

## 31 – 35 Addison Street

### Revisions to proposed mixed use development.

2<sup>nd</sup> December 2021

#### Proposal:

Five (5- 6) storey mixed use development consisting of one (1) level of basement, three (3) ground floor retail tenancies, 17 apartments, roof top communal open space, retention and refurbishment of existing heritage item.

The proposal was previously reviewed by the Design Review Panel on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020. This report outlines how the revised proposal addresses issues previously raised by the Panel. Previous Panel comments are highlighted in red.

Design quality principals	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	<p>The proposal is located on the main high street (Addison Street) of Shellharbour village centre. A single storey heritage listed building is located in the north-western corner of the site, fronting Addison Street.</p> <p>A laneway, linking the high street to a public carpark (located to the south of the site), adjoins the site's eastern boundary. A single storey heritage listed building is located on the opposite side of the lane.</p> <p>The unique and sensitive context of this site demands a site-specific design approach. A building form that simply followed DCP and ADG built form controls would not result in a positive outcome on this site. An appropriate built form must be developed in response to a detailed analysis of the site and its immediate context.</p> <p>No change to these issues</p>
Built Form and Scale	<p><u>Addison Street</u></p> <p>The current proposal is for a single storey building that is an interpretation of a historic building that once occupied the site. In principle, this is a valid strategy that could contribute to the scale and character of the high street. However, the current proposal relates poorly to the proposed 6 storey building fronting the lane. The roof form of the single storey buildings collides with the proposed six storey building, providing no clear expression of these two very different building forms. If this strategy is to be successful, the single storey building must be developed to present the full extent of the hipped roof towards the laneway and a lightweight linking element (that sits below the eaves of the single storey building) be provided between single storey building and the larger building. Furthermore, the 4-storey wall immediately behind the single storey is not a satisfactory transition and should be stepped.</p> <p>Alternatively, a more contemporary building form could be developed to address Addison Street. The form must relate to the scale and grain of the street. This may potentially be two storey building (with a recessive upper level) and an awning to provide</p>

---

continuous cover to the street. The larger building form fronting the lane must be set back a minimum of 7.5m from Addison Street.

If executed well, this strategy will clearly define the expression of heritage structures within the street whilst still respecting the scale and character of the street.

The applicant has opted to develop a more contemporary building form to address Addison Street. The Addison Street façade has been expressed as three elements in a reasonable response to the grain of the street. However, the building bulk presented to the street is excessive. The balustrade to the level 2 unit's projects to the street frontage, sitting approximately 1m above the pediment of the heritage structure. The level 2 units are setback approximately 5m from street façade of the heritage building, the perspective study provided (A8000-D) demonstrate that the upper-level building bulk will be very prominent when viewed from the street.

- A visual impact study (series of perspectives taken from the street) should be developed to test the prominence of the upper levels of the building when viewed from Addison Street. The upper levels must be recessive and not dominant the neighbouring heritage structures. As previously recommended levels 2 and 3 should be setback a minimum of 7.5m from the street. However, this setback must be tested in the context of the street and an increased setback provided if necessary to provide an appropriate relationship with the street's heritage context.
- It is recommended that the floor to floor height in commercial units be reduced to at least 3.6m, these are small scale retail units that can function adequately with lesser ceiling heights. If a servicing strategy is developed that locates bulkier services towards the rear of the unit serviceable ceiling heights can still be achieved with a significantly reduced floor to floor height. Given the sensitivity of the heritage context of this development a reduced ceiling height within retail units is warranted.
- The colonnade provided to Addison Street is poorly proportioned, it lacks sufficient depth to accommodate effective pedestrian circulation. The proportions of the colonnade (height to depth) appear to provide little protection from driven rain fall.

Effective weather cover for pedestrians must be provided, this may be more readily achieved with a street awning.

#### Interface with lane

The laneway provides an active link between the public carpark and the high street. It is recommended that the extent of retail / commercial space be maximised along the edge of the laneway to contribute to a safe and active public space.

