

**Report and Recommendations of the
Design Review Panel, Sutherland Shire Council
Thursday, 30 May 2024**

Panel Members: John Dimopoulos (Chairperson), Kathy Bryla, Alex McRobert,
Matthew Taylor (Landscape)

Council Staff: Slavco Bujaroski (Team Leader)

Applicant Team: Andrew Janeke, Daniel Tonnet, Susan Chen – Grimshaw
Architects

DA No: DA24/0086

Project Address: 9-13 Shackel Road, Bangor

Proposal: Construction of a health services facility (hospital) and
associated landscaping works

PREAMBLE

The site was visited by the Panel members prior to the meeting.

Although this type of development is not required to comply with SEPP 65 the proposal has been considered in relation to the Design Quality Principles of the SEPP as being well recognised minimum standards for the attainment of good design.

Issues considered relevant to the proposal are noted below.

COMMENTS

The Panel supports well-considered design and acknowledges that care has been taken in the preparation of the development proposal. However, good site response and architectural design proceeds from a thorough and sensitive understanding of the site context, and the site analysis provided as a basis for this design proposal is inadequate in some key areas. To progress this application, the Panel recommends further consideration/clarification on the issues outlined below:

Context / neighbourhood character / built form and scale

1. Primarily, the main issues seem to be centred around the lack of acknowledgement of multiple stormwater easements that affect the site. These 'statutory easements' are not shown on any of the drawings and greatly affect the form making of the project as they are not generally to be built over. For reference, a previous DA [not this applicant] acknowledged and responded to these stormwater easements. The panel feels that to respond to these will greatly affect the planning of the current application and will require a significant redesign. If there was any other kind of thinking in dealing with, and responding to these easements, that the panel should have considered, it was not present in any reports, nor were any of the representatives at the meeting aware of it.
2. In terms of fit and character, the building is not within the expected typology anticipated by councils LEP and DCP controls and therefore subject to scrutiny on design outcomes as to not add to impacts otherwise anticipated in those controls. The zoning anticipates residential typology and the industrial style aesthetic in the current design presents as harsh and overbearing, particularly in such a green setting/outlook. Due to the Bushfire requirements outlined in the applicants report, the land is on designated bushfire prone land and will consequently need to mitigate the bushfire hazards with emergency vehicle access requirements right around the footprint of the building. This is significant because any kind of tree screening that may have helped in this regard of bulk and scale impacts to neighbouring buildings [backyards] cannot be implemented. On this NW boundary, the panel suggested reducing the wall length to the pods to increase the wall to atrium recess ratio, increasing the recesses to allow for planting within these areas, if permissible.
3. Furthermore, it was asked [in light of bushfire constraints] if the main building pods [especially for pods between grids A to J], could be shifted as much as possible towards the SE boundary, cantilevering over the driveway ramp and gaining a larger separation between the proposal and the neighbours to the north. This would obviously mean the moving of the basement parking entrance closer to the battle axe handle with a steeper and single length ramp arrangement [**NB** see notes on fire stair exits below].

4. Returning to the issue of desired future character and expected typology, the applicant should be aware of Council's DCP housing requirements on such sites to have a 60/40 ratio of distribution of bulk on the site, with the front 60% being at 8.5m in height and the rear 40% being at 5.4m, or essentially a double level towards the street and a single level beyond, to mitigate impact to the rear yards of other surrounding properties. Arguments need to be presented and strengthened in this regard.
5. Therefore, notwithstanding the excellent design analysis and form-making presented to the panel, given the BAL 29 rating on this site, and its associated environmental and infrastructure constraints, along with the obvious amenity impact issues to the adjoining dwellings to the north, the panel feels the scheme in its current design is too large and impactful in its context and needs to review its design strategy.
6. Light spill from the likely 24hr use of this facility, to the neighbouring residential properties, was seen as a concern, especially from the recesses, and measures need to be put in place to eliminate this.

Amenity + safety

7. It is unclear to the panel how the fire stairs function, it is assumed that they are meant to exit to the external ramp, where the ramps in some instances do not comply with A.S. pedestrian exit requirements. The sketchup model is also unclear in this regard as it has residue building components floating over the lower ramp area.

Sustainability + environmental concerns

8. Although sustainable strategies are encouraged and welcomed by the panel, the applicant showing a full suite of well-considered and comprehensive sustainability measures lacking though was the commitment to battery storage and EV charging stations throughout the carparking.

Landscape

9. The landscape proposal consists of extensive native plantings across the site. It is not clear whether the species have been selected for bushfire zone plantings or the selection represents typical native species of the area. Further, APZs and other bushfire mitigation measures need to be clearly outlined on the landscape plan. The limited landscape interface area between the proposed building and the adjacent neighbours to the south of the site does not provide sufficient space for an appropriate landscape buffer for this critical area. Further, the overland requirement for much of the area limits the landscape response and combined with bushfire requirements results in an outcome that is not satisfactory in relation to amenity and response to the building mass and scale.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Panel is broadly supportive of the proposal, however there are a few fundamentally inappropriate design strategies that have been proposed, as noted above, and an alternative proposal must be developed that takes more account of the detailed contextual characteristics of the site if support is to be granted by the panel.

John Dimopoulos
Chair