

## Attachment 4 – Applicant and Council Response to DRP Meeting Minutes

Table 5.1 details the summary of the meeting minutes of the Shellharbour Design Review Advisory Panel of the first revision of the proposal and how the applicant has responded to these comments through design changes.

<b>Table 5.1</b>		
<b>DRP Comment</b>	<b>Applicants Response</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<i>The proposed stepped masonry frame, street aligned retail glazing and discrete minor awnings appear heavy handed and quite out of place. It is therefore recommended that the formerly proposed expression is reinstated along the northern boundary, with internal spaces at ground and first levels consistently setback to create a defined recessed volume.</i>	<p>The Addison street façade has been revised back to the original design concept with a more refined and less bulky, detailed, verandah language typical of the streetscape.</p> <p>The street façade provides a double storey verandah with the upper storey recessed. The incorporation of the steel post and beam and recycled brick for the lower two storeys and a change in material to light weight cladding above further reinforces the two storey element in keeping with the desired character for the street.</p>	The original two storey verandah design has been re-instated to the northern building façade whilst maintaining the modified building setbacks.
<i>The east elevation will be largely visible from the public domain and the context of the heritage item. However its composition suggests a typical party wall with little alignment with the typical expression of the streetscape. This is a poor outcome that cannot be supported. It would be better to return the verandah height datum to the east, continuing this datum the length of the northern volume and using a material that complements the materiality and expression of the verandah.</i>	<p>The building has been setback on the North Eastern corner so that the two storey verandah element wraps around the eastern façade creating a ‘corner’ building approach.</p> <p>- The verandah on Addison Street has been setback so that its completely within the boundary so that the heritage item is visible from the public domain.</p> <p>The retail on ground floor has also been positioned so that there’s an open space adjoining the heritage item which further enhances the visibility of the heritage item.</p> <p>Bricks have been incorporated to the lower 2 levels in keeping with what’s been approved for no 31-35 Addison.</p>	<p>The two storey verandah expression wraps on the northern elevation continues to a portion of the eastern elevation. The reclaimed bricks complement the verandah expression on the ground and first floor.</p> <p>The eastern elevation has been revised to include the verndah element and increased setbacks to the north-eastern corner including a balcony thereby reducing the building bulk.</p> <p>The colour palette and external finishes of the entire eastern elevation have been revised. The upper floors lighter colours focuses visual interest onto the lower levels.</p> <p>The revised design achieves an appropriate curtilage and interface with the adjoining heritage item.</p>
<i>The layout fails to provide amenable units at residential levels, with ADG noncompliant light wells to the west, excessively deep south facing balconies and a lack of formal entry to south west units. Noncompliant light wells cannot be used to facilitate cross ventilation leading to ADG noncompliance.</i>	Further refinement of the stairwell has been incorporated to open up the lightwell to the west. By doing so the building reads like two simple structures connected by a bridge.	<p>Suitable amendments have been made and the development as revised is compliant with the ADG cross ventilation requirements.</p> <p>The location of the lift has been modified and screening between common circulation areas so cross ventilation can be achieved.</p>
<i>The Communal Open Space is poorly designed, under sized, and liable to lead to privacy issues to adjacent habitable spaces, including living rooms and bedrooms. It will</i>	Whilst the Communal Open Space is under the ADG requirement, the space has been further refined to provide better amenity for the occupants. Bench seating, under	The proposal provides 13.75% (119m <sup>2</sup> ) site area as communal open space. Whilst this does not achieve the 25% (216.22m <sup>2</sup> ) requirement of the ADG, the area is acceptable given the

<b>Table 5.1</b>		
<b>DRP Comment</b>	<b>Applicants Response</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<p><i>therefore not encourage or optimise social interaction.</i></p> <p><i>It appears that the COS will not comply with minimum solar access requirements.</i></p>	<p>covered seating, BBQ area have been incorporated.</p> <p>Larger planters have been incorporated in the COS to allow for larger canopy trees.</p> <p>Private balconies are oversized greater than the ADG requirement.</p>	<p>number of units, balcony sizes, proximity of the site to the beach (350m), public park (400m) and swimming pools (550m).</p> <p>Conditions of consent have been recommended requiring all embellishments/facilities shown on the Landscape Plan to be installed and all furniture fixed in position.</p> <p>Shadow diagrams have been submitted demonstrating compliance with the solar access requirements of the ADG.</p> <p>Conditions of consent are recommended requiring acoustic mitigation measures to be incorporated to Units 1.03 and 1.02 that adjoin the communal open space area.</p>
<p><i>The open gallery access creates numerous privacy issues with adjacent bedrooms and living spaces.</i></p>	<p>Privacy screens have been carefully considered to eliminate any privacy issues between gallery and units</p> <p>Further refinement of the stairwell has been incorporated to open up the lightwell to the west.</p>	<p>The configuration of the common circulation areas and the location of sensitive areas (bedrooms and living area openings) have been modified to increase residential amenity. Privacy screens have been proposed where required.</p>
<p><i>Entry porch to car parking does not achieve its visual aims or create an amenable streetscape interface</i></p>	<p>The southern façade is well articulated through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Balconies and living spaces face the southern boundary for passive surveillance.</li> <li>- The southern façade incorporates screening for privacy.</li> <li>- The southern façade is further enhanced with the incorporation of deep soil planting.</li> </ul>	<p>Suitable amendments have been made.</p>