secretary

COUNCIL OBSERVERS

None

APOLOGIES

None

ITEM DETAILS

Property Address: 14-16 Marshall Avenue, 2-10 Berry Rd and 5-9 Holdsworth Av
St Leonards NSW 2065 (Areas 13,14 and 15).

Council's Planning Officer: Chris Shortt

Owner: Holdsworth Land Pty Ltd

Applicant: Holdsworth Land Pty Ltd

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 3 x 11-13 storey residential flat buildings comprising a total of approximately 195 apartments, basement car parking, provision of east-west pedestrian link and associated stairways, landscaping and green spine/communal open space on ground level to 3 lots and other associated landscaping.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

RS and PSC welcomed the Panel and Council staff. The meeting was in the form of a documentation review and the Applicant and Design Team were not in attendance.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3.0 DEP PANEL COMMENTS RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Introduction

The Panel makes the following comments and recommendations in relation to the project. A number of issues raised at the previous DEP meeting have not been fully addressed by the Applicant. While these items have not generally been repeated in this report they remain current and so this report should be read in conjunction with the DRP #1 and # 2 Minutes. All these matters must be addressed in order for the Panel to consider that the development exhibits design excellence.

The following notes are referenced to the numbering in the PTW document titled DEP Response Package December 2021_1596031.

4.3 North-west street corner

The introduction of transparent glass balustrade at Level 1 and vertical white components assist in providing an improved scale to the street and strengthening the corner. However this corner does still not achieve the strength of identity required to address the busy roundabout, nor the gateway significance of this corner to the South St Leonards Precinct.

The North facing elevation at the upper levels is perhaps less successful than previously proposed where a clear podium and upper level to the building had been expressed.

The Panel continues to have concerns over visual privacy to the lower 2 corner apartment private open spaces where the landscape treatment is too subservient to the gateway location. The position of the fence line could be set back to provide a planted buffer zone at the boundary and the height and character of the fence reviewed.

The Panel recommends that the approach to this corner could relate to Area 12 where a sandstone wall has been integrated to formalise the corner. Area 13 and Area 14 should be considered in totality.

4.4 Loading docks

The Panel is not convinced that the loading and associated spaces are adequate for a complex of this size. The Applicant should provide design evidence that this loading allowance is adequate for deliveries (commercial and private), waste collection, service vehicles and maintenance operations. Provide detailed management plans that allow for all contingencies including but not limited to multiple arrivals, over stays, unintended turnarounds and the ability to function adequately whilst servicing 3 buildings.

The Panel recommends that this area be discussed in greater detail with Council's traffic team.

4.4 Landscaped rooftop carpark entry lid

The landscape to the rooftop is acceptable.

The Applicant should justify in detail the suggested AC units on balconies and give particular attention to demonstrating that the visual quality of the building and acoustic impacts of the AC units do not impact the neighbouring apartments.

4.4 Building 14 height compliance

Whilst the LMR sits within the maximum height limit this matter is superseded by the non-compliance in the number of storeys. Council are of the view that the buildings appear as between 11 and 13 storeys, despite the DCP limiting buildings to 10 storeys.

The Panel recommends this matter be discussed with Council.

4.7 Landscape design

The Panel is of the view that the landscape narrative requires immediate resolution as it does not respond to the specifics of the broader context of the Berry Creek bushland corridor. The design has not developed the opportunity for the site to be utilised as a wildlife corridor link from Newlands Park/Holloway Reserve/Smoothie Park/Gore Cove Reserve/Berry Island up and over the ridge through to Gore Hill Cemetery and Oval.

The Panel recommends that the landscape design be developed as a series of cross sectional typologies that would allow for zones of mid storey where sightlines are not of concern. This would allow for greater flexibility in the design approach and ensure a balance of habitat creation, mitigation of CPTED issues and variation in landscape experience.

The plant schedule should be revised at the development application stage to provide greater biodiversity as well as aesthetic interest. The planting is at risk of having a municipal park appearance.

4.8 Amenity issues to ground level apartments

Light and amenity issues are improved with the additional space provided around the level transitions in the communal open space. Consider additional light ingress through hit and miss brickwork (or similar) to the North walls of the lower units as the units are compromised in daylight ingress to the bedrooms.

Visual privacy to the private open space and living rooms is compromised adjacent to the staircases. Consider forms of adjustable screening to allow for privacy control to these apartments.

4.11 Brickwork types and imagery

The revised imagery is acceptable.

4.12.01 Landscape design and Connection with Country

The Panel acknowledge the additional information provided by the Applicant in relation to the 'Connection to Country' approach however note that the main concerns of the Panel have not been addressed. Whilst the landscape narrative is logical the Applicant has further highlighted the importance of Indigenous engagement early on in the process of design with the preliminary Connecting with Country principles developed without involvement from an Indigenous consultant and lacking depth. The Panel strongly advises that the Applicant engage an Indigenous consultant to work collaboratively with the design team to develop the overall approach and design outcome prior to any further detail design being undertaken. The Applicant should also contact the Aboriginal Heritage Office to obtain advice on how to further develop the design with Connection to Country, for the siting of buildings, architectural design, landscape design and stormwater management.

