

Attachment F: Design Review Panel Comments

The below table details the summary of the meeting minutes of the Shellharbour Design Review Advisory Panel meeting (DRP0001/2024) held for the first revision of plans submitted to Council prior to lodgement of the subject application. The table includes comments from the Design Review Panel (DRP), Applicant's response, as well as Council's response.

The amended design is considered to adequately address the Design Review Panel's comments, by way of submission of amended plans or additional information, and also by way of recommended conditions of consent.

DRP Comment	Applicant's Response	Council Response
Context and Neighbourhood Character		
<p>While adjacent heritage and the streetscape's low scale, village character may challenge the prospect of new four storey shop top development, nearby developments (such as at 37-39 Addison Street by the same architect) demonstrate that a sensitive response to adjacent patterns, alignments, predominant features (such as the two storey verandahs – albeit setback in that case) and DCP objectives can result in good scale and character, while achieving yield, amenity and other development requirements. It is therefore surprising that the current proposal departs so radically from the sensitive built form approach so successfully undertaken at 37-39. Instead, its frontage comprises three levels of street aligned curved rendered and glass balustrades to over scaled balconies above a glazed shopfront with a single level non-aligned porch. As a result, the proposal appears over scaled, detached from its heritage context and quite out of place in the Addison Street streetscape.</p> <p>Further examination of the proposed layout reveals similar disregard for adjacent alignments, resulting in awkward junctions and missed opportunities to achieve an acceptable level of coherence and shared</p>	<p>After the DRP meeting held on 17 May 2024, a heritage consultant was engaged by the applicant in order to prepare a Statement of Heritage Impact.</p> <p>The subject Development Application was lodged which included the addition of a two-storey verandah structure to the front of the site.</p> <p>The applicant provided a SEPP (Housing) 2021 Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Context and Neighbourhood Character':</p> <p><i>'A thorough site analysis has been prepared and used to inform the design. The surrounding locality currently consists of a mix of single level commercial buildings, as well as 4 and 5 storey mixed use buildings. This Southern side of Addison Street from Mary Street in the west to Wentworth Street in the east is currently undergoing a transformation with recent completion of mixed use buildings and approval of unit buildings with street level commercial. Immediately adjoining the site to the East is a 2 storey commercial building currently</i></p>	<p>Council advised that a pre-lodgement meeting could take place in order to obtain advice from Council's heritage officer, as well as planning advice. No pre-lodgement took place. However, it is noted that Council had provided additional brief advice on provision of the DRP meeting notes to the applicant regarding the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addressing of Ch 6 of the DCP - Addressing of the SEPP (Housing) 2021 - Building Height to comply - Car parking and manoeuvrability - Amenity consideration - Acoustics and design - Addressing of the built form - Addressing of bulk and scale - Aesthetics - Universal Design - Waste Management - Landscaping - Trees and Vegetation

