

The General Manager  
Strathfield Council  
PO Box 120  
STRATHFIELD NSW 2135

**STRATHFIELD COUNCIL  
RECEIVED**

**DA2020/080  
7 September 2020**

**Attention: Ms. Nicole Doughty**

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. DA2020/080  
2 EASTBOURNE ROAD, HOMEBUSH WEST**

We refer to Development Application (DA) No. DA2020/080 in relation to the property at No. 2 Eastbourne Road, Homebush West (the site). As you are aware, we represent the Applicant in relation to this DA.

The purpose of this correspondence is to respond to and provide additional information in relation to the issues raised in Council's letter of 23 June 2020 and the comments made by Council's Design Review Panel on 15 July 2020. To this end, we enclose the following:

- amended architectural package prepared by Bechara Chan;
- Flood Planning Report prepared by Zait Engineering Solutions;
- Tree Root Mapping prepared by GBG Australia;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Management Plan prepared by Redgum Horticultural; and
- Stormwater Concept Design prepared by SGC Consulting Engineers.

The following is a summary of the main amendments which have been made to the proposal:

- general changes:
  - changes to levels in response to flood report;
  - reduce overall building height by 2.249m;
  - deletion of lift overrun;
  - increase building setbacks for trees/branches above ground
  - deletion of 3 units;
- basement level 1:
  - increase basement setbacks to retain trees 1, 3, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 26;
  - provision for 16 bicycle spaces
  - enlarge bin room and provide bin hoist;
  - relocate fire stair;
  - deletion of 3 parking spaces;
- basement level 2:
  - redesign of storage;

- relocate fire stair;
- delete two (2) parking spaces;
- increase basement setbacks to retain trees 1, 3, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 26;
- relocate plant rooms;
- ground floor:
  - relocate residential entry to front of building, including glazing on the southern side of the entry;
  - relocation of temporary bin holding room and provision of bin hoist;
  - provision of landscaping along the southern side of the site between the driveway and boundary;
  - general redesign of units;
- first floor:
  - deletion of angled slot windows on the southern elevation and provision of awning windows;
  - general redesign of units to improve amenity;
- second floor:
  - deletion of angled slot windows on the southern elevation and provision of awning windows;
  - general redesign of units to improve amenity;
- third floor:
  - provision of ventilating corridor;
  - increase to rear setback in the north eastern corner of the site to accommodate retention of Trees 21 and 23;
  - increase to southern side setback to Unit 3.01;
  - increase to northern side setback to Unit 3.03 to accommodate retention of Tree 26;
  - general redesign of units to improve amenity;
- fourth floor:
  - deletion of one (1) unit;
  - increase front setback from 11.475m to in excess of 20m;
  - provision of communal roof terrace including tables, bench seating and BBQ facilities and perimeter planting;
- roof level;
  - deletion of lift overrun; and
  - reduction in size of communal roof terrace and provide bench seats, tables and BBQ facilities with stair access from level below.

**Table 1** below provides a comparison between the original proposal and the amended development.

*Table 1: Numeric aspects of the proposed development (calculations courtesy of Bechara Chan & Associates)*

	<b>Original Proposal</b>	<b>Amended Proposal</b>
<b>Site area</b>	1,565.1m <sup>2</sup>	No change
<b>Site frontage</b>	16.165m	No change
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	3,033.88m <sup>2</sup> including 1,627.56m <sup>2</sup> associated with affordable dwellings	2,926.57m <sup>2</sup> including 1,249.42m <sup>2</sup> associated with affordable dwellings
<b>Floor Space Ratio</b>	1.943:1 including 0.53:1 associated with affordable dwellings	1.87:1 including 0.42:1 associated with affordable dwellings
<b>Building height</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 12.045m to 12.465 to Third floor roof</li> <li>● 15.415m to Fourth floor roof</li> <li>● 18.38m to stair and lift overrun</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 11.745m to 12.065m to Third floor roof</li> <li>● 15.2m to Fourth floor roof</li> <li>● 16.13m to upper communal roof terrace balustrade</li> </ul>
<b>Storeys</b>	5 + roof terrace	5 + roof terrace
<b>Communal open space</b>	394.88m <sup>2</sup> or 25.2% of the site including:	392.22m <sup>2</sup> or 25.1% of the site including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 158.21m<sup>2</sup> at the rear of ground floor</li> <li>● 119.57m<sup>2</sup> at fourth floor</li> </ul>

