

Design Review Panel

Georges River Council

REPORT OF THE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 6 July 2017 at Georges River Council - Hurstville Office

Panel Members - Mr Peter Annand, Prof Peter Webber, Ms Caitriona O'Dowd

ITEM 3

Date of Panel Assessment:	6 July 2017
Applicant:	Manevski Developments
Architect:	Marchese Partners
Property Address:	73 Vista St Sans Souci
Description:	Planning proposal to re-zone part of site
No. of Buildings:	N/A
No. of Storeys:	N/A
No. of Units:	N/A
Consent Authority Responsible:	Georges River Council
Application No.:	PP2017/0042
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	None

The proponents have submitted a planning proposal that seeks to rezone the site which is currently zoned in part W2 (recreational waterways) and in part R2 (low density residential) under Kogarah LEP 2012. It will require amendments as follows:

- To the foreshore building line
- To realign the boundaries
- To amend Schedule 1 to allow for substantially increasing the building height from 9m to approx. 18.9m
- To increase FSR from 0.27:1 to 2.32:1

It is proposed that the site be developed with approximately 50 seniors living self-contained units, which was the number the applicant argued was necessary if the required communal facilities and services were to be included. This is the justification advanced for a planning proposal of this bulk, scale and density.

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings

Comments

Context and Neighbouring Character

Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is the key natural and built features of an area, their relationship and the character they create when combined. It also includes social, economic, health and environmental conditions.

Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of an area's existing or future character. Well designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood.

Consideration of local context is important for all sites, including sites in established areas, those undergoing change or identified for change.

The proposal is completely out of context with the surrounding built environment which is predominantly single dwellings, many large and up to 3 storeys high and stepping down the site. The view catchment from the site reveals no apparent buildings above 3 storeys anywhere along this part of the waterway.

To the south, the site adjoins Anderson Reserve. At the southern end of the reserve there is a substantial motor yacht club which has an apparent height of about 3 storeys. There are substantial trees on the adjacent reserve and one large and very significant tree within the south west corner of the subject site.

The proposed building in close proximity to the boundary may possibly impact adversely on the existing mature specimens in Anderson Reserve. An arborist should be consulted in relation to impacts on all significant trees.

It is very likely that the important tree on the site itself would be endangered.

Built Form and Scale

Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings.

Good design also achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type, articulation and the manipulation of building elements.

Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.

The applicant submitted a schematic design indicating possible height and form of the future development, as well as a proposed envelope diagram. This provides for a 3 storey building form on the Vista Street frontage increasing from 4 to 6 storeys on the remainder of the site.

It was stated that this would be appropriate to 'book end' the existing motor club at the opposite end of the reserve, although this in reality is less bulky and only 2-3 storeys in height.

It also indicates small and unacceptable setbacks from Vista Street and the common boundary with Anderson Reserve as well as potentially inadequate setbacks from the common boundary with the adjoining residential property which would appear not to comply with the ADG standards. On the Georges River frontage the proposed setback is well under the average of waterfront buildings on properties to the north and highly problematic.

The built form and scale is unacceptable in this urban and waterfront context. .

After the site visit the Panel had strong reservations about the bulk and form of the proposal. The 'Visual Impact Presentation' provided at the meeting reinforced this position. The montage views clearly demonstrated that the form and scale is inappropriate for the site, being of the order of at least three storeys higher than any existing buildings within the view catchment, and with a floor area much larger than any but the Motor Boat Club.

Density

Good design achieves a high level of amenity for residents and each apartment, resulting in a density appropriate to the site and its context.

Appropriate densities are consistent with the area's existing or projected population. Appropriate densities can be sustained by existing or proposed infrastructure, public transport, access to jobs, community facilities and the environment.

No convincing evidence was presented by the proponent to justify a very substantial increase in density from .271:1 to 2.32:1. This density is clearly unacceptable for the site – see above.

Sustainability

Good design combines positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.

Good sustainable design includes use of natural cross ventilation and sunlight for the amenity and liveability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling reducing reliance on technology and operation costs. Other elements include recycling and reuse of materials and waste, use of sustainable materials and deep soil zones for groundwater recharge and vegetation.

No sustainability information was provided at this stage.

Landscape

Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in attractive developments with good amenity. A positive image and contextual fit of well designed developments is achieved by contributing to the landscape character of the streetscape and neighbourhood.

Good landscape design enhances the development's environmental performance by retaining positive natural features which contribute to the local context, co-ordinating water and soil management, solar access, microclimate, tree canopy, habitat values and preserving green networks.

Good landscape design optimises useability, privacy and opportunities for social interaction, equitable access, respect for neighbours' amenity and provides for practical establishment and long term management.

No landscape plans were provided with the submission. The visual impact assessment as presented by the landscape architect illustrates that this proposed building does not suitably blend with the existing landscape and built form.

The assessment relied on the provision of additional tree planting on the public reserve to screen the excessive bulk of the proposed building rather than allowing for substantial setbacks and planting *within* the subject property.

Amenity

Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive living environments and resident well being.

Good amenity combines appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.

As this is a planning proposal, architectural details and definitive architectural forms were not presented. .

The proponents are proposing a variety of community and communal services within the proposal however, there is no guarantee that these will remain in final designs nor may they survive necessary floor space reductions.

Safety

Good design optimises safety and security within the development and the public domain. It provides for quality public and private spaces that are clearly defined and fit for the intended purpose. Opportunities to maximise passive surveillance of public and communal areas promote safety.

A positive relationship between public and private spaces is achieved through clearly defined secure access points and well lit and visible areas that are easily maintained and appropriate to the location and purpose.

No comment at this stage.

Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

Good design achieves a mix of apartment sizes, providing housing choice for different demographics, living needs and household budgets.

Well designed apartment developments respond to social context by providing housing and facilities to suit the existing and future social mix.

Good design involves practical and flexible features, including different types of communal spaces for a broad range of people and providing opportunities for social interaction among residents.

It is not an issue that some greater mix of housing types in this area would be desirable but the proposal for seniors housing only at this scale of development is not appropriate.

Aesthetics

Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the internal layout and structure. Good design uses a variety of materials, colours and textures.

The visual appearance of a well designed apartment development responds to the existing or future local context, particularly desirable elements and repetitions of the streetscape.

A detailed design has not been developed since this is at planning proposal stage. The built form which proposes a waterfront development of 6 storeys in height is inconsistent with the character and scale of any nearby development, and far too visually assertive, particularly from the water and adjoining parkland.

The Panel does *not accept* the conclusions of the 'Visual Impact Assessment' that the impacts would be only in the 'Low' and 'Moderate-Low' range, and considers that the impacts would be in reality High and unacceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

The planning proposal cannot be supported.