



Contact: Enguang Lee
Phone: 02 9228 6579
Fax: 02 9228 6540
Email: enguang.lee@planning.nsw.gov.au
Our ref: MP11_0048

Mr Walter Gordon
Manager Planning and Development
Meriton
Level 11, Meriton Tower
528 Kent Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Mr Gordon,

**Preferred Project Report
'Stage 2' Residential Development - Buildings 6, 9 & 10
61 Mobbs Lane, Epping (MP11_0048)**

With reference to the Preferred Project Report (PPR) dated January 2012 received by the Department on 12 January 2012 for 'Stage 2' residential development at the above site.

The Department has reviewed the PPR and requires additional information and clarification to enable project approval. The required information is outlined in **Attachment 1** and includes those details raised by Parramatta Council and other public agencies. It is requested that a revised PPR be prepared as the PPR will be included as an 'approval document' under any project approval.

Your contact officer for this project, Enguang Lee, can be contacted on 9228 6579 or via email on enguang.lee@planning.nsw.gov.au. Please mark all correspondence regarding the project to the attention of the contact officer.

Yours sincerely

Heather Warton
**Director
Metropolitan and Regional Projects North**

20/02/12

Attachment 1

1. Project Description

The project description summary outlined in Section 2.1 shall be amended to ensure consistency with the submitted plans and building schedules. Inconsistencies between the summary and submitted plans are summarised below:

- the summary states Building 9 provides 8 adaptable units, while the plans/schedules indicate 7 adaptable units
- the summary states Building 9 provides 86 car spaces, while the plans/schedules indicate 85 car spaces
- the summary states Building 6 provides 98 car spaces, while the plans/schedules indicate 102 car spaces
- the summary states Building 6 provides 25 bicycle parking spaces, while the plans indicate only 16 bicycle parking spaces

The project description shall include the 6 proposed visitor car parking spaces for the 'recreational facilities'.

The project description shall include the GFA summaries for each building.

2. Building Height and Built Form

Building 9

The Department considers that Building 9 exceeds the maximum building height as defined under the concept approval. Parramatta Council raise similar concerns over building height. The concept approval allows for a maximum of 6 storeys above ground level which includes an allowance for basement parking to above finished ground level up to 1.2m. Building 9 appears to exceed the storey limit resulting in a 7-storey building element on the western part of the building. The proponent shall illustrate the natural and future ground levels on all elevation plans and demonstrate compliance with the 6-storey building height limit for the site.

The concept approval indicates a stepping down from the eastern section of Building 9 to the western section of Building 9 to follow the natural contours of the land. The proposal is inconsistent with the concept approval as it is proposed that the building steps up, not down, to the western section of the building.

The concept approval requires that Building 9 is reduced in depth in the centre of the building to enable heavy landscaping along the northern boundary adjacent the neighbouring TAFE site. The proponent shall reconsider the built form of Building 9 to demonstrate consistency with the concept approval.

The height of the proposed retaining wall on the southern elevation is inconsistent with the objectives of the *Residential Flat Design Code* and would result in an imposing blank wall at pedestrian level. Further consideration shall be given to ground level elevation and landscape treatments to mitigate the visual impact of imposing ground level facades.

Building 6

The concept approval prescribes a stepping down from a 6-storey element to the eastern elevation to a 5-storey element to the western elevation. The height of the fire stair roof also exceeds the 6 storey element. Roof design shall be reconsidered accordingly to ensure consistency with the concept approval.

3. Architectural Plans

Generally, more detail is required relating to the context of the individual buildings and their immediate surroundings. The submitted plans omit contextual detail, particularly on the elevation drawings.