<p>amenity – especially with the heritage listed property to its west. The Panel therefore urges the Architect to reappraise the site and its adjacent context and to prepare a more detailed site analysis. An improved proposal would respond directly to adjoining alignments – at the frontage as well as within the site – and be more respectful of the setback requirements of the DCP. Given the precedent set by the neighbouring building to the east the Panel believe there is clear justification for developing a two storey verandah that extends over the street. A revised proposal would also benefit from a more sensitive response to streetscape patterns; besides reducing apparent scale and enhancing local character, double height verandahs for example, could benefit internal planning and spatial allowances – which on such a small site, are extremely constrained.</p>	<p><i>leased by a gym and supermarket. This building contains a rebuilt heritage item. Immediately adjoining the site to the West is a Single storey heritage listed Victorian home, known as 'Windradene'.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal has been designed to show consideration toward the current context, whilst also taking into consideration the desired future scale as envisaged by the planning controls. The two storey steel framed awning is consistent with adjoining street verandas and recently approved developments along this Southern side of Addison Street. White brickwork at the base of the building aims to provide a material connection to 'Windradene' and is consistent with the materiality of development along Addison Street at ground level.'</i></p>	<p>On submission of the Development Application and on preliminary assessment, Council noted that the upper-level setbacks did not comply with Chapter 6 Shellharbour Village Centre setbacks.</p> <p>The design has been further amended to include compliant setbacks on the upper levels, and a design is further setback from the front boundary in line with similar neighbouring developments and their gradual 'stepping in' of upper levels.</p>
<p>Built Form and Scale</p>		
<p>The Panel does not support the four-storey street aligned built form currently proposed; it does not comply with the DCP's setback requirements, it appears over scaled and does not respond to Addison Street's heritage or streetscape character. It is instead recommended that a double height verandah be incorporated into the scheme, thereby reducing apparent scale, while better relating to adjacent built form at number 25 and familiar streetscape patterns nearby. In addition, a front setback is required above level two, as per the DCP; this may allow for a terrace and setback flat roof (such as at 37-39), which may further reduce apparent scale. The verandah should be aligned with adjacent porches and provided with equal bays; not only would this further reduce apparent scale, a four bay division could introduce verticality into its expression, while referencing the</p>	<p>The applicant provided a <i>SEPP (Housing) 2021</i> Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Built Form & Scale':</p> <p><i>'The careful articulation, material and colour consideration, alongside precise planning and building use dedication, results in a building that will suitably integrate with the desired scale of the locality. The design of the proposal achieves an appropriate built form in terms of scale, proportions and building composition having regard to the height and FSR controls applying to the site and desired scale and massing of the locality. The proposal incorporates significant articulation, architectural language and materials in the composition of the facades which serves to break up the visual scale and bulk of the development, visually reducing the</i></p>	<p>The proposal complies with the maximum allowable height of 15m, where the applicant has responded favourably to reducing screening so that this may be within the allowable height, and this is also subject to conditions of consent.</p> <p>As discussed, setbacks have been increased and are compliant. A two-storey verandah has been included in the design facing Addison Street.</p> <p>The application was submitted with a Heritage Impact Statement and was referred to Council's Heritage Officer, who provided a supportive referral response subject to imposed conditions. The proposal and its built form is considered to</p>

<p>width of the adjacent gabled heritage building to its west. While removing a bay to mark residential entry was discussed at the meeting, further studies could explore whether this is a good idea or not.</p> <p>The contextual elevation provided (DA32E by Couvaras Architects) clearly shows the built form approach taken to interfaces with heritage structures. In all location where a new building is located next to a heritage structure, it is setback (side boundary interface) above its two-storey base, reducing the buildings' perceived scale. However, it could be argued that the existing gabled heritage cottage already provides a stepping down of built form to the adjacent heritage garden, which being a chief departure from the typical street pattern, constitutes the major heritage item which needs mediation. Like the verandah/ entry discussion referred to above, further built form studies would be needed to determine the veracity of this built form/ streetscape/ heritage response. The proposal currently presents a four storey nil setback façade to its southern boundary, which adjoins a public carpark. Further analysis of the evolving context should be undertaken to inform how a more contextually responsive southern façade can be developed. It is noted that more recent developments provide facades that are expressed with a top, middle and base, with the top of the building being setback to be more recessive.</p> <p>Due to its resultant height non-compliance and resultant impacts on adjacent properties, the roof top terrace is not supported. It is also noted that protection from the elements and required communal facilities would increase roof level built form, which is not acceptable. Therefore communal open space must be</p>	<p><i>apparent building mass. The development provides a contemporary building that will reinforce the desired future character of the area and enhance the amenity of the locality.'</i></p>	<p>sympathetically respond to neighbouring heritage items, and offers a transition, particularly from the residential entry component of 27 Addison Street across to the front-facing 1980s shop addition at 29 Addison Street to the west. Colours and materials are in line with the desired future character of the Shellharbour Village.</p> <p>Communal open space is provided, although resulting in a departure from the ADG allowance, is considered appropriate, given the narrow and constrained site; as well as the inclusion of larger balconies for many of the units within the development. The balconies provide some weather shelter, and the communal open space is designed to be planted in a dense, yet attractive manner, providing welcome space for residents and visitors.</p> <p>The 'core' or lift and stairwell has been re-designed to be moved towards the western half of the site, yet includes planter boxes along the western elevation and timber-look screens which soften the overall appearance when viewed from the public domain.</p> <p>Privacy is considered to have been addressed appropriately, where windows are off-set from the main COS, high-silled or are provided with screens.</p> <p>Car parking layout and manoeuvrability has been assessed by Council's Engineers and is considered satisfactory subject to conditions.</p>
--	---	---

