

Joint Randwick / Waverley Design Review Panel Endorsed Recommendations

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Item | 5 | Date of report | November 2019 |
| Address | 5-15 Cadwood Avenue, LITTLE BAY NSW 2036 | Application no. | RZ/4/2019 |
| Date of meeting | | | |
| Panel members | Michael Heenan (Chair), Richard Nugent , Jonathon Knapp - Abstaining | | |
| Council staff | Terry Papaioannou | | |

INTRODUCTION

Attached is a copy of the minutes relating to this SEPP 65 meeting.

The Panel's comments are intended to assist Council in their design consideration of an application against the SEPP 65 principles. The absence of a comment under a head of consideration does not imply that particular matter to be satisfactorily addressed, more likely the changes are suggested elsewhere to generate a desirable change.

Your attention is drawn to the following;

- SEPP 65, including the 9 Design Quality Principles and the requirements for a Qualified Designer (a Registered Architect) to provide Design Verification Statements throughout the design, documentation and construction phases of the project.
- The Apartment Design Guide, as published by Planning NSW (July 2015), which provides guidance on all the issues addressed below.

Both documents are available from the NSW Department of Planning.

Note:

The Design Review Panel is appointed by the NSW Minister for Planning, on the recommendation of Council. The Panel's written and verbal comments are their professional opinions and constitute expert design quality advice to Randwick Council, the architect and the applicant.

1. *To address the Panel's comments, the applicant may need to submit amended plans. **Prior to preparing any amended plans or attending additional Panel presentations, the applicant MUST discuss the Panel's comments and any other matter that may require amendment with Council's assessing Planning Officer.***
2. *When addressing the Panel's comments by way of amendments, if the applicant does not propose to address all or the bulk of the Panel's comments, and wishes to make minor amendments only, then it should be taken that the Panel considers the proposal does not meet the SEPP 65 requirements. In these instances it is unlikely the scheme will be referred back to the Panel for further review.*
3. *In this report it is noted that the proponent has lodged a rezoning application which includes some considerations other than those outlined in SEPP 65 and commentary has been made as appropriate.*

Joint Randwick / Waverley Design Review Panel

Endorsed Recommendations

PANEL COMMENTS

This Planning Application proposes changes to the FSR and height for the site that will result in approximately 1,909 new dwellings, a local centre with provision for a supermarket, retail, medical centre, gym, childcare centre and possible hotel, Community park on the western part of the site, dedication of more than a hectare of new public open space and 76 apartments to be dedicated to Council for affordable housing. No changes are sought to the boundary of the E2 Environmental Conservation land containing Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub (ESBS).

The proposal includes a broad analysis and structure plan design for sites to the north of the proposal site as part of the strategic context, and justification, for the proposal. The Panel acknowledges the importance of understanding the site in a strategic context, but is obliged to limit its comments to design aspects and attributes of the site area included in the Planning Application.

This is the first time the Panel has reviewed this site, and is familiar with the site and the surrounding area. The urban designer for this project is SJB and the proponent is Meriton.

Principle 1: Context and Neighbourhood Context

The site is located to the east of Anzac Parade just to the north of the recently developed residential area of Little Bay. The site is in single ownership and consists of approximately 12.3ha in total developable with an established open space framework consisting of a local park and E2 Environmental Conservation Area. Just to the north of the site is area zoned R3, Medium Density Residential, containing a LAHC estate. It is anticipated that this estate may be redeveloped consistent with LAHC's strategy to create integrated precincts of market rate housing coupled with state sponsored housing. North of this is the long Bay Correctional Facility which may be redeveloped over time, however no time frame has been established for this transition.

Surrounding these large landholdings is a fairly continuous fabric of low density residential development consisting of single family homes mixed with occasional small scale residential flat buildings. This area is located in close proximity to the coast with recreation and open space uses. The site directly abuts The Coast Golf Club which extends eastward from the E2 zoned lands with an uninterrupted view to the water.