---

---

The heritage interpretation panels proposed in this location could still be incorporated into the street façade and / or located within the café courtyard.

The extent of retail addressing the laneway remains unchanged. Consideration should be given to relocating vehicular parking bays within the basement and dedicating more of the laneway frontage to retail. This may be achievable if the yield of the development is reduced.

Interface with public carpark

The ground plane facing the carpark presents entirely as hard surfaces. Consideration should be given to the provision of setbacks and landscape plantings to soften this elevation. (See Landscape.)

Provision has been made to accommodate some soft landscaping within planters facing the carpark.

Interface with western neighbours

The proposal is for a five-storey building with blank walls abutting the south-western boundary. This anticipates that the neighbouring site (39 Addison Street) would connect to the proposed building with a similarly scaled building, to create a continuous street wall addressing the public carpark. It is unclear as to whether this is a desirable / feasible development strategy for the neighbouring site.

It is recommended that a built form study of the neighbouring sites to the west be undertaken to inform an appropriate built form response on the subject site.

The future contextual study must consider the appropriate placement of built form on the neighbouring sites to realise the intent of council's controls (FSR, height, setbacks, character) and ADG objectives.

It is anticipated that this study is likely to identify that a modest setback from the site's western boundary, that allows a greater level of articulation (including windows to improve amenity), would provide a more appropriate interface with the western boundary.

A built form study has been provided outlining a built form strategy for the neighbouring site to the west and the remainder of the town centre block. The study lacks sufficient detail to determine if ADG objectives or permissible FSR can be realised on the neighbouring site.

The study also shows the western neighbour abutting the subject site with a 2-storey high blank wall adjacent to the heritage structure. The blank two storey wall will be visible from the public domain, it should be set back from the site boundary to allow articulation to the exposed façade.

Building height

The proposal does not comply with council's building height control of 15m.

---

---

The proposal presents a 5 / 6 storey building towards the eastern lane way. The scale of the proposal overwhelms the neighbouring heritage building. The proposed building should be developed as a four-storey building fronting the lane. The upper level of the building should be set back and recessive in nature, with the intent of presenting a three-storey building to the lane.

Consideration may be given to maintaining the level 4 units in the western portion of the site. As the existing ground level is higher in this location, the extent of the height non-compliance is significantly less (particularly if the communal roof garden were relocated to level 4). However, a view analysis (providing views from the high street) must be undertaken to determine if the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable.

The proposal presents a five-storey building to the lane, the scale of the proposal is excessive within the heritage context. As previously recommended:

- The proposal should present as a maximum 3 storey building to the lane with a recessive 4<sup>th</sup> storey.
- The upper level (fifth story / level 4) should be removed from the eastern portion of building (so it is not visible from the Adison Street, when approaching from the east). Consideration may be given to allowing the upper level in the western portion of the site. However, a view analysis (providing views from the high street) must be undertaken to determine if the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable.

A convincing urban design rational has not been provided to support the proposed height non-compliance.

#### Communal open space

It is recommended that the communal open space be relocated to the eastern portion of level 4. North and east facing balustrades should be setback from the perimeter of the building so as not to contribute to the perceived bulk of the building as viewed from street level. This strategy will contribute to reducing the perceived height of the building.

The roof top terrace has been removed and a small roof garden (107sqm) provided on the western side of level 4. The residential entry (47sqm) has also been nominated as communal open space. The ADG requires the area of communal open space to be 25% of the site area, this equates to 368sqm on this site. The current proposal fails to meet ADG requirements for communal open space, by 214sqm. The space provided lacks amenity, there is no provision for communal activity within the entrance. It is therefore questionable that this space can be considered COS in its current configuration. It is also recommended that the primary area of open space is provided with an accessible toilet. The western roof garden is also setback only 3m from its neighbour, this will create potential privacy issues with future developments on the neighbouring site.