<p>provided at lower levels, either by removing a portion of level three or even level one so as to provide an adequate provision of communal amenity; if the provision of communal open space were to be restricted to level one, a more refined design would need to resolve privacy issues while providing demonstrable communal amenity. In addition, a strong argument must justify likely numerical and solar access non-compliance.</p> <p>Due to its resultant height non-compliance and resultant impacts on adjacent properties, the roof top terrace is not supported.</p> <p>Therefore communal open space must be provided at lower levels, either by removing a portion of level three or even level one so as to provide an adequate provision of communal amenity; if the provision of communal open space were to be restricted to level one, a more refined design would need to resolve privacy issues while providing demonstrable communal amenity.</p> <p>To enhance its relationship and cohesion with adjacent heritage (ie. with buildings that cannot change), the courtyard should be aligned with the rear façade of the street aligned gabled cottage and the north edge of the rear hipped roof built form.</p> <p>To maximise courtyard space and lobby amenity, the core should be redesigned. To reduce its footprint, the stair should be redesigned as a simple fold back type and relocated to align with the elevator. To maximise the size of the courtyard, the core should be moved as far as possible to the west. To enhance the internal amenity of the entry, a section of the courtyard could</p>	<p>An additional condition pertaining to traffic management and traffic light operations detail within the car park prior to issue of a construction certificate, shall ensure satisfactory traffic outcomes.</p>
--	---

<p>be removed, thereby allowing light, air and glimpses of landscape above.</p> <p>To increase privacy across the courtyard, windows must be significantly reduced in size, more strategically located and provided with finer defensive screening. At level one, planting and fencing must be carefully resolved to minimize privacy impacts; within such a small space, it may be better to conceive of the courtyard as heavily planted with limited seating and communal amenity provided in an alternative manner (eg. a communal lounge for example, with outlook to the south).</p> <p>The current proposal provides a 4.2m floor to floor height above the ground floor retail and a minimum 3.2m floor to floor height above the ground floor carpark. Consideration may be given to lowering the ground floor level, so as to reduce the overall height of the building and better relate to the western neighbour.</p> <p>The ground floor parking layout, including vehicular movement and bin storage, appears very tight. A redesign of the built form as recommended above provides the opportunity to reassess and confirm spatial allocations.</p>		
Density		
<p>On such a small site, it appears that the density currently proposed is excessive. Refinements to built form – including the provision of a front facing verandah, level three front setback, level one rear setback, realignment of the courtyard and relocation of the bin storage are likely to reduce density to some degree.</p>	<p>The applicant provided a <i>SEPP (Housing) 2021</i> Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Density':</p> <p>The unit areas and proportions generally exceed the rules of thumb in the Apartment Design Guide, and provide a level of openness and amenity. Submitted</p>	<p>Setbacks have been increased on both the front and rear, and a two storey verandah with appropriate design and material elements is proposed.</p> <p>The central communal open space is considered appropriate, given there are also large balconies provided to much of the units,</p>

