

## Attachment 6 – Design Review Panel Comments

Design quality principals	DRP Comments	Applicant Comments	Council Assessment Officer Comments
<b>Context and Neighbourhood Character</b>	<p>The site is located one block east of the Warilla Town Centre and has a major frontage to George Street, which intersects with Warilla's main street. Three blocks west of Warilla Beach, the context is characterised by low scale residential precincts.</p> <p>To the north of the site is King Mickey Park and to its east is a riparian corridor associated with Bensons Creek; an existing low scale medium density development to the south and detached residential dwellings are located to the west. The site is 2.2 Ha, zoned medium density residential, has a maximum density of 0.7:1 and a maximum height of 9m. With close proximity to the town centre and the ocean, the site is ideally located for seniors housing.</p> <p>The subject site is currently occupied by low scale seniors housing, operating on site since 1967, and owned and managed by Warrigal Care, a not-for-profit seniors provider. The applicant advised the Panel that the current proposal is in response to local demand and is required to upgrade tired facilities struggling with compliance and acceptable amenity issues. The site is</p>	Not comment provided.	Noted.

	<p>challenged by minimal flood levels and acid sulphate soils, which largely restrict excavation.</p> <p>The applicant and the architect know the site very well and have provided an informative site and context analysis as part of their documentation package.</p>		
<b>Built Form and Scale</b>	<p>The architect explained, using a number of diagrams, that the built form layout was generated by a number of site and planning factors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Permeability, pedestrian connections and a publicly accessible open space were high priorities for the client</li> <li>- buildable area is largely restricted by adjacent properties and the Riparian zone</li> <li>- an ADG requirement to achieve 3hrs solar access necessitates built form generally to be oriented east west</li> <li>- flood levels raise ground levels, thereby resulting in raised built form which breaches the height plane</li> <li>- a resultant open space network is informed by anticipated pedestrian movement and intends to connect the corner, the central open space, and the riparian corridor</li> <li>- the location of the club is intended to mark an existing streetscape, currently activated by a popular opportunity shop</li> </ul> <p>Although the master plan's built form layout is supported in principle, the Panel has a number of concerns that were each discussed at the meeting. Of primary concern were the urban</p>	<p>The number of on-site car parking spaces has been reduced to comply with the SEPP (Housing) 2021. This was a reduction of 46 spaces.</p> <p>The majority of parking is now parallel to the main driveway.</p> <p>Buildings A has been redesigned so that carparking for Building A occurs below ground.</p> <p>Warrigal has an open door policy in all of the villages and this development will be no exception. The children's playground at the intersection of George Street and Arcadia Street has been deleted.</p> <p>The layout of the central space has been relocated as suggested by the panel by redesigning of the layouts and locations of Building B and C. The central open space connects better to the community hub and provides clearer pedestrian connections to the public street frontages.</p> <p>Buildings B and C have been reorientated east/west to provide the opportunity to realign the park centrally with the community hub and reduce the extent of driveway on the site.</p>	<p>During the assessment process amendments to the built form were submitted which incorporated a number of suggestions put forward by the DRP. These design amendments included a basement under Building A and deletion of at grade parking visible to the residents and the re-location of car parking spaces to within the building envelope.</p> <p>As suggested by the DRP, Building A has been modified to align with the Arcadia Street property boundary.</p> <p>The positioning of the common open space and internal road network has been modified to a more streamline design that reduces the need for residents to cross internal roads to access the common open space areas.</p> <p>The location and design of the common open space areas has been rationalised and fit-for purpose.</p> <p>The location of the community hall has been moved further south and is connected with the larger common open space area.</p>