As previously recommended, the communal open space should be relocated to the eastern portion of level 4. North and east facing balustrades should be setback from the perimeter of the

---

	<p>building so as not to contribute to the perceived bulk of the building as viewed from street level.</p> <p><u>Residential entry</u>  A drawing was tabled at the meeting, relocating the residential entry further west, to abut the heritage building. This allows a greater extent of the street frontage to be dedicated to retail and will potentially provide a better-quality entry experience. Ideally the grades of the entry should be developed to avoid the need for ramps and stairs to be located between the street entry and lift.</p> <p>The proposed relocation of the substation from the high street to the carpark frontage is also a positive development, documented in the revised drawing. The applicant is encouraged to further refine the strategies outlined in the revised drawing to provide better amenity and a more activated interface with the public domain.</p> <p>A level entry (1:20 grade) has now been provided by relocating the entry adjacent to the heritage building. In general terms this is a positive development. However, further detail development is recommended.</p> <p>The lift now appears to be abutting the heritage building. The direct connection of the single storey heritage structure and the 5 storey high lift shaft is visually jarring. The lift door is also orientated away from the entry, in a concealed dead-end passage. It is recommended that the lift is recessed into the building form (pushed further east) to provide some curtilage to the heritage structure and allow the lift door to be visible when entering the lobby.</p> <p><u>Detail treatment of heritage building</u>  At this stage a very basic level of information has been provided to document proposed developments to the heritage structure. Further detailed information is required to document proposed restoration and alterations of the heritage structure, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The extent of work proposed to existing structure</li> <li>- Junctions between the heritage structure and proposed building form</li> <li>- How the café functions (toilets, kitchen, storage)</li> <li>- How the cafe is serviced</li> </ul> <p>A statement of heritage impact is required, including a heritage assessment of the fabric and significance of the former Allen Residence at 31-33 Addison Street. A Heritage conservation management plan is required for 35 Addison Street, along with a schedule of conservation works.</p> <p>A statement of heritage impact and schedule of conservation works has now been provided, Council's heritage architect is deferred to for a detailed review of these documents.</p>
Density	<p>The current proposal is approximately 280m<sup>2</sup> in excess of the site's maximum permissible FSR and 5m in excess of the site's maximum permissible height. The current proposal presents as an over-development of the site. Further development (as</p>

	<p>outlined above (Built Form) is required reduce the perceived scale of the building.</p> <p>Almost the entire eastern and southern perimeters of the building are wrapped with 3m deep balconies. Though this provides good amenity to the units, it contributes to the perceived bulk of the development. Consideration should be given to rationalizing the extent of balconies to assist in reducing the perceived bulk of the building.</p> <p>The proposal still presents as an over development of the site it remains 270 sqm in excess of the sites permissible FSR.</p> <p>As previously highlighted the perceived bulk of the building form could be significantly reduced by rationalizing the design to incorporate smaller balconies. The deep balconies also appear to be limiting the potential for direct solar access to many of the residential units.</p> <p>Given the significant constraints of this site, it is evident that GFA in excess of the site permissible FSR cannot be achieved whilst providing an appropriate relationship with the site's heritage context.</p>
Sustainability	<p>60% of units are capable of being developed to provide natural cross ventilation to meet the requirements of the ADG.</p> <p>60% of units are capable of being naturally cross ventilated.</p> <p>At this stage insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the number of units that will be provided with 3 hours of solar access between 9am and 3pm, mid-winter. Sun's eye diagrams taken at hourly intervals should be provided with revised documents to demonstrate the extent of solar access. It is acknowledged that, given the specific constraints of this site, it is unlikely that full compliance with ADG solar access requirements will be met. However, it must be demonstrated that every practical measure has been developed to ensure that solar access to each unit has been maximized.</p> <p>Suns eye diagrams have been provided.</p> <p>Drawing A7520D claims 12 of the proposed 17 units receive a minimum of 3 hours solar access (between 9am and 3pm, mid-winter). Units 103, 104, 105, 204, 302, 303 and 401 are claiming ADG compliant solar access. However, the suns eye diagrams provided by the applicant demonstrate that these unit receive less than 3 hours solar access. Only 5 of the proposed 17 units (29%) are ADG compliant.</p> <p>The Panel have acknowledged that full ADG compliance may be difficult to achieve given the constraints of the site. However, the Panel have also stated that:</p>