	plans show possible furniture layouts, proving to be space efficient.	and the amenity provided within these and the COS is of high quality (BBQ in COS and on balconies, seating and landscaping to COS). Bin storage is considered appropriately located, with separate residential and commercial bin spaces provided.
Sustainability		
Sustainability was not discussed at the meeting; however the Panel expects to see a raft of well considered sustainability commitments in any further iterations, including : - target electrification by using heat-pump hot water; - electric as opposed to gas for all appliances; - provision of photovoltaics that can produce energy for common areas as well as be directed to some apartments; - wherever possible (e.g., where bathrooms are located adjacent to external walls) natural ventilation and light should be provided to wet areas; - EV vehicle and bicycle charging stations should also be provided in the basement - using re-cycled bricks in some or all of the designated locations and eco-friendly concrete solutions.	The applicant provided a SEPP (Housing) 2021 Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Sustainability': Solar studies indicate that the units will receive the required daylight & sunlight for a building within the Shellharbour local government area. Majority of units are naturally cross ventilated. A RWT has been proposed. Roof areas will allow solar collection systems to be installed in the future if required.	The proposal demonstrates consistency with a sustainable approach to development, and includes measures which are indicated on the provided BASIX certificate, such as a rainwater tank which then connects to and provides irrigation. Air conditioning is also provided, and appropriate glazing is provided to ensure sufficient solar access. Cross-ventilation of all units is able to be achieved.
Landscape		
While technically not included in the proposal's scope of works, it would be beneficial for the streetscape, the development and the community, to consider repairing the gap in the street left by the existing driveway; this could include a small café seating area or additional infill planting to complement existing street features. The small pocket of planting at the rear of the property appears to only provide a minimum soil volume for token planting to help soften this façade. Consideration in any replanning should consider how deep soil could be provided, or any planting areas be	<i>The applicant provided a SEPP (Housing) 2021 Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Landscaping':</i> <i>'Although not affected by a minimum landscaping control, thoughtful landscaping has been proposed at the front setback directly above the residential entry and on Level 1 podium to the communal open space to soften the hardscape and building. Planter boxes are located on levels 2 and 3 to create interest</i>	The proposal includes recommended landscape works within public domain to the front of the site, where recommended conditions of consent shall ensure that a Public Domain Plan is submitted to Council for approval, due to the ongoing development of public space within Addison Street, and technical advice which may be required from Council's Assets Officers.

<p>enlarged. As noted above, a setback above level one is recommended, which could provide significantly re planting. While DSZ may not be required due to the urban nature of the project, alternative planting opportunities to offset this should be explored throughout the built form. How these larger planters can help define space to create rooms, and how they could help create privacy, should be explored. The proposed level one COS lacks amenity and program, and even with a developed landscape design, would fail to provide an acceptable amenity due to privacy concerns via overlooking, and being obstructed by circulation. In tandem with a comprehensive built form review, opportunities for an improved COS could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including a common room that directly accesses an area of outdoor space - Reconfiguring the circulation to avoid cutting directly through the COS, but rather touching only the edge, so the spaces themselves can be used unencumbered by circulation at all time. - Ensuring that the minimum COS requirements with regards to solar access are exceeded. - Consideration as to what type of demographic this development will attract and proposing a COS commensurate with this. - Considering distant water and other views that could be positively exploited by utilising a higher zone for COS, and pushing the spaces to the boundary as opposed to being buffered all around by planting. - Considering the materials and planting chosen to ensure local biodiversity and characteristics are captured and celebrated, and the UHIE is mitigated wherever possible. - Considering how 	<p><i>and drama with species selected to drape and soften the building to the side boundaries.'</i></p>	<p>A landscape plan has been provided as part of the Development Application. Landscaping to the rear in the form of low-lying shrubs and climbing plants is considered appropriate, given the required car parking within the site, and limited opportunity to provide further landscaping within this area. Deep soil is considered to be able to be achieved within the rear planter area adjacent the car park entry door.</p> <p>Landscaping within the communal open space provides planters with planting which may offer a degree of privacy to units which have windows facing in towards the COS; however screening and high sill windows have also been provided which assist with privacy concerns. Planters on building are considered a welcome addition in terms of providing suitable landscaping for the site, and in a bid to soften the northern and western elevations in particular. Recommended conditions of consent shall ensure appropriate deep soil zones are provided and adequate landscaping is provided for such areas.</p> <p>Good quality amenity is provided within the central COS, where a BBQ, seating and table space is provided. The COS itself is also located away from the main breezeways and can be used expressly without interruption or pass-through from residents looking to enter their unit. Larger balconies are provided for much of the nine units, which compliments the COS.</p>
---	---	---