	<p>design quality, pedestrian amenity, and safety of the thoroughfares within the development.</p> <p>It would appear that the high number of cars proposed and the apparent restrictions on excavation, have led to a poor outcome. While some parking layouts do work and could even be increased in capacity – such as the parking area along the southern boundary – other areas feature 90-degree parking, double loaded layouts along building frontages, and extensive hard stand, making the open space look more like a car park than an amenable, attractive, and safe street network.</p> <p>The panel would therefore suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the number of cars proposed on site be greatly reduced (Council have advised that this is indeed possible)</li> <li>- that internal streets generally feature parallel parking with street trees and carefully integrated footpaths</li> <li>- that ninety-degree parking be used only within specific parking areas removed from building or park frontages.</li> <li>- consideration be given to providing basement parking to service building A and B. The eastern façade of building A presents a street level car park to the main pedestrian route between the village and community hub and building B presents a carpark to a desirable northern aspect, which could accommodate amenable garden apartments.</li> </ul>	<p>The top floor of Building A has been articulated to recede behind the building line so that the street form of Building A reads as 2 storey.</p> <p>Ground floor apartments adjacent to Arcadia Street are garden apartments with direct entry from the street or internal public spaces.</p> <p>The accompanying overshadowing diagrams prepared by ADM Architects (Drawings A303 to A307) show the placement of windows and private open space in the adjacent building, the positioning of balconies in Buildings D, E and F and the interface and overshadowing as a result of the proposed buildings.</p>	<p>The positioning of Building B now follows the contours of the Benson Creek thereby reducing the visibility of the third storey from the public domain to an acceptable level.</p> <p>The third storey of Building A, closest to the Arcadia Street property boundary has been deleted and the roof form modified to visually present as a two storey development along Arcadia Street. Whilst portions of the third storey of the development will be visible at specific view points in the public domain, the unique characteristics of the site and proximity to Warilla Town Centre will achieve an appropriate streetscape outcome.</p> <p>The setback of the Level 1 balconies orientated to the southern residential properties have been increased and section plans illustrate that the design is appropriate from a visual privacy context.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the additional cost of the basement construction on this site is acknowledged. However, additional units resulting from basement parking may compensate for this expense.</li></ul> <p>While the Panel supports the site's permeability, it questions the complete openness of the key open space to the public. Not only could this reduce the capacity to provide essential seniors' activities, but it may also result in conflicts with the general public. It may be better instead to increase the public character of the east west driveway (including its pedestrian quality, passive surveillance and view lines to the riparian zone), while slightly reducing the openness of the central open space. Swapping building B with the park may achieve these objectives while providing a better interface with the riparian zone to the north.</p> <p>The Panel understands the club's proposed location is aligned with its intention to mark a major entry and activate its most public interface. However, the club's peripheral location will increase walking distances for senior residents and greatly constrain its interface with the development's key open space. Given the poor pedestrian amenity currently proposed, this may impact on patronage and therefore deprive some senior residents of the amenity they require on a daily basis. However, if the main open space were to be relocated as suggested above, the club could be lengthened, reconfigured and/or repositioned to provide it with an active western edge; this could serve the open space as much as the club, especially in terms of external and internal activities, security and outlook.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Although the ADG does require 3hr mid winter solar access in this type of Local Government Area, the predominant east west orientated built form may not best serve the layout. It may be better to clarify the street and open space network first, then reinforce its spatial structure with built form oriented to suit. While additional north south oriented built form may decrease solar compliance, a well considered urban design argument could be made to justify 2hr compliance, especially if superior amenity and urban design quality can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Although the scale proposed is generally supported, the Panel is concerned that the Arcadia Street built form appears over scaled, especially given the lower scale suburban context opposite. It is the Panel's view that apartments fronting Arcadia Street must read as two storey buildings. If a third level is to be considered on buildings A or F it must be setback from the street and recessive in nature.</p> <p>The Panel would encourage a reallocation of GFA to within the site to reduce visual bulk along this frontage. It is also recommended that the articulation of built form be reassessed generally to better reduce apparent scale. A great example of well considered medium density massing is demonstrated by Angelo Candelapas' Pindari Apartments and nearby Randwick townhouses, which incorporate a modulated base, screened glazing and large eaves.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to aligning building A with the street and providing garden apartments with direct entry from Arcadia Street at ground level. The typology of apartments</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>currently shown will need to be developed to facilitates this concept.</p> <p>At this stage limited information has been provided to the Panel to document the relative level of each building, making it difficult to fully appreciate how each building relates to the ground plane or fully appreciate the perceived height of the building / the extent of the proposed height noncompliance.</p> <p>Buildings D, E and F sit adjacent to the site's southern boundary. To limit the potential for overshadowing, the building from has been stepped down to two storeys and set back 6m from the boundary.</p> <p>This is a reasonable strategy. However further detail information is required to demonstrate if this strategy will successfully mitigate potential loss of solar access to adjoining medium density development. Building RLs must be clearly documented, the perspective shadow diagrams provide must also show the current extent of overshadowing to clearly demonstrate the impact of the proposal.</p> <p>While a setback of 9m has been provided between first floor balconies and the southern boundary, Buildings D, E and F orientate windows to habitable rooms and balconies directly back towards the southern neighbour. The relationship between buildings D, E,F and the southern neighbour must be more clearly documented to ensure that potential privacy issues are avoided. A series of section through the southern boundary should be developed to ensure that an appropriate interface with the neighbour is provided.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<b>Density</b>	<p>The panel supports the density proposed for the development. However, the excessive parking provision, resultant poor pedestrian amenity, and breaches of the height plane, indicate that the density proposed is yet to be demonstrated as an amendable layout, that aligns with the objectives of a compliant scheme.</p> <p>Further detail resolution is required to demonstrate that the proposal does not present as an over development of the site.</p>	No comment provided.	<p>Various components of the proposal have been modified to achieve an appropriate urban design outcome. The visibility of the third storey levels have been reduced through building positioning, deletion of apartments along the Arcadia Street elevation and a hipped roof form. All residential car parking is located within the building footprints and a basement under Building A as recommended by the Panel. The location of visitor car parking along the main internal driveway has been rationalised.</p> <p>Council is satisfied that the current proposal is an appropriate response to the site and its context.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>Notwithstanding the comments above regarding poor pedestrian quality, excessive hard stand and suggested built form/ open space improvements, high ADG solar access and cross ventilation compliance is commendable. It is not clear however, what additional sustainability measures are being proposed.</p> <p>It is noted that cross ventilation compliance will be dependent upon natural ventilation through clerestory windows; these windows must meet the clear opening requirements of the ADG and be conveniently operated by a remote operating system.</p> <p>It is noted that there are extensive further opportunities for including sustainability initiatives in the design above and beyond those required by BASIX, such as solar energy generation, rainwater harvesting, permeable paving, deep soil provision etc</p>		<p>A BASIX Certificate accompanied the development application and achieves the requirements as per the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004</i>. Proposed sustainability measures include solar panels, rainwater harvesting and four (4) EV charging stations. The amount of hardstand area has been significantly reduced.</p> <p>The subject site includes Benson Creek, a riparian corridor and 1<sup>st</sup> order watercourse. A Vegetation Management Plan accompanied the application proposing significant re-vegetation and weed removal which will vastly improve the current vegetation health of the watercourse.</p>