	<p><i>“it must be demonstrated that every practical measure has been developed to ensure that solar access to each unit has been maximized”.</i></p> <p>It is a concern that units with a north-eastern orientation are failing to provide ADG compliant solar access. This is largely due to the depth of the balcony and the configuration of the apartment. A design response that rationalized the size of balconies and locates living room window closer to the perimeter of the building would improve solar access and reduce the footprint / perceived bulk of the building.</p> <p>Opportunities to harvest rainwater for use in maintaining any plantings established on the building or the site should be explored. Other water minimization measures should be considered including the reuse of rainwater for toilet flushing and use in washing machines. The use of solar water heating and photovoltaic cells is also encouraged.</p> <p>The Panel strongly encourages the use of locally indigenous species in landscape plantings as a means to support biodiversity, reduce weed problems and improve resource management. The use of vegetation, particularly tree plantings, to improve environmental outcomes of the development is desirable.</p> <p>The revised proposal now makes the following environmental commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of rainwater tank for rainwater collection</li> <li>- On site capture of rainwater for use in irrigation and maintaining plantings</li> <li>- Provision of photovoltaic cells on roof</li> <li>- Use of environmentally low-impact materials</li> <li>- Use of locally indigenous species in landscape planting</li> </ul>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p>	<p>The Panel considers that a number of concerns and issues in relation to both the public and site’s private domains require further consideration.</p> <p><u>Public Domain</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The substation and pump station should be relocated to enable the entire Addison Street frontage of the development to contribute positively to the high street character. (The applicant advised that this is now proposed.)</li> </ul> <p>The substation has been relocated as recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The residential entry should have a clear, strong and attractive identity.</li> </ul> <p>An improved entry has been provided. However, Further development is recommended (refer to built form and scale).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The need for a setback of the new (single-storey) element to Addison Street should be explored. It may be</li> </ul>

