

# ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

MP 11\_0048

61 MOBBS LANE, EPPING – STAGE 2

MARCH 2012

## CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 ISSUES RAISED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING.....	2
3.0 CONCLUSION .....	10

## ANNEXURES

1. Letter from DoPI
2. Concept Approval
3. Architectural Plans
4. Landscape Plans
5. Tree Master Plan
6. Approved Plans – NGL
7. Ventilation Plans
8. Building Depth Plans
9. Photomontage – Community Precinct

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report addresses issues raised by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure which incorporate comments from Parramatta City Council.

The following fundamental design changes have been undertaken in response to key issues raised by the various submissions:

### Building 6

- The stair access leading to the building roof has been removed.
- The lift overrun has been minimised in size.

### Building 9

- The western portion of the southern elevation has been reduced in height.
- The basement has been dropped further into the ground. This has necessitated the need for two independent basements with two separate entrances. The western portion of the building has one level of underground parking. The eastern portion of the building has two levels of underground parking.
- The podium of the basement has been reduced, and is now 6m from the rear northern boundary line and for increased deep soil and screen landscaping.

### Building 10

- There are no design changes to Building 10.

### Recreational Area

- GFA areas have been updated.

Additional design changes of a minor nature and clarifications have also been undertaken to the architectural plans in response to issues raised.

This submission therefore seeks approval for Epping Park – Stage 2 Buildings 6, 9 and 10.

The buildings have been designed to satisfy the Residential Flat Design Code Guidelines, whilst having regard to compliance with the Building Code of Australia, Health and Safety requirements, Disability Standards and ensuring the design is of high quality.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Project Application, Epping Park – Stage 2 Buildings 6, 9, 10 and 17 (MP 11\_0048), at 61 Mobbs Lane, Epping was lodged with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure on 28 June 2011. The Preferred Project Report was lodged on the 12 January 2012, pertaining to Buildings 6, 9 and 10 only. Following a review from the Department of Planning and Parramatta Council, this report provides additional information justification.

## 2.0 ISSUES RAISED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure issued a letter on the 20 February 2012 outlining a number of issues to be considered for the Stage 2 Buildings.

Below is an updated Schedule of issues raised by the Department and reflects consistency with the approved Concept Plan and State Environment Planning Policy No. 65.

### 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**Issue:** The project description shall be amended to ensure consistency with the plans and building schedules.

**Response:** The Project Description is amended as follows:

#### Building 6:

- 76 x two bedroom apartments, 2 x three bedroom apartments, providing a total of 78 apartments;
- Included in the above are 10 adaptable units;
- Total number of car parking spaces provided is 98. (Included therein is 1 carwash bay, 19 visitor spaces and 4 adaptable spaces); and
- 25 bicycle spaces are provided.

#### Building 9:

- 9 x one bedroom apartments, 63 x two bedroom apartments providing a total of 72 apartments;
- Included in the above are 6 adaptable units;
- Total number of car parking spaces is 86. (Included therein is 1 car wash bay, 17 visitor spaces (3 are on street) and 7 adaptable spaces); and
- 24 bicycle spaces are provided.

#### Building 10:

- 6 x one bedroom apartments, 33 x two bedroom apartments, providing a total of 39 apartments;
- Included in the above are 4 adaptable units;
- The total number of car parking spaces is 50. Included therein is 1 car wash bay, 10 visitor spaces (4 are on street) and 2 adaptable spaces; and
- 13 bicycle spaces are provided.

#### Recreational Facilities:

- The existing tennis court is to be restored and upgraded.
- An enclosed swimming pool; and
- Retail shop is 120m<sup>2</sup>
- Community room is 42m<sup>2</sup>

## 2. BUILDING HEIGHT AND BUILT FORM

### Building 9

**Issue:** Building 9 exceeds the height as defined in the Concept Plan.

**Response:** Building 9 has been substantially reduced in height to comply with the Concept Plan. Refer to the plans at ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** The western part of Building 9 has a clear height limit of 4 storeys.