			Conditions of consent to ensure the clerestory windows are operated by a remote operating system has been recommended.
<b>Landscape</b>	<p>The survey appears not to accurately show all existing trees. This should be updated to match current and accurate conditions. None of the existing trees are marked on either the architecture or landscape drawings. As there are many on or near the site that appear worthy of retention, an arborists report should be produced to ascertain their value. All existing trees (both to be retained and removed) should be located on plans, with those worthy of retention integrated into the design.</p> <p>New trees should be integrated into all streets, especially if on-grade parking is to remain. Ideally, they should occur every 3-4 spaces (perpendicular) and every 2 spaces (parallel).</p> <p>It appears the COS does not yet meet ADG requirements, however, given the reduced parking numbers will likely free up more space, this should be possible to rectify in any future iterations. It does appear that some areas of COS are within the flood-affected areas; this should be avoided or designs suitably mitigating any potential risk from flooding events.</p> <p>With reference to the Panel's commentary - offering suggested amendments to site planning - and with reference to the applicant noting the COS should be completely open to the public (not just residents) the Panels feels that the COS layout needs further refinement as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The zone of COS addressing the corner of George and Arcadia Streets could be publicly</li> </ul>	<p>An Arborist Report accompanied the development application which addresses tree retention and removal.</p> <p>The amount of hardstand areas has been significantly reduced.</p>	<p>A planting schedule accompanied the Landscape Plan and Vegetation Management whereby the majority of the plant species proposed are natives. The proposed planting schedule includes a number of the plant species that are proposed for removal.</p> <p>Tree planting has been integrated into the on-grade parallel parking spaces.</p> <p>The size of the COS has been vastly increased and achieves compliance with the ADG requirements.</p> <p>The COS is not located in the 1% AEP flood affected area.</p> <p>The existing op-shop is to be re-built as part of the proposal in addition to a neighbourhood shop that are positioned towards the George Street frontage will high visibility to the public domain to encourage customers.</p> <p>A continuous pedestrian path is proposed along the creek that connects to the main development pedestrian path. Along the creek pedestrian path is a community garden, seating area with pergola.</p> <p>The design and embellishments within the common open spaces of the development have been rationalised to provide for set activities (BBQ, table and</p>