<p>POS could be improved to offset any shortcomings in the COS amenity (However this would require a high level of excellence to be considered).</p>		
<p>Amenity</p>		
<p>Apart from built form, streetscape and heritage issues, the proposal includes numerous amenity issues as follows : - entry and ground floor lobby lacks any apparent internal amenity, access to natural light, air or outlook - ground level vehicular circulation is too tight - garbage store is too small and highly compromised - typical lobbies are cramped (see notes above) - first level courtyard layout is highly constrained by the core and very limited in open space potential; privacy issues would suggest that communal uses should be minimised in the courtyard and provided elsewhere in another form - openings across courtyard do not adequately address acoustic and visual privacy requirements - for such a small and constrained site, north facing balconies appear too large - access to the roof top communal space requires a significant height non-compliance, which is unacceptable; in addition, there is no protection from the weather, no WC or storage provided and insufficient landscape</p>	<p>The applicant provided a SEPP (Housing) 2021 Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Amenity':</p> <p><i>'It is considered that the amenity of apartments is achieved under the Apartment Design Guide requirements for size, ventilation, day lighting, etc. The orientation of the building maximizes solar access, natural ventilation and extensive views of surrounding suburbs from upper levels. The rear 3 bed units are afforded expansive views to the south and to Bass Point Reserve, the existing gravel loader and the new marina breakwater.'</i></p>	<p>Screening has been provided to the west of the residential entry hallway and foyer, of which allows for additional natural light and air. The front door entry is provided with glazing, where outlook towards Addison Street is provided.</p> <p>Vehicle circulation is considered appropriate, having been referred to Council's Engineers for comment, and subject to conditions of consent with regards the proposed traffic light operation system.</p> <p>Waste storage is considered appropriate, where separate residential and commercial storage areas are provided at ground level.</p> <p>COS is considered appropriately designed, and allows for dedicated and uninterrupted use from residents accessing unit entries. Visual privacy is considered addressed by way of screening, off-set windows from COS and high sill windows. Balconies for north-facing balconies are larger and provide good amenity and additional POS for dedicated use, as well as weather protection from overhanging eaves and balconies above.</p>
<p>Safety</p>		

As noted above, the ground level vehicular circulation is too tight, which could result in safety issues.	<p>The applicant provided a <i>SEPP (Housing) 2021</i> Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Safety':</p> <p><i>'The design provides a high level of safety and security, with clearly defined entries & exits, high levels of surveillance of public areas, and limited opportunities for concealment and surprise.'</i></p>	<p>Vehicle circulation is considered appropriate for the site on revised design.</p> <p>Further, recommended conditions of consent have been included in the draft consent which will ensure detailed traffic management for the traffic light operations are provided to Council for approval prior to issue of a construction certificate.</p> <p>An entry gate is provided to the main residential entry point on Addison Street, and an intercom is recommended by way of condition of consent for the rear roller door access to the car park.</p>
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction		
As noted above, the roof top communal space is unacceptable and the size of the level one courtyard is perhaps too small and constrained to provide adequate communal uses. Therefore, the provision of communal amenity remains unresolved.	<p>The applicant provided a <i>SEPP (Housing) 2021</i> Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Housing Diversity and Social Interaction':</p> <p><i>'The housing mix provides excellent opportunity for social interaction and diversity. The open breezeway between units and levels creates an opportunity of social connection and interaction between residents. The site is easily accessible to a range of services and facilities including public transport.'</i></p>	<p>Roof top terrace was removed, and COS is considered appropriate. There are nine units within the proposal, and all are provided with their own balconies and BBQs, where tables can be provided to the balcony areas, too. The main COS is provided with BBQ, seating and landscaping, and is considered appropriate given the scale of the development and provision of additional, dedicated POS for all units.</p> <p>In addition to the COS matter, three of the units are capable of achieving adaptable housing standards.</p>
Aesthetics		
As noted above, the proposed built form and its relationship with context – especially its massing and expression - is not supported. The Panel encourages the architect to review the built form to directly respond to adjacent alignments and local architectural and urban design patterns. The integration of a	<p>The applicant provided a <i>SEPP (Housing) 2021</i> Design Verification Statement which stated the following in response to 'Aesthetics':</p> <p><i>'Consideration to the aesthetics has been dealt with in "built form" above.'</i></p>	<p>The proposal has been amended since the initial DRP meeting, and has also been amended to include revised, complaint setbacks, and an overall more contextually fitting design. For example, and as discussed above, the proposal includes a two-storey</p>

contemporary two level verandah, and introducing a level three set back (with setback glazing and large eaves) may result in an expression that is more responsive to streetscape and heritage generally. The use of face brick and steel materiality is supported.		verandah which is a welcome and consistent addition to many developments within Addison Street, reflective of the desired character of the area. Large eaves have been integrated into the design, as well as good-sized glazed areas to the fronts of north-facing units. Face brick and steel have been included within the front façade, which contributes to an aesthetically pleasing design.
---	--	--