

Appendix B

Development Control Plan 2015 Compliance Tables

Sutherland Shire Development Control Plan 2015			
Chapter 9: R4 Caringbah Medical Precinct			
Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
Amalgamation CI 5	As per DCP amalgamation in groups of 4 lots	Amalgamation of 16 units	No but accepted that 16 lots provides for alternative building forms and acceptable with an appropriate building form
Min. frontage width (if non-compliant with amalgamation plan) CI 5.2.3	26m	Approximately 170m to the east and west and 55m to the south	Yes
Road widening CI 6	Take into account Council's road widening	Space is left but the subdivision plan does not account for dedication to Council in front of the HSF on Taren Point Road	Not satisfactory
Medical floor space ratio CI 7	25% of GFA if proposed height and FSR exceeds the mapping in the LEP (0.55:1 and 9m)	<p>Height and FSR exceeds the LEP mapping. 4716m² in HSF. As the cl 6.21 SSLEP 2015 preconditions are not met, the allowable FSR under SSLEP is 0.55:1 or 5187m². An additional allowable 0.5:1 (4715.5m²) arises under the Housing SEPP if at least 50% is affordable. The proposal includes 18,852m² residential with a total of 23,568m² including the HSF. The DCP requires 25% as HSF (4713m²)</p> <p>Proposal is 25.0% of GFA prior to the Housing SEPP uplift. The additional uplift arises from SEPP Housing and should be applied to residential housing</p>	<p>Yes for GFA requested prior to SEPP Housing GFA uplift.</p> <p>The 25% is a DCP requirement and it is considered that it is unreasonable to require 25% of the SEPP Housing uplifted GFA to be included in the HSF GFA calculation.</p> <p>However the GFA/FSR requested greatly exceeds the controls under SSLEP and Housing SEPP combined, hence whilst the % requirement is met, the FSR control is significantly breached</p>

Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
Medical floor space location	Located on Ground and First Floors only	Located in Levels 1-5 of the Building C	No, however the reasoning set out to encourage a large user in a single space is considered acceptable
Streetscape and Built Form CI 9	<p>Dev't must be designed and sited so that it addresses the street and must have clearly identifiable entries.</p> <p>Pedestrian entries and internal circulation to health services and residential uses should be separate and clearly differentiated.</p>	<p>Sited to have Buildings A & B face the street more than would occur under the amalgamation plans.</p> <p>The pedestrian entries via Taren Point Road and Hinkler Avenue into the COS are clear, however pedestrian entry into the buildings is very obscure.</p> <p>Pedestrian entry to Building A from the central courtyard is near the top of the ramp from Hinkler Avenue but there are no elevations showing how this will be clearly identified. The lobby is small, under the unit above and there is nothing particularly identifying it as an entry. There is another pedestrian entry at the south end of Hinkler Avenue which is also narrow and deeply inset.</p> <p>Building B entry from the COS is via two narrow pathways either side of Unit B2.1.01 which are tucked away (including the eastern one on the diagonal). The western entry has no lobby to indicate a building entry. Entry to Building B from Taren Point Road is clearer on the western side but deeply inset.</p> <p>Entry to HSF is clearly identifiable on the through-link</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No –poor entry identification except for the HSF. Further information required to justify that entries are clear</p>

Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
	<p>Building form must be articulated and avoid large expanses of unbroken wall.</p>	<p>On all sides articulation is mostly provided by the balconies of the units and by entrances via the COS from both Hinkler Avenue and Taren Point Road. Additionally on Hinkler Avenue Building A there are two small slot indents and an inset of two balconies. On Taren Point Road in Building B there is one slot inset and another inset about half way along.</p> <p>Level 7 on Building B facing Taren Point Road is inset with a balcony such that the glazing provides an impression of recession.</p> <p>The Montages also provide some additional articulation via window framing which is not well demonstrated in the elevations – Streetscapes. Further information is required to ensure those finishes and articulation elements would be retained in the final building form.</p> <p>Building form is articulated, however the expanse of the building form is such that the articulation is difficult to discern in the streetscape elevations.</p>	<p>Reasonably articulated provided the detailing in the montages is included within the final plans (subject to their impact on solar access). However the buildings remain very long with insufficient indents to provide discernible articulation. Further detailed information or consent conditions is required to ensure this.</p>
	<p>Facades are to be composed with an appropriate scale, rhythm and proportion.</p> <p>Dev't on street corners should be designed to define and address both street frontages.</p> <p>All parking is to be located in a basement.</p> <p>The finished roof levels of basements are to be located at or near ground level.</p>	<p>Façades are very long and hard to agree that they are in proportion to the desired future character of the area.</p> <p>Dev't addresses Hinkler Ave and Taren Point Road.</p> <p>All parking is within basement.</p> <p>Finished roof level of basement is well below ground level. Eg in the north west corner of building A (Unit A3.1.05) the FFL of Level 1 is RL30.8 but natural ground level at that point is approximately RL33.28</p>	<p>Partial</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>

Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
	<p>Lift overruns and service plants must be integrated with well-designed roof structures.</p> <p>The need for additional building services must be resolved at design stage and integrated with overall design of the dev't.</p>	<p>Residential lift overrun centrally positioned and not visible from the street.</p> <p>Fire booster location is not agreed by Council's engineers. Council's landscaping officer is concerned that the other services within the landscaping are compromising the required substantial setback landscaping</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No. Further detailing on services, including on finishes such as down pipes is required</p>
Street setback CI 10	6m with no articulation zone	1m-6m for Bld A and B. 2m for HSF on Hinkler Avenue. 3m for HSF on Taren Point Road	No
Basement in articulation zone	6m (no articulation permitted)	1-6m for Bld A and B 2-3m for HSF	No
Private courtyards in front setback	Must not compromise potential for large scale indigenous trees to complement the scale of the building	Courtyards extend up to 1m from the boundary inside the setbacks. Combined with retaining walls, paths and services the proposal limits the amount of large scale indigenous trees able to fit onto the site is compromised	No. The design of the development with subterranean dwellings makes satisfaction of this objective more difficult than would be the case with a design which raised the units closer to natural ground level.
Side and Rear setback (building envelope plan) CI 11	<p>Minimum side boundary setback at ground level on the northern boundary is 9m.</p> <p>Minimum side boundary setback at ground level on the southern boundary is 3m</p> <p>Floors above 4 storeys to be setback a further 3m for ADG separation</p>	<p>Note this is based on the amalgamation/building envelope plan.</p> <p>3m provided from HSF to northern boundary – giving 6m separation to existing dwellings on building to the north. No privacy screening provided. Landscaping plan includes no substantive planting on north side of HSF.</p> <p>12m separation between HSF and Bld B at all levels.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Accepted that the setbacks are altered by the amalgamation of 16 lots. HSF north setback is unacceptable and includes no planting or privacy treatments.</p> <p>No between HSF and Bld B at levels 5-7. An additional setback of the HSF at these levels could improve solar access to lower level north facing Bld B units.</p>

Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
Landscape design CI 12	Deep soil setbacks to be: 6m front 3m side and rear	6m provided to some of Bld A & B, other parts are 3m or less. 3m for HSF Taren Point Road 2m for HSF Hinkler Avenue and Nil HSF to north	No
	Include indigenous canopy trees in setback areas with a minimum height of 8m, if possible planted 3m from structures	Five trees are provided in the setbacks, all stated to reach 8m in height. Only one (<i>Banksia integrifolia</i>) is planted within a 6m wide setback with the other four planted in 3m wide setbacks, which are unsuitable given the control for 6m wide front setbacks.	No. There are native trees >8m however there is only one planted within the desired width of setbacks and even it is not proposed more than 3m from the structure. Certainly the objective of the controls (to enhance the indigenous tree canopy) is not met by these plantings.
	Street trees selected from Council's Native Plant Selector	Yes, although greater variety could be conditioned. An unrealistic number of street trees are proposed given the mature height of the proposed trees	Yes. A more appropriate layout and wider range of trees could be conditioned
	Ground floor courtyards must not extend into the 3m landscape strip	21/24 ground floor courtyards extend into the 3m zone from the frontage boundary	No
	Communal open space a minimum of 25% (minimum of 2358m ²). Minimum dimension of 3m	Stated to be 30.1% (2839m ²). That area includes areas <3m in width and other areas which are not capable for use for outdoor recreation such as: entry passages to buildings, setbacks next to the entry path to Taren Point Road and Hinkler Ave, areas around the substations, the WC on the rooftops, the fire exit doorways (Building A), and areas above OSD tanks which are themselves above the proposed ground level around them. COS includes the throughlink with no direct access for the residents. Plans include pathways <3m (approx. 16m ²). Throughlink is 7.5x 63=473m ²	Unclear as calculation is incorrect. Further information required.

Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
Building layout CI 13	Medical component minimum floor to floor height of 4m	4m at ground level 3.6m above	No but considered acceptable as control written with thought that medical centres were on the ground floor only
Solar access: CI 14	NB RFBs are subject to ADG controls	See ADG	No
Visual and acoustic privacy CI 15	NB RFB are subject to ADG controls for visual privacy. Windows of HSF should not overlook residential POS	See ADG South side of HSF overlooks balconies and POS of north facing Bld B. No privacy details to residential building to the north	No No
Adaptable units CI 16.2	20% of 242 units = 48 units	49 units identified.	Yes
Liveable units CI 16.3	10% of 242 units = 24 units	25 provided.	Yes
Safety and security CI 17	Enhance opportunities for natural surveillance. Effective lighting	Ground level units are generally below ground so surveillance would generally be from the level above. Lighting not specified. Pedestrian entries are recessed and difficult to locate	Partial. Street surveillance will be partially achieved. Wayfinding is not clear to pedestrian entries
Car parking CI 18	Residential parking subject to Housing SEPP. Control 18.2.5 states where development is subject to RTA Traffic Generating development, the RTA prevails over the DCP numbers. The HSF is covered in the RTA.	See Housing SEPP analysis	Yes under SEPP Housing for residential. No under the DCP table, but Yes under the RTA numbers if they override the DCP table.
Car Parking Building A	<u>Residential Bld A:</u> 1 x 1br (53 units)= 53 1.5 x 2br (65 units)= 97.5 2 x 3br (5 units)= 10 Total= Min. 160.5 spaces <u>Residential visitor:</u> 1 per 4 units = 31 spaces TOTAL Bld A resi DCP = 192 RTA Rates Bld A 0.6 x 1br (53 units)= 31.8 0.9 x 2br (65 units)= 58.5 1.4 x 3br (5 units)= 7 Total= Min. 97.3 spaces <u>Residential visitor:</u> 1 per 5 units = 25 spaces TOTAL Bld A resi RTA =	<u>Bld A under DCP Table</u> 128 resi + 31 visitors = 159 spaces total provided	<u>Bld A</u> No under DCP table requirement Yes under RTA Requirement Yes under the relevant SEPP Housing non- discretionary development standard s18(2)(g)

Subject	Control	Provided	Compliance
	123		
Car Parking Building B	<u>Residential Bld B DCP Table:</u> 1 x 1br (28 units)= 28 1.5 x 2br (77 units)= 115.5 2 x 3br (14 units)= 28 Total= Min. 171.5 spaces <u>Residential visitor:</u> 1 per 4 units = 30 spaces TOTAL Bld B resi = 202 RTA Rates Bld B 0.6 x 1br (28 units)= 16.8 0.9 x 2br (77 units)= 69.3 1.4 x 3br (14 units)= 19.6 Total= Min. 105.7 spaces <u>Residential visitor:</u> 1 per 5 units = 24 spaces TOTAL Bld B resi RTA = 130	<u>Bld B under DCP Table</u> 133 resi + 30 visitors = 163 spaces total provided	<u>Bld B</u> No under DCP table requirement Yes under RTA Requirement Yes under the relevant SEPP Housing non-discretionary development standard s18(2)(g)
HSF car parking	<u>Health Services Facility DCP Table:</u> 1 per 35m ² GFA (4716m ² total) = 135 spaces Health services facility RTA 4/100m ² GFA = 189	135 medical spaces 135	<u>Health Services Facility</u> Yes under DCP Table No under the relevant RTA
	<u>Car wash bay:</u> DCP: 1 for first 30, then 1/20 dwellings: Bld A: 5 required Bld B: 5 required	<u>Carwash</u> Bld A = 2 Bld B = 1	<u>Car wash</u> – No
	<u>Bikes 1/10 car park spaces:</u> Bld A: 159 spaces = 16 Bld B: 163 spaces = 16 HSF: 135 - 14	<u>Bikes</u> Bld A: 20 Bld B: 20 HSF: 0	<u>Bikes</u> Yes Yes No
	<u>Motor bikes</u> Ch 36 DCP1/25 car spaces in non-residential; HSF provides 135 car spaces so 6 motor cycle spaces required	<u>Motor bikes</u> None	<u>Motorbikes</u> None required for residential. HSF: No
Garbage bins CI 19	Max. 50% of street frontage to enable kerbside collection	N/A – Engineers require collection within the driveway by HRV, max 5% grade	No HRV loading truck loading bay provided in Building B