Attachment: Detailed Council Officer Assessment of Proposal against HDP Criteria and Urban Design Capability Test

A. Housing Diversity Precinct Criteria (HDP Criteria)

HOUSING DIVERSITY PRECINCT CRITERIA

To be considered as a Housing Diversity Precinct, a site or area must satisfy the following criteria:

(1) Have urban design merit via an urban design capability test that demonstrates the proposed built form is compatible with surrounding development and neighbourhoods.

(2) Be at least 1 hectare and located either:

a. entirely within a 10 minute walk of, a Strategic or Local Centre, or

b. within the GPOP area, having 30 minute door-to-door access to employment in Parramatta CBD, Westmead or Sydney Olympic Park.

(3) Include or be located within walking distance (800m) of retail convenience.

(4) For sites 1-2 ha in size - contain or be entirely within a 5 minute walk of a park, sportsground or play space as detailed in the Community Infrastructure Strategy

(5) For sites greater than 2 ha in size – require the on-site provision of quality parks, sportsgrounds or play spaces as detailed in the Community Infrastructure Strategy

(6) Be predominantly low-rise, two to three storeys.

(7) Propose one or more of the following housing types:

- attached or detached dwelling houses
- terrace housing
- semi-detached housing
- villas
- townhouses
- manor homes
- co-housing (maximum 3 storeys)
- seniors housing (maximum 3 storeys)
- new age boarding houses (maximum 3 storeys)

(8) Residential flat buildings may be permitted in Housing Diversity Precincts, but only where:

a. The built form is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood and meets the urban test as per clause (1); and

b. Other housing types are also provided in the precinct, as specified in clause (7); and

c. They contain at least 5-10% permanent affordable rental housing (subject to viability); however, where viable, Council's aspiration is for a higher provision.

(9) Have strategic merit in relation to: access (including to a regular public transport service); constraints; topography; environment; and amenity.

B. Assessment of Proposal against Housing Diversity Precinct Criteria

Housing Diversity Precinct Criteria	Compliance
(1) **Urban design -** Have urban design merit via an urban design capability test that demonstrates the proposed built form is compatible with surrounding development and neighbourhoods.	No. The Applicant's scheme is not considered to exhibit urban design merit as it has not passed the urban design capability test (refer to Table 2).
(2) **Size and proximity to Strategic or Local Centre -** Be at least 1ha and located either: a. Entirely within a 10-minute walk of a Strategic or Local Centre or Within the GPOP area, having 30 minute door-to-door access to employment in Parramatta CBD, Westmead or Sydney Olympic Park	Yes
(3) **Proximity to retail convenience -** Include or be located within walking distance (800m) of retail convenience.	Yes
(4) **Size and proximity to open space** - Proximity For site 1-2ha in size – contain or be entirely within a 5 minute walk of a park, sportsground	Not applicable.
(5) **Open space provision** - For sites greater than 2ha in size – require the on-site provision of quality parks, sportsgrounds or play spaces as detailed in the Community Infrastructure Strategy (CIS).	No. The proposal seeks to dedicate 2ha of public open space including a full-sized oval and village square; open space facilities which are broadly supported. However, it is noted that the proposal seeks to dedicate 15% of the site as public open space whereas the CIS requires 20% to be dedicated as per identified benchmarks.
(6) **Predominance of low rise building forms -** Be predominantly low-rise, two to three storeys.	No. The proposed building heights are predominantly greater than 2-3 storeys.
(7) **Housing diversity and building heights** - Propose one or more of the following housing types: • attached or detached dwelling houses; • terrace housing;	No. While the proposed housing typologies are broadly supported, the proposal does not

• semi-detached housing; • villas; • townhouses; • manor homes; • co-housing (maximum 3 storeys); • seniors housing (maximum 3 storeys); and • new age boarding houses (maximum 3 storeys).	satisfy this criteria as it exceeds the maximum 3 storey height identified for seniors housing.
(8) **Criteria for residential flat buildings -** Residential flat buildings may be permitted in Housing Diversity Precincts, but only where: a. The built form is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood and meets the urban test as per clause 1; and b. Other housing types are also provided in the precinct as per clause 1; and c. They contain at least 5-10% permanent affordable rental housing (subject to viability) ; however, where viable, Council's aspiration is for a higher provision.	No. In terms of criteria 8a, the predominance of bulky residential flat buildings is incompatible with the low scale, suburban setting of the locality. In terms of criteria 8b, the proposal does provide other housing typologies as per clause 1. In terms of criteria 8c, the proposal does not seek to dedicate permanent affordable rental housing to Council; rather the Applicants seek to retain a portion of the affordable housing units for use of staff and visitors.
(9) **Site constraints and opportunities -** Have strategic merit in relation to: access (including to a regular public transport service); constraints; topography; environment; and amenity.	No. The proposal seeks an excessive density and built form outcome that is not responsive to access constraints including the lack of major public transport services; steep topography; existing significant vegetation and hazard constraints; and public and private amenity in terms of solar access and privacy.

