



Our Ref: UDRP19/0003
Contact: Gavin Cherry
Telephone: (02) 4732 8125

28 March 2019

Willowtree Planning
100 Walker Street
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060

Attention: John Cole,

Dear Mr Cole,

Urban Design Review Panel Meeting
Proposed Development - Residential Aged Care Facility and Allied Health Facility
Address - 5-7 Floribunda Avenue GLENMORE PARK NSW 2745

Thank you for attending Council's Urban Design Review Panel on 20 March 2019.

The attached minutes are provided as a summary of the key points raised during the Panel meeting.

We hope that you have found participation in the Panel process beneficial and that it will assist both yourself and Council reaching a determination of your proposal.

If you require any further assistance regarding the attached advice please contact me on (02) 4732 8125.

Yours faithfully

Gavin Cherry
Development Assessment Coordinator

Please note: this advice is to assist you with your development proposal. It is not a full assessment of the proposal. The applicant is responsible to address all relevant requirements.

Penrith City Council
PO Box 60, Penrith
NSW 2751 Australia
T 4732 7777
F 4732 7958
penrithcity.nsw.gov.au

URBAN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL ADVICE

Date of Meeting: 20 March 2019

Reference: UDRP19/0003

Proposal: Residential Aged Care Facility and Allied Health Facility

Address: 5-7 Floribunda Avenue GLENMORE PARK NSW 2745

Key Design Considerations

- The proposal is being pursued under the provisions of SEPP (Housing for Seniors of People with a Disability) 2004 and in accordance with that policy, the proposal must demonstrate compatibility with the character of the immediate area. Further Part 3 – Design Requirements outlines that any proposal must recognise the desirable elements of a locality and the desired future character and ensure that the proposal contributes to the quality and identity of the area by complementing the existing streetscape character and integrating the built form in sympathy to this character (but not necessarily the same).
- The immediate area (excluding the community facility) is typical of detached two storey structures with spatial breaks between each built form and a traditional pitch roof form character.
- The proposal provides an expansive building footprint and frontage (almost 80m in length), which does not respond to, or reflect the existing detached built form character of the area. While this does not necessitate a series of detached buildings, it does require a design solution that provides spatial breaks in building elements through staggered and recessive setbacks, considered landscape design and tree retention, sympathetic architectural design treatments and integrated roofing form.
- The internalised courtyards also provide limited internal amenity for future residents, and little opportunity for visitors. Opportunities exist for views of the natural landscape towards the Loch where rooms are orientated to centralised break out areas between wings / doubled loaded rows, with outlooks to the north and north west. It is understood that the internalised courtyards have been requested to assist with security, safety and management of residents, however this can still be achieved through landscaping and fencing elements that provide outlook for residents, but also an outlook and congregation spaces for visitors.
- The proposal also provides extensive excavation, to achieve a compliant building height with respect to the LEP provisions. This would suggest that the building mass and scale is not appropriate, where subterranean rooms result (as is indicated).

Reorientation of the built form, staggered setbacks and articulation may assist to reduce the need for excavation.

- A transitioned building scale would also assist, such as single storey adjacent to the south eastern boundary stepping in form towards the north west. Noting the rear 25% single storey requirements in the SEPP, this provision likely relates to the management of built form interface and separation, privacy and amenity considerations. Given the Loch and open space arrangements to the rear, there is less sensitivity to the rear boundary than the side. This would suggest that a potential variation (or transference) of the 25% requirement could be considered (as a variation) from the rear to the side (responding to the intent and objective of the standard). Please note that the 25% requirement is under the heading of 'development standard' in the SEPP instrument (Part 4, Clause 40) and would necessitate a formal request to vary this standard if pursued.
- Appreciating the plans are conceptual in form, the proposed parking within the front setback is not supported, and the side setbacks necessitate an assessment of tree retention to ensure that existing canopy trees can be retained to ameliorate the building scale as viewed from the south eastern adjoining properties, as well as prevent direct views into rear yards with swimming pools.
- An alternate wing built form concept was outlined by the Panel during the meeting however it was outlined that the management requirements of the client have necessitated the current proposal. While management requirements are appreciated, this does not preclude the need to comply with the SEPP and provide a sympathetic and compatible built form design. Options could include: -
 - Reorientation or alignment of the built form in a similar alignment to the adjacent community facility. This would allow for staggered / increased setbacks to the Floribunda Avenue, with potential for extensive landscaping to break the building form and mass as viewed from the roadway (thereby making the built form appear smaller and more contextually integrated)
 - Stepped building form with articulation elements coupled with tree canopy plantings.
 - Relocation of the allied health facility from the front setback to the rear or better integrated into the built form rather than protruding within the setback zone forward of the broader aged care development.
- It is recommended that amended concept plans be prepared and sent to Council for electronic review. This would enable feedback outside of a formal UDRP meeting and enable progression of the design and support for the spatial arrangement prior to finalisation of a development application. Please ensure that any plans are sent to Abby Younan, Council's Planning Administration Officer for circulation to the relevant Panel Members.