	<p>acceptable to have a nil setback with a covered walkway over the public footpath (in accordance with council's requirements).</p> <p>refer to built form and scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Street tree plantings should be discussed with council.</li> </ul> <p>No change to this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refer to comments above (Built form) in relation to the public laneway (pathway). Another option may be to open the corner and make it the entrance to the residential units. Landscaping could be provided in such circumstances.</li> <li>- As outlined above, the interface with the public carpark needs refinement. Its physical and environmental character will have implications for its social character. The development should incorporate setbacks that can support tree plantings that will screen the built form and enliven the space.</li> </ul> <p>Some soft landscaping has been provided. However, the extent of landscaping provided would not support tree planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 'alfresco dining and landscape' of the proposed café in part of the heritage building is a valuable addition to the public domain. The Panel recommends that locally indigenous (coastal) species be used in the plantings. Given the southern location of this space on the site, the need for deciduous trees is questioned; evergreen species would provide year-round amenity. The location of the hydraulic/sprinkler boosters in this space is disappointing and options for its relocation should be explored. (Its permissible orientation needs to be confirmed.)</li> </ul> <p>Boosters have been relocated with the entry. Details should be provided to show how these serviced are concealed within this very prominent location.</p> <p><u>Private Communal Open Space (COS)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refer to Built form for relocation recommendation of recreational COS.</li> <li>- Kitchen facilities and a common room should be linked to the COS.</li> <li>- The Panel commends the proposed diversity of activities to be provided in the COS (though the softfall mounds and balls are questionable for a residential development).</li> <li>- The planting plan requires further development. The use of individual planters rather than generously dimensioned planter boxes is highly problematic. Frequent irrigation will be required, by hand where pots are free standing in open spaces.</li> <li>- The Panel recommends that perimeter plantings be discontinuous in places to allow access to views.</li> <li>- Locally indigenous (coastal) species would be highly suitable for amenity plantings on this rooftop.</li> </ul>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The final plan may include space at the ground floor to provide curtilage to the heritage item. It will potentially be shaded and enclosed. Careful attention is therefore need to ensure its amenity.</li> </ul> <p>No change to these issue.</p>
<b>Amenity</b>	<p>Further development of the residential entry is recommended, as outlined above (Built Form and Landscape).</p> <p>Unit layouts are generally functional, room dimensions should be provided to demonstrate compliance with ADG requirements.</p> <p>The Panel questions whether one lift for this number of apartments is sufficient.</p> <p>No change to this issue. Units remain generally functional. Room dimensions demonstrating ADG compliance has not been provided.</p>
<b>Safety</b>	<p>Consideration should be given to the detail treatment of the laneway and spaces created between buildings to minimise the potential for antisocial behaviour. Activation and casual surveillance of these spaces should be maximised and best practice CPTED principles adopted.</p> <p>The revised street entry could be made safer by relocating the lift to allow the lift door to be visible when entering from the street (refer to built form and scale)</p> <p>The proximity of the proposed basement to the heritage structure requires further detail consideration. Can the proposed basement be constructed without compromising the integrity of the heritage structure? Construction methodology must be developed to demonstrate how the heritage structure can be protected.</p> <p>No change to this issue</p>
<b>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</b>	<p>The proposal will potentially provide an appropriate housing option for this neighbourhood.</p> <p>No change to this issue</p>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	<p>More consideration should be given to the fact that the proposal is sharing a site with a heritage item; ideally, the heritage building will remain the site's chief focus. To achieve this, the Panel encourages an elegant and refined expression.</p> <p>The revised building form presents excessive bulk to the street and the laneway. Before an appropriate aesthetic can be developed a more contextually appropriate form must be established. It is anticipated that this will have a significant impact on the building aesthetic.</p> <p>Detail sections (1:20 or 1:50) through the building should be provided, to clearly demonstrate the architect's design intent.</p>

	<p>Sections should show balustrade detail / specification, concealment of services, lighting, drainage, soft treatments, details of screens and louvres etc.</p> <p>Sections have been provided, within an accompanying report. The sections should be provided as part of the DA drawing package so that it may be included within the DA determination documents. The sections provided should include a greater level of detail as outlined above.</p> <p>Servicing of the building must be considered at the DA stage of the design process. The location of service risers, car park exhausts, AC condensers, down pipes should be documented.</p> <p>Most servicing elements have been identified within Architectural drawings. The applicant is encouraged to show locations of down pipes. If down pipes are located as an afterthought, they can be very detrimental to the aesthetic quality of the building.</p>
<p><b>Summary / Recommendations</b></p>	<p>The current proposal still presents as an over-development of the site that overwhelms its heritage context. The site's unique and sensitive context demands a site-specific design approach if a positive contribution to Shellharbour village centre is to be achieved.</p> <p>Further consideration of the following issues are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce building mass presented to lane way.</li> <li>- Reduce building mass presented to Addison Street.</li> <li>- Remove level 4 units from eastern portion of the building. Consideration may be given part of the western portion of level being allocated to residential use. However, a view analysis (providing views from the high street) must be undertaken to determine if the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable.</li> <li>- Further refinement of the residential entry</li> <li>- Increase the extent of the active interface with lane</li> <li>- Relocate lift shaft to provide increased curtilage to heritage structure.</li> <li>- Increase extent and amenity of communal open space.</li> <li>- Consider the incorporation of a street awning in place of the colonnade.</li> <li>- Further development is required to improve solar access</li> </ul> <p>It is anticipated that the aesthetic expression of the building will change significantly when developing the building in response to these issues.</p>

Report author: David Jarvis

Architects' registration: 9184