Principle 2: Scale and Built Form

Allowable heights vary from block to block and range from 18 metres at Anzac Parade to 8 metres across eastern blocks. The surrounding areas are generally 9.5 metres allowing for a three storey building. This planning proposal shows building heights that greatly exceed allowable. They have, in part, been based on long term speculation as to the certainty and location of transport improvements and the need to provide for increased housing targets. These proposed heights reach up to 22 storeys on the eastern portion of the site. A datum of approximately six storeys appears to have been set across the site from which higher built form rises. The cap on the proposed heights appears to be set by the OLS that applies over the site.

The heights proposed are incompatible with surrounding development and result in unacceptable impacts as illustrated by the visual assessments provided. The Panel feels that any increase in height that might be considered could only be entertained on western portions of the site closest to Anzac Parade.

Joint Randwick / Waverley Design Review Panel

Endorsed Recommendations

While this is a Planning Proposal only and does not provide details regarding architecture, a greater variety of building and residential types should be considered, as demonstrated in the Little Bay development to the south.

Proposed changes to the street configuration are acceptable and will allow greater flexibility in the development. The Panel suggests that Banksia Street, shown as an open space on the proposed plan, be retained as an authentic street to moderate the large block size created by its realignment from an E/W orientation to a N/S orientation and provide for future connectivity if the LANC site is redeveloped to the north.

Although currently a development lot in the approved scheme, and as illustrated in the LEP controls, the Panel questions the appropriateness of Lot J for development. It lies east of Christo Street which delineates the eastern edge of the street grid and would result in a considerable amount of built form and private gardens directly abutting parkland.

Principle 3: Density

The Consultant's design report states that in December 2009, the Land and Environment Court granted development consent to a Stage 1 Master Plan across the site comprising an FSR of 0.5:1 including varying residential building forms ranging in height between 2-6 storeys. Current net FSR controls vary from block to block and range from 0.5:1 to 1.5:1. An overall FSR of 2.0:1 has been proposed across the site which quadruples the current allowable amounts. The Panel feels that this is unacceptable. The analysis indicating that long term future transport improvements are under study is not sufficient justification for an up zoning of this scale at this time. This substantial increase in density results in excessive building height and bulk as illustrated in the Visual Assessment Report.

Principle 4: Sustainability

No detailed information has been provided. This is not relevant for this assessment and the Panel reserves comment on this Principle.

Principle 5: Landscape

The landscape strategy maintained the current open space provisions with the addition of approximately one hectare of new open space. A variety of smaller neighbourhood parks have been proposed. The Panel reserves further comment on this Principle.

Principle 6: Amenity

Shadow diagrams have been provided which show minimal shadow impacts on the development at Little Bay to the south. Most high-rise tower forms have an E/W orientation that suggests that ADG solar access requirements may be met. Other aspects of the ADG, such as cross ventilation, have not been illustrated and the Panel reserves further comment on this Principle.

Principle 7: Safety

Streets provide passive surveillance. Additional consideration needs to be given to the configuration of the public domain where built form directly abuts open space. Clear pathways and sightlines need to be maintained in order to ensure that CPTED principles are embedded in the design.

Principle 8: Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

While this is a Planning Proposal only and does not provide details regarding architecture, a greater variety of building and residential types should be considered, as demonstrated in the Little Bay development to the south.

Joint Randwick / Waverley Design Review Panel

Endorsed Recommendations

Principle 9: Aesthetics

No detailed information has been provided. This is not relevant for this assessment and the Panel reserves comments of this Principle.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposal seeks to justify a substantial increase in carrying capacity of the site to align with updated housing targets and strategic initiatives of local and state government. The Panel does not feel that the reasons given in support of the increase are grounded in adequate certainty to consider this increase. Council has worked closely with planners and urban designers to determine the current controls and the successful implementation of Little Bay to date is evidence of their appropriateness for the site.

This proposal needs significant reworking as the scale, bulk and height of the proposed built form exceeds what would be acceptable on this site.

The Panel would like to review this proposal again should it be modified.