**Response:** The western part of the building has been reduced in height to comply with the Concept Plan approval.

**Issue:** A stepping down element has been incorporated into Building 9.

**Response:** The stepping down element has been redesigned to be within the approved Concept Plan envelope (refer to ***Annexure 3***).

**Issue:** Removal of central setback of Building 9.

**Response:** This central indented setback of Building 9 was specifically required to retain existing trees along the northern boundary. Following an assessment of all trees on the site in accordance with the approved Tree Masterplan, the Arborist identified the two large trees along the northern boundary were not in a healthy state. Subsequently, approval from the Department was granted. Refer to ***Annexure 5*** contains a copy of the tree removal consent.

The amended landscaping plans now shows screen more suitable planting along the entire northern boundary to provide better visual privacy towards the TAFE Horticulture open space area.

**Issue:** Height of retaining walls on the southern elevation of Building 9

**Response:** Retaining wall heights have been removed and will be planted out where indicated on the landscape plan.

### Building 6

**Issue:** The fire stair and lift on Building 6.

**Response:** The stairs, roof and other protruding elements have now been removed or reduced in size to comply with the height controls. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

### 3. ARCHITECTURAL PLANS

#### General Comment

**Issue:** The proposed Existing Natural Ground Levels (NGL) have not been shown.

**Response:** Previous approvals of Buildings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 (refer to ***Annexure 6***) did not show the existing ground levels being superseded by the approved road levels from the Early Works Approval (MP08\_0258) Therefore the future natural ground levels are shown and demonstrate compliance with the number of storeys stated in the approved Concept Plan.

**Issue:** Finished Floor Levels have not been indicated on all architectural Plans.

**Response:** Finished Floor levels are now provided on all Architectural Plans. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

#### Building 6

**Issue:** Setback distances between Building 6 and Building 2 and 8 have not been illustrated.

**Response:** Setback distance are now shown on the plans. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** The relationship between Building 6 and tennis court area.

**Response:** Further details on Building 6 and the adjoining tennis court area are now shown on the plans. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** The south east elevation does not include ground level detail between Building 6 and 2.

**Response:** Architectural plans have been amended to show detail between Buildings 2 and 6. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** South west corner of the building does not clearly indicate elevation at pedestrian level

**Response:** This has now been shown on the architectural plans. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** Further annotation in Drawings A0612 and A0621 is to be provided for the retaining wall/landscaped area between building 6 and tennis court.

**Response:** This has now been shown on the relevant plans. Refer to ***Annexure 3***. In particular refer to plans 602, 603 and 604 for additional detail.

**Issue:** Shadow diagrams to be amended to include tennis court.

**Response:** Shadow plans have been corrected. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

### **Building 9**

**Issue:** The setback to Building 8 and to Building 9 shall be clearly illustrated.

**Response:** Plans have been amended to reflect this setback. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** The south is to include further details of the driveway/car park entry.

**Response:** Plans have been amended to show details of driveway/ car park areas. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** The east, west and south elevations do not show roof and plant details.

**Response:** Plans have been amended accordingly. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

### **Building 10**

**Issue:** Building 10 clarification is required regarding the treatment of the area above the car park entrance at Level 1.

**Response:** Landscape Plans have been amended to address this issue. Refer to ***Annexure 4***.

**Issue:** Annotations for resident and visitor car parking on the tennis court should be corrected.

**Response:** Plans have been amended accordingly. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

### **Cover Sheets**

**Issue:** Cover Sheet to reflect any layout changes.

**Response:** Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

## **4. SEPP 65/RFDC COMPLIANCE**

**Issues:** Building Depth 6, 9 and 10.

**Response:** Building depths satisfy the Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC) in terms of providing adequate cross ventilation, privacy and architectural design. The depth of each building has been governed by the shape and orientation of the envelopes approved with the Concept Plan. A detailed outline of how each building satisfies the RFDC is provided below.

### **Building 6**

The envelope of Building 6 is long, rectangular in shape and has an east to west orientation. To provide the required cross ventilation, solar access, number of units to a lift core, the building has been planned and designed with modulated facades of varying depths and shapes, as a result of the envelope orientation.