Building 6

- the setback distances between Building 6 and Buildings 2 & 8 shall be illustrated in the elevation or separate section drawings
- the relationship between Building 6 and the tennis court/gym/retail complex shall be more clearly illustrated. Details of finished floor levels shall be included to indicate building height in context with the finished tennis court level

- the south-east elevation shall include ground level detail between Building 6 and Building 2 to illustrate the natural/future ground level at pedestrian level
- plans shall more clearly illustrate elevational treatment at pedestrian level at the south-west corner of the building
- further annotation in drawings A0612 and A0621 is requested for the retaining wall/landscaped area between Building 6 and the tennis court. Further detail is required for the car park entrance and driveway
- shadow diagrams shall be amended to include the tennis court

Building 9

- the setback to Building 8 shall be clearly illustrated in plans
- the south elevation shall include further details of the driveway/car park entry and natural/future ground levels to clearly illustrate the building in its topographic context
- the east, west and south elevations do not show roof and plant detail

Building 10

- clarification is required regarding the treatment of the area above the car park entrance (at Level 1) adjacent the tennis court which wraps around the east and north elevation of the building. It appears that this Level 1 element protrudes beyond the north facing pergolas providing external access to Level 1 apartments however little detail is provided
- annotations for resident and visitor car parking on the tennis court shall be corrected

Cover sheets

- the cover sheets shall be amended to reflect any layout changes in the Stage 2 development i.e. the amendments to the shop

4. SEPP65/RFDC compliance

The department considers that the proposal does not wholly comply with SEPP 65 and the Residential Flat Design Code. The following areas of non-compliance is listed below:

- Building depth – Buildings 6, 9 & 10
- Building separation – between Building 9 and Building 8
- Fences and Walls – the retaining wall on the southern elevation of Building 9 is too high
- Balcony Depths – Building 9 has balconies 1.8m in depth, less than the 2m requirement
- Internal circulation – Building 10 has up to 10 apartments accessed from the western lift core
- natural ventilation – the Department considers that only 50% of apartments are cross ventilated. Council requires all toilets adjoining external walls to have operable windows

The proponent shall demonstrate that where compliance is not met, that adequate residential amenity can still be achieved. For example, where the 6 storey element of Building 9 is less than 18m from Building 8, it shall be demonstrated that visual privacy can be achieved through the use of appropriate mitigation measures.

5. Landscaping

The PPR contained landscape proposals surrounding Building 9 only. Landscaping plans are required for all buildings and shall be amended to reflect changes proposed in the PPR. Landscape proposals shall be in accordance with the approved concept plan and tree master plan.

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

Details are required for the area around the tennis court adjacent Buildings 6 & 10. Detail is required at Level 1 level above the car park for Building 10 and its relationship to the adjoining terrace above community room. The retaining wall adjacent and below Building 6 warrants particular landscape attention.

The PPR proposal removes significant soft landscaping from the area surrounding the shop and community room. Landscaping proposals shall seek to soften the hard landscaping and terrace area and consider solar shading to positively contribute to amenity in this common area.

6. Two-storey Retail/Community Room Building

Council has raised concern regarding the visual impact of the proposed 2-storey building that would replace a single storey shop. This results in impacts upon FSR, landscaping, visual impact and amenity. The impacts of this redesign have not been discussed or addressed in the PPR. A photomontage of this 2-storey building should be included within the PPR.

7. Waste Collection Vehicles

The PPR states that vehicular access to basement levels in Buildings 6, 9 & 10 by waste collection vehicles will not be required as waste bins will be collected by a building manager for collection from the roadside.

The Department is satisfied with this arrangement however this is at variance to the arrangement at Buildings 4, 5, 7 & 8 where vehicular access to the basement was available to waste vehicles. Such vehicular access was included in the proponent's Statement of Commitment in previous project applications. Consistency in waste collection arrangements between the Stage 1 and Stage 2 is preferred.

8. Bicycle Parking Provision

The Department acknowledges the adequate provision for bicycle parking for future occupiers of the site contained within the basement of the buildings in accordance with Parramatta Council's DCP. However, provision shall be made for at-grade visitor bicycle parking provision. Bicycle parking shall be provided in a weather protected location and near building entrances with high levels of casual surveillance.