Table 1: Assessment of Proposal against HDP Criteria

C. Detailed Council Officer Assessment - Urban Design Capability Test

Urban design metric/criteria	Existing Context and/or Desired Future Character	Assessment of Proposal
1. Connectivity to the existing neighbourhood, permeability of block structure, enhancement of view corridors.	The surrounding street network is generally well-connected, with a logical block structure and size, pedestrian links and some cul-de-sacs, typical of residential subdivision. In consideration of the proposed medium density residential and apartment typologies, the internal street network should form a grid structure with visual connections to open space and sky. A street network should provide travellers with a sense of orientation through physical elements that serve as reference points. The road structure should be further extended outside of the site with multiple access points, tying into the surrounding street network. Blocks should be permeable to enable pedestrian circulation.	The proposed internal street system is inwardly focused and characterised by a high occurrence of cul-de-sacs. Visual corridors are often interrupted and blocked by built form. The lack of access and connectivity throughout the site results in the proposal being deemed incompatible with the neighbourhood. A revised proposal that provides connected two-way street and a grid street structure (where possible) would increase permeability and improve integration with surrounding streets and spaces.
2. Street widths, hierarchy and elements within the road reserve	The surrounding local roads have a suburban character with 16m-wide road reserves with mature tree planting and wide grass verges. A compatible street structure would simulate and enhance this layout, improve vehicular movement, and increase tree planting through a legible street hierarchy with 20m and 16m road reserves.	The proposal exhibits a complex winding structure without view corridors. This is exacerbated by the lack of a clear road hierarchy. Overall, this leads to poor legibility and integration with the surrounding road network.
3. Accessibility and street address to all buildings and public domain	The surrounding single dwellings each have a clear street address.	The proposal does not provide a clear street address to all buildings, which will result in wayfinding issues. The proposed public open space is not clearly bounded by streets, directly abutting private residential development that limits accessibility and creates a sense of privatised space.
4. Responsiveness of built form and	The surrounding single dwellings are sensitively situated within individual	The proposal includes some built form envelopes and streets that

streets to topography through extent of cut and fill	lots, reducing cut and fill by orientating buildings to existing contours. Streets are also aligned to existing contours.	do not sensitively respond to the topography, with building envelopes positioned on steep embankments or in gullies, resulting in significant fill. The proposed envelopes are therefore incompatible with the topography of the site.
5. Responsiveness to significant vegetation	The surrounding neighbourhood incorporates significant vegetation within road reserves and setbacks.	Some clusters of significant trees have been retained but the proposal should further manipulate and articulate built form and street structure to preserve large native trees. A significant portion of the ecologically sensitive vegetation to the rear of the site is encroached by building envelope footprints. A compatible masterplan structure would be designed with more clusters and mature trees being retained.
6. Responsiveness to natural features	The surrounding localities are clearly separated from dense vegetation with a buffer. Landform, native vegetation, ecological communities, and water courses should be considered in any design. Natural elements should define and shape the structure of new elements in places.	The proposed building envelopes encroach too far into the ecologically significant vegetation with no buffer provided.
7. Predominant residential typology and residential mix	The predominant residential typology and character of the surrounding context is low rise residential comprising single detached houses.	The proposed predominant typology predominantly comprises bulky residential flat buildings, making up 69% of the buildings across the site, which is far removed from the neighbourhood suburban setting and deemed incompatible.
8. Building height	The existing maximum building height in the locality is 2 storeys.	The proposed number of storeys ranges from 2-7 storeys, with the predominant building form being 4-7 storey residential flat buildings. Building heights up to 7 storeys are not compatible with the surrounding low rise residential area. A 6-storey interface to North Rocks Road is not an appropriate height as it is incompatible with the North

		Rocks Shopping Centre building height that is perceived as one storey from the street (currently sitting lower within the landform). The argument of locating density within the suppression of the landform is not supported as it will require significant fill and the height would be perceptible from within the site, from new streets and public spaces. The proposed height is deemed to be incompatible with the locality.
9. Building footprint and site coverage	The building footprints of the surrounding context cover approximately 30% of each lot with an average length and depth of 17m. Compatible building footprints would be appropriately broken up with articulation and mid-block breaks at the DA stage. Building lengths should be less than 60m and the depth a maximum of 21m; this to achieve appropriate urban scale and necessary apartment amenity.	The proposed building envelopes are excessive, with lengths up to 70m and depths to 26m that will contribute to perceived building bulk and scale. This is further exacerbated by other factors such as reduced street widths and setbacks throughout the site.
10. Overshadowing and privacy impacts to development outside and within the site	Existing dwellings within the neighbourhood are modest in scale, allowing adequate sunlight access and privacy to adjoining dwellings. Building height and bulk should align with adjacent development to limit overshadowing impacts.	The 3 storey townhouses located close to the eastern and western property boundaries are not considered compatible as they would have potential adverse impacts on the public and private domain in terms of solar access and privacy, including adjacent residential properties.
11. Solar access to the public domain and private open space	Existing dwellings within the neighbourhood are modest in scale, allowing adequate sunlight access to adjoining private open spaces and the public domain. The street structure and built form bulk should be articulated to ensure sufficient solar access is provided to streets, the public and private open space.	The proposed building heights and street wall could have impact on solar access to these spaces. The narrow and long courtyards, associated to the building height do not guarantee appropriate solar access to the communal open spaces.
12. Front setbacks and landscape character	The locality has a distinct landscape character with an abundance of mature native trees, with large front and rear setbacks of 10m to ensure the preservation of these trees.	The proposed generic application of a 3m setback does not respond to the existing or proposed context. Building setbacks should relate to the

		street hierarchy, allow for retention of mature trees, provide physical separation of built form from the street, allow for landscaping to mitigate the perceived building bulk, and be utilised to help meet deep soil requirements.

Table 2: Urban design capability test