The depth varies between 12m to 18m, and for the majority of the building. Adaptable Units have been the main cause for where the Building exceeds 18m as they require larger rooms and common corridors. In other instances, entrances into units have been extended into the corridors to comply with Building Code of Australia requirements in relation to fire egress (refer to **Annexure 8**).

### **Building 9**

The envelope for Building 9 is also of a long rectangular shape but has a north-south orientation. The depth of Building 9 has specifically been controlled by the envelope orientation to provide adequate solar access. The north-south orientation automatically triggers the need for cross-over units to comply with cross ventilation and more importantly solar access due to the long south facing facade that is governed by the Concept Approval. The cross-over units makes up most of the units and have a depth up to 18m.

Within Building 9 there are only 4 units per floor that the depths exceeds 18m. These 2 sets of individual units exceed the 18m depth due to the requirements to provide Adaptable Units, in addition to compliance with BCA egress requirements. Where the depth of the unit has exceeded 18m, the next set of units comply and are in an area of the building that has been designed as a separate building element to maximise privacy between units, cross ventilation and with an indented facade to ensure a high level of architectural detail is achieved (refer to **Annexure 8**).

### **Building 10**

The approved envelope of Building 10 is close to being square in shape and has a direct north-south orientation. The square shape of the envelope therefore makes the design of the building very complex in terms of complying with the mix of cross ventilation, solar access, BCA egress, privacy between balconies, the provision of Adaptable Units and ensuring a high quality design to comply with the SEPP65 Design Principles.

Building 10 predominately complies with the required depth. The width of the building above 18m is a result of the wider corridor required for wheelchair access into the Adaptable Unit. Furthermore, the square shaped envelope pushes the units closer together, and with only 1 lift/corridor, compliance with the BCA, depth compliance becomes difficult due to the concept approved envelopes. To compensate for where depths are over 18m, all facades, even where below or equal to 18m has been deliberately broken up (refer to **Annexure 8**).

In conclusion, all buildings have been designed and planned to take into account the culmination of the RFDC, the BCA, and provision of Adaptable Units that are larger than normal units. Overtime there has been no change to the RFDC yet the BCA, associated Australian Standards, Health and Safety requirements, and Adaptable Unit layout requirements, have resulted in more space required for units, corridors and service requirements which ultimately affects the way Residential Flat Buildings can comply with the RFDC.

Overall, the buildings have been designed appropriately to take into account all the relevant building codes, planning controls and guidelines. To this effect the buildings are considered appropriate in their context and for the site.

**Issue:** Separation between Buildings 8 and 9.

**Response:** Building separation is in accordance with the Concept Plan envelopes as shown in the architectural plans. The separation is in accordance with the SEPP65 RFDC guidelines as the primary windows/balcony aspects and view lines are towards the internal street and not the side building facades, which therefore removes any privacy conflicts. This approach was adopted for the setbacks between Buildings 7 and 8 that was subsequently approved by the PAC.

**Issue:** The retaining wall on the southern elevation of Building 9 is too high.

**Response:** The retaining wall has now been removed. Refer to ***Annexure 3***.

**Issue:** Balcony depth – Building 9 – should be 2m.

**Response:** Balcony dimensions have been rechecked and have a minimum depth of 2m. Refer to ***Annexure 3***. An appropriate condition can be imposed to ensure this takes place.

**Issue:** Building 10 – has 10 apartments off the western lift core.

**Response:** Building 10 has 7 apartments off the lift core.

**Issue:** Natural ventilation: DoP considers that only 50% of apartments are cross ventilated.

**Response:** Buildings have been purposefully modulated and windows carefully located to ensure that buildings have more than 60% of units with cross ventilation as outlined below:

- Building 6 – 68%;
- Building 9 – 66%;
- Building 10 – 83%.

Refer to ***Annexure 7***.

**Issue:** Council requires all toilets adjoining external walls to have operable windows.

**Response:** Toilets are generally located within a large bathroom and are not located against an external wall. These rooms are mechanically ventilated, which is standard design and building construction that has been consistently approved in all Mobbs Lane buildings and other local government areas.