4.12.02 WSUD and landscape connections

The Panel requests that the water strategy be further developed in conjunction with the broader landscape design, Connection to Country and sustainability approach in the development application stage of the project. Critical to the success of this will be coordination with adjacent sites to ensure that design features such as the creek bed and rain garden are carried through.

An ecological consultant should be engaged in future stages of the project to manage displaced wildlife on the existing site when construction commences.

4.12.03 Environmental footprint

The Panel requests that the sustainability strategy be developed prior to the development application stage to a greater level of detail in the future stages of the project to ensure that it is robust and truly integrated into the design. This should include focus on roof heat absorption / emission where roof gardens could be considered to minimise radiant heat. An environmental consultant may be engaged to facilitate this process.

4.12.04 Communal open space and levels

The integration of the Area 12 landscape is supported.

The landscape design should be developed to balance the variety of recreational spaces within the Green Spine with the landscape bush character being proposed. A wider range of demographics such as teenagers should be accommodated in the design after the landscape narrative for Connection to Country is resolved.

4.12.05 Deep soil compliance

The proposal is acceptable.

4.12.06 Existing trees

The trees that have been identified by the arborist as being worthy of retention should inform the siting of buildings as the loss of existing tree cover will have a negative impact on wildlife and also increase radiant heat.

The landscape strategy is negatively impacted by the excessive number of storeys provided particularly to Block 14, where the opportunity exists to situate the outdoor area at a higher/existing level. Trees 9, 15, 16 and 19 could be retained if the lower ground plane alters to provide a compliant number of storeys to Building 14. In addition Tree 9, a palm, could be salvaged and re-located.

4.12.07 Solar access

The sun views provided demonstrate the availability of solar access to the façades however this does not necessarily correspond to the availability of sunlight inside living room and to balconies. Detailed analysis of the sun access to living spaces needs to be provided to all buildings including Block 14 which is well under the requirement. This should consider the effects of self-shading by the articulated façade design.

4.12.08 Sun-shading

The overall sun-shading is not adequate where for example the proposed vertical perforated sunshades to the western facades will provide minimal shading to glass due to their wide spacing.

The Panel recommends that alternative sun-shading strategies be investigated such as adjustable louvres, integrated blinds, reduced glass area and possible planting.

4.12.09 Cross ventilation

Cross ventilation as graphically depicted does not comply with the ADG requirements for effectiveness as for example illustrated in Figure 4B.8.

The Panel recommends that additional windows to bedrooms and kitchens be considered to achieve cross ventilation.

4.12.10 Communal open space and neighbouring properties

The co-ordination of communal open space with adjacent sites has been improved with Area 12 to the east. The addition of the turf terraces with seating walls and edges is considered a positive outcome and better mitigates the level change within the centre of the Green Spine. Further resolution is required with Areas 16 and 17 in conjunction with development of the water strategy and the design principles established to achieve Connection to Country.

Design features such as the open creek bed should carry through to sites to the south of the site and not stop abruptly at the east-west link.

4.12.11 Visual and acoustic privacy

The proposed setbacks of 4.5 and 6.0m between Building 14 and 12 are not considered compliant with the ADG as the proposal is for habitable rooms with windows. Additional details should be provided to demonstrate visual and acoustic privacy will be achieved whilst maintaining natural ventilation to apartments that contribute to the 60% cross ventilated requirement.

4.12.12 Street activation

The general approach to increasing street activation is acceptable. However the garden entrances on Marshall Avenue require further development including demonstration of gates and fences etc.

The visual relationship between the northern end of the green spine and Marshall Avenue requires further detail design to improve the community's perception of a detailed and well-vegetated space.

4.12.13 Street legibility Building 13/15

The proposed entry portal design and materials are foreign to the architecture established throughout this development. Further design development is suggested including clarification of whether the structure is roofed or open.

4.12.14 Indoor communal space and roof gardens

The indoor communal space is not considered adequate for a development of this size. The proposed location is provided with poor internal access and external visibility. The Applicant could consider the potential uses of this space as high value positive amenity for residents of all 3 buildings (eg parties, meetings, clubs, indoor exercise etc.) It is noted that other equal sized developments on the St Leonards South Precinct are providing considerably larger community space for their residents.

4.12.15 Private open space

The expansion of private courtyards into the green spine by 1 m is acceptable, however, more detail design should be provided to indicate how planting is resolved to provide privacy to residents whilst retaining passive surveillance.

4.12.16 Corridor privacy

Issues remain with cross-looking and acoustics into apartments, for example between living rooms in apartments 140501 and 140502. The adjacency of entry doors between apartments such as 140504 and 140505 should also be reviewed.

5.0 OUTCOME

5.1 Direction to Applicant

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

- The Panel does not support the proposed development in its current form. An amended proposal should be prepared, satisfactorily addressing the identified issues.