	<p>accessible, designed to complement the function of the communal hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The remainder of the COS should be (or appear substantially) private. If the applicant feels they do not wish to fence the community, the landscape should at a minimum be designed to deter entrance by the general public, paying particular attention to mitigating potential CPTED issues.</li> <li>- The connection between the main and creek-side COS is narrow, constrained by the built form; this could be better connected. A visual connection, such as the one currently proposed, should remain.</li> <li>- The creek-side COS appears to be a dead-end, yet a path also appears to run along the creek edge. It should be explored how these could be connected and how a 'circuit' or more connected path system could be achieved.</li> </ul> <p>In reference to the detailed design in the COS, the following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The levels / entry experience at the George and Arcadia Street entry should be universally accessible with shallow grades that avoid the need for handrails.</li> <li>- The playground may not be required given the scale of the development, however if retained it should be designed with materiality sensitive to the rest of the development (i.e., avoid colour and plastic), should be associated with easy access, and be designed adjacent to a place where carers can supervise.</li> </ul>		<p>chairs, exercise equipment) and flexible spaces (large grass and hardstand areas).</p>
--	--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are several lawns that appear unusable due to their limited dimensions, orientation, or location. Several of these have seats located in them facing paths. Consideration should be given to removing small, unusable lawns, and arranging seats within suitably-programmed areas as opposed to being spread out and lining circulation paths.</li> <li>- The stone pebble edge to the two larger lawns is a nice detail but consideration should be given to how they may obstruct movement where they stretch between spaces.</li> <li>- The larger lawn is the only space conducive to active recreation and would benefit from the central paths being removed or realigned to maximise the available space</li> </ul>		
<b>Amenity</b>	<p>As noted above, the proposed layout creates a number of significant amenity issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive hard stand as a result of surface car parking</li> <li>- some building frontages and main central space significantly impacted by parking layouts</li> <li>- poor and unsafe pedestrian amenity</li> <li>- safe and amenable site permeability depends on clear sightlines, enhanced passive surveillance, and high-quality landscaped streetscape</li> <li>- it being unclear whether the club provided will be able to accommodate anticipated seniors living active and passive uses in its current configuration; nor how it relates to the main open space. Whilst the strategy to allow the</li> </ul>	<p>Pedestrian access is provided from the Arcadia St and George St intersection through landscaped space into the development as shown in the Pedestrian Connections diagram on the Design Program Plan (Drawing A-005) prepared by ADM Architects. This provides direct access to the community hub and ensures the community hub acts as a central gathering point.</p>	<p>All residential car parking has been positioned within the building footprint. The majority of visitor car parking spaces are located on-grade along the main internal road or within Building A basement.</p> <p>The configuration of the community hall, neighbourhood shop and op-shop has been modified so the op-shop has frontage to George Street and the community hall is closer to the residential buildings. The community hall is adjacent to the residential communal BBQ area.</p> <p>The separation of the buildings achieve compliance with the ADG. The setbacks of the balconies to the southern property boundaries have been increased with sections adequately illustrating that a</p>