## 5. **LANDSCAPING**

**Issue:** Landscaping plans are required for all buildings.

**Response:** Landscape plans have been provided for all buildings. Refer to ***Annexure 4***.

**Issue:** Landscape proposals shall be in accordance with the approved concept plan and tree master plan.

**Response:** Landscape plans are in accordance with the approved Concept Plan and Tree Masterplan.

**Issue:** Landscape proposals for the RE1 (Public Recreation) zone between Buildings 9 and 10 shall be of high quality.

**Response:** Noted. Refer to *Annexure 4*.

**Issue:** Landscape details are required for the area around the tennis court, adjacent Buildings 6 and 10.

**Response:** Refer to *Annexure 4*.

**Issue:** Detail is required at Level 1 above the car park for Building 10.

**Response:** Refer to *Annexure 3 and 4*.

**Issue:** The retaining wall adjacent and below Building 6 warrants particular landscape attention.

**Response:** Noted. Refer to *Annexure 4*.

**Issue:** The PPR removes significant soft landscaping from the area surrounding the shop and community room.

**Response:** This area forms the central focus of community facilities. Appropriate landscaping has been provided to account for the majority of pedestrian movement. A revised landscape plan is at *Annexure 4*.

**Issue:** Landscaping proposals shall seek to soften the hard landscaping and terrace area and consider solar shading.

**Response:** Substantial landscaping has now been provided to the original tennis court and terrace seating area, roof gardens, planter boxes and trees in deep soil areas are also shown. Refer to *Annexure 4*.

### **Two- Storey Retail/Community Room Building**

**Issue:** Concerned about the visual impact of a two storey structure, which has replaced an approved one storey structure. The additional height impacts upon FSR, Landscaping, visual impact and amenity.

**Response:** The retail/community room building is a stepped building that is tucked into a steep embankment. On the lower level is the shop with a floor space of 120sqm, which is compliant with the Concept Plan approval. Also at this level a community room of 42sqm has been introduced for Body Corporate meetings.

On an upper level there is a community swimming pool, spa and gymnasium, which is setback by a minimum of 6m to provide visual relief. Fronting the swimming pool is a large communal terrace that provides an open area for residents and adds significantly to the visual surveillance of this precinct.

The combination of the revised landscaping of the community area significantly improves the visual amenity whilst providing residents with a focal point that is modelled on other community estates.

**Issue:** A photomontage of the 2 storey building should be included in the PPR.

**Response:** A photomontage of the community building is attached to *Annexure 9*.

### **Waste Collection Vehicles**

**Issue:** The waste collection system varies between Stage 1 and 2.

**Response:** The waste collection system will involve a building manager taking garbage bins from within the basements and stored at specific location points in front of each building. These are shown on the architectural plans.

### **Bicycle Parking Provision**

**Issue:** Provision should be made for at grade bicycle parking provision. Bicycle parking shall be provided in a weather protected location and near building entrances with high levels of casual surveillance.

**Response:** To date bicycle parking spaces have been approved and located in the basement levels, close to the driveways and lifts. The current proposal continues on from this approach. From our experience, residents want to store bicycles in a secure location. The prime location is in the basements where they are not viewed from the public where stealing is more likely to occur.

Visitor bike spaces are also located in the basements as close as possible to the driveways. Of note, there has been limited use by visitors with bikes to the majority of our developments.

Notwithstanding this, we see the likely demand for bicycle parking to be in the vicinity of the shop and have therefore provided visitor bicycle spaces next to the street visitor car spaces. In addition, a condition of consent can be imposed that requires suitable "bicycle" direction signs to the parking spaces in the basements to improve accessibility for residents and visitors.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

Substantial changes have been made to the plans that takes into account the comments raised by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and Parramatta City Council. More specifically, building heights have been reduced to ensure compliance with the approved Concept Plan, and minor details on architectural plans are now shown as requested.

The buildings have been designed to satisfy the Residential Flat Design Code Guidelines, whilst having regard to compliance with the Building Code of Australia, Health and Safety requirements, Disability Standards, and ensuring the design is of high quality to comply with SEPP65.

Buildings, roads, garbage removal, bicycle parking and landscaping designs have been provided to be consistent with past Major Project Approvals for Buildings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8.

On balance the proposal has met the Director General requirements and is worthy of approval.