



Our Ref: UDRP18/0006
Contact: Gavin Cherry
Telephone: (02) 4732 8125

14 March 2018

A Saouma
PO Box 84
Merrylands NSW 2160

Dear Mr Saouma

**Urban Design Review Panel Meeting
Proposed Development - Residential Flat Building - 18 Units
Address - 1 Station Lane PENRITH NSW 2750**

Thank you for attending Council's Urban Design Review Panel on 7 March 2018.

The attached minutes are provided as a summary of the key points raised during the Panel meeting. We hope that you have found participation in the Panel process beneficial and that it will assist both yourself and Council reaching a determination of your proposal.

If you require any further assistance regarding the attached advice please contact me on (02) 4732 8125.

Yours faithfully

**Gavin Cherry
Development Assessment Coordinator**

Please note: this advice is to assist you with your development proposal. It is not a full assessment of the proposal. The applicant is responsible to address all relevant requirements.

Penrith City Council
PO Box 60, Penrith
NSW 2751 Australia
T 4732 7777
F 4732 7958
penrithcity.nsw.gov.au

Urban Design Review Panel Advice

Date of Issue	14 March 2018
Reference	UDRP18/0006
Proposal	Residential Flat Building - 18 Units
Address	1 Station Lane PENRITH NSW 2750
Key Issues	<p>The proposal has been considered having regard to State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings, the Apartment Design Guide, Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010 and Penrith Development Control Plan 2014.</p> <p>The proposal as tabled does not suitably respond to the constraints of the site or sufficiently demonstrate compliance with key requirements within the above instruments and policy documents. Below are matters to be addressed, and recommendations to inform an amended design if a proposal is pursued on this site:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site does not comply with LEP 2010 being an allotment significantly less than 800sqm in site area. A clause 4.6 variation to this lot size requirement is not supportable as the site area requirements are necessary to ensure sufficient separation and setbacks between built form to achieve the objectives of the SEPP, ADG and LEP. As such, acquisition of the closed road (laneway) adjacent to the subject site is necessary and this land must be incorporated into the development design as useable space contributing to the built form and / or landscape design of the development. - The proposed basement design does not provide for sufficient boundary setbacks and opportunities to reduce or remove the basement ramp, through measures such as a vehicle lift, would assist in minimising the extent of the basement construction and should be further explored. - The ground floor design is not suitable and does not provide an identifiable entry into the development, common open space at ground level, suitable waste collection arrangements or landscape treatments. Acquisition of the closed laneway will allow for side access and an identifiable entry point into the core of the development. The current proposal with entry pathway and lobby wrapping around a bin compound is a poor and unsupportable outcome. - It is recommended that a maximum of 3 units per level is likely achievable when ADG compliant setbacks and solar penetration is provided for. The proposal does not provide compliant 6m setbacks to the western boundary (and the eastern boundary if the laneway is not acquired) and any suggestions for reduced setbacks (to 3m) must meet the objectives of the separation standards in the ADG. These requirements are not just about setbacks, but also opportunities for green space separation and visual breaks between built form. Consideration of reduced setbacks will be dependent on

the landscape solution and the provision of deep soil, or raised planter beds that can accommodate tree canopy plantings between point encroachments.

- A reduction in setbacks to the southern and northern boundaries is reasonable due to the existing setback of the northern RFB development (greater than 12m) and the drainage infrastructure to the south. Variations must however still be justified having regard to the ADG objectives and SEPP principles.
- The proposal provides a variation to building height which is not suitable given the surrounding established lower built form and the battle axe / constrained nature of this site. The deletion of roof top common open space, and its embellishment at ground level (such as the closed laneway) will remove the need for the extent of lift overrun proposed and will enable a more compliant built form. Where the built form cannot comply, a deletion of a level is required unless the architectural roof feature provisions within LEP 2010 can be satisfied (excluding any habitable floor area). These provisions do not extend to include part of a residential unit storey.
- The ADG establishes floor to ceiling and floor to floor requirements. The proposal does not appear to achieve these requirements and compliance must be demonstrated. Minimum ceiling heights of 2.7m are outlined within Objective 4C-1 for habitable rooms with 3.1m floor to floor heights outlined within Figure 4C.5. This must also be considered in conjunction with building height requirements detailed above, and further reinforces the need to reduce the scale of the development and number of units proposed.
- The proposal provides for 6 storey's without stepped building form which does not comply with the ADG as level 5 and 6 requires a 9m setback (4.5m to non-habitable rooms). The proposal requires stepping of the built form at level 5 and 6 to both the western and eastern boundaries to address these requirements noting the adjacent development to the east is only 4 storey's in height and to the west is indicated to be 3 storey's in height. The scale of the proposal must suitably transition and respond to the existing built form that surrounds it. Revised plans should show how the surrounding built form character has informed the proposed development in terms of setback, separation and building height. The landscape design will be critical in considering any variations or departures from the ADG or SEPP provisions.
- A coordinated waste management solution that addresses waste collection arrangements for the subject site and adjacent developments should be discussed with Council's waste management officers as the solution to waste management should not be at the expense of good urban design outcomes with respect to ground floor design treatments and landscaping outcomes.
- The acquisition of the closed laneway and the resulting incorporation of this land into the development must be meaningful and ensure that a suitable development outcome is achieved on the site. This is necessary to ensure that the objectives of the zone and the lot size restrictions within the LEP have been met. The closed laneway and the existing easements that restrict development potential in the laneway must be carefully considered, integrated

into the design of the development and ensure that any access or maintenance requirements to Council's drainage infrastructure are integrated into the landscape design of the space.

The above comments are to be addressed in conjunction with the advice provided within separate pre-lodgement meeting discussions which occurred on the same day as the urban design review panel meeting. A further urban design review panel meeting is required once a revised design is prepared, which addresses the above comments and satisfies the requirements outlined within the pre-lodgement meeting. Where a conflict between pre-lodgement and urban design requirements arises, this should be discussed with Council prior to finalisation of any plans for the lodgement of the development application.