	<p>community facility to provide an interface with the broader community is commendable, the club must also provide a social gathering space that fosters a sense of community within the village. Safe resident specific spaces must also be provided. The extent of facilities provided within the facility must be clearly documented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- visual bulk to Arcadia Street appears excessive</li> <li>- 9.5m of separation has been provided between buildings B and C this is less than the minimum 12m required by part 3F of the ADG (habitable room / balcony to habitable room / balcony). Consideration must be given to the window configuration building B to limit potential privacy issues and ensure that the objectives of the ADG are addressed.</li> <li>- Building B contains 22 units but provides only 15 parking spaces. It is unclear how this building will provide safe and convenient parking to all its residents. The applicant is encouraged to explore basement parking for this building.</li> </ul>		<p>reasonable level of visual privacy will be achieved.</p> <p>A Plan of Management accompanied the development application which provides details as to the activities to be undertaken at the community hall.</p> <p>All buildings have enough car parking spaces to allocate a minimum of one car parking space per unit.</p>
<b>Safety</b>	<p>See notes above regarding the requirement of permeable large sites to better integrate clear sightlines, enhanced passive surveillance and high-quality landscaped streetscape so as to maintain safety and security – especially at night.</p> <p>With its excessive hard surface and parking, the current layout creates numerous opportunities for vehicular accidents; on a Seniors site, this is not acceptable.</p>	No comment provided.	<p>The configuration of the development including pedestrian paths have been rationalised. Pedestrian paths provide clear lines of sights with passive surveillance opportunities.</p> <p>All common open space areas have passive surveillance opportunities from upper level balconies.</p> <p>The internal road layout has been minimised through the re-location of car</p>

	The COS design, with regards to some being in close proximity flood prone areas should be resolved.		<p>parking within the building envelopes and parallel on-grade visitor parking. Three designated pedestrian crossings are proposed that are sufficiently separated from the car parking entries to minimise vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.</p> <p>The main common open space areas are not located in the 1% AEP flood prone areas. The community garden and seating area to the east near the creek are flood prone, however as the size of these areas are small in comparison to the other common open space areas this is considered acceptable.</p>
<b>Diversity and Social Interaction</b>	See notes above regarding the central open space, the regulation of public access and the alignment between the club and the central open space.	No comment provided.	<p>The proposed development provides a mixture of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments.</p> <p>Multiple common open spaces are provided on ground level and on the rooftop of Building B and C. The embellishments and fixtures within the common open spaces provide flexibility of its future uses.</p> <p>The location of the community hall is adjacent to the main common open space area and is not an unreasonable distance from the buildings.</p>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	While use of light-coloured face brick is very promising – the expression of the buildings tends to emphasise a language more typical of urban development, rather than a coastal environment such as this. It also reinforces a three-storey height, which may appear excessive in this	No comment provided.	<p>The colour palette is similar to other Warrigal Care developments within the LGA. The contrasting dark colours of the community hall/op-shop draw attention to the building from the public domain.</p>

	<p>context – especially as the proposal exceeds height requirements.</p> <p>In this context, it may be better to explore two-storey massing (plus parapet), a third level setback behind a landscaped terrace, and large projecting eaves to create shade and solar protection.</p> <p>With screening to balconies and windows, a breezy open character could be developed, which is softer, more driven by sustainability, and arguably more contextually responsive.</p>		<p>The design of the balconies has been refined and positioned to further the articulation of the building.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>			
	<p>The Panel supports the proposal in principle but have a number of significant amenity and urban design concerns.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the proposed built form layout and open space and street network be amended to address the above comments.</p> <p>Once an amended proposal has been achieved, it should be returned to the Panel for discussion.</p>	<p>No comment provided.</p>	<p>Council is satisfied that the proposal has adequately addressed the concerns raised by the DRP and does not require the application to be returned to the Panel for discussion.</p>