	Original Proposal	Amended Proposal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>158.21m<sup>2</sup> at the rear of ground floor</li> <li>236.67m<sup>2</sup> at roof level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>114.44m<sup>2</sup> at roof level</li> </ul>
<b>Landscaped Area</b>	485.83m <sup>2</sup> or 31% of the site	521m <sup>2</sup> or 33.3% of the site
<b>Deep soil</b>	350.91m <sup>2</sup> or 22.4% of the site	320.97m <sup>2</sup> or 20.5% of the site
<b>Parking</b>	39 spaces incl: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 visitor/carwash bay</li> <li>5 visitor spaces</li> <li>29 resident spaces</li> <li>6 accessible spaces</li> </ul>	34 spaces incl: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 visitor/carwash bay</li> <li>1 visitor spaces</li> <li>26 resident spaces</li> <li>6 accessible spaces</li> </ul>
<b>Dwellings</b>	38 (including 6 adaptable), incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 x 1 bed</li> <li>23 x 2 bed</li> <li>3 x 3 bed</li> </ul>	35 (including 6 adaptable), incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 x 1 bed</li> <li>20 x 2 bed</li> <li>4 x 3 bed</li> </ul>
<b>Affordable dwellings</b>	21	16

The following sections provide a response to the issues raised in Council's correspondence and the DRP's recommendations.

## 1.0 COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

**Table 2** below provides a detailed response to the issues raised in Council's correspondence dated 23 June 2020.

*Table 2: Response to Council correspondence*

ISSUE	RESPONSE
1) Design Review Panel	Refer to <b>Table 3</b> below.
2) Building Height	<p>The overall height of the proposal has been reduced by 2.249m and the apparent bulk to the street has been substantially reduced with the deletion of a unit at the front of Fourth Floor level.</p> <p>An amended Clause 4.6 variation request accompanies this correspondence.</p>
3) Floor Space	Bechara Chan & Associates have reviewed the GFA of the proposal and confirm that the figure in <b>Table 1</b> above has been calculated in accordance with the SLEP 2012 definition.
4) Tree Retention	<p>The proposal is accompanied by a detailed Root Mapping report along with an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Management Plan which address Council's comments in relation to tree removal.</p> <p>The proposal has been amended to retain Trees 1, 3, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 26 with management measures provided to ensure the health and longevity of these trees.</p>
5) General Design Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building height</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed above, the height and bulk of the proposal has been substantially reduced.</p> <p>Refer to amended Clause 4.6 variation request accompanies this correspondence.</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public domain interface</li>   <li>• Clothes drying facilities</li>   <li>• Bicycle racks</li>   <li>• Housing diversity</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed above, the streetscape presentation of the proposal has been substantially improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reducing the level of the ground floor level slab by 400mm following preparation of a detailed Flood Report, which accompanies this correspondence;</li> <li>• relocating the main pedestrian entrance to the centre of the front elevation to activate the street and provide a more pleasant residential environment;</li> <li>• provision of additional landscaping along the southern side boundary;</li> <li>• relocating the temporary bin holding room to the northern elevation, away from main circulation areas and provision of an internal hoist;</li> <li>• provision of a revised landscape design for the front setback.</li> </ul> <p>Clothes lines are provided within the rear communal open space at ground floor level.</p> <p>Bicycle parking for 16 bikes is provided within Basement level 2.</p> <p>The proposal provides thirty (35) apartments including sixteen (16) affordable dwellings which are distributed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• four (4) dwellings at ground floor (50% of units at this level);</li> <li>• four (4) dwellings at first floor (50% of units at this level);</li> <li>• four (4) dwellings at second floor (50% of units at this level);</li> <li>• three (3) dwellings at third floor (42.3% of units at this level); and</li> <li>• one (1) at fourth floor (25% of units at this level).</li> </ul>
<p>6) Additional information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elevation plans of 4 Eastbourne Road and 5 Hornsey Road showing overshadowing impacts at 9am, 12pm and 3pm on 21 June</li>   <li>• 3D height plane of the proposed development and building height development standard</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed shadow analysis accompanies this correspondence.</p> <p>This will be provided shortly under separate cover.</p>
<p>7) SEPP 65 – Design Verification Statement</p>	<p>Bechara Chan &amp; Associates has prepared a detailed Design Verification Statement which accompanies this correspondence.</p>
<p>8) Waste Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of garbage collection area.</li>   <li>• Conflict between bin room and pedestrian entry</li> </ul>	<p>The garbage collection area has been relocated to the north western corner of the building at ground floor level and is setback approximately 9.005m from the front boundary.</p> <p>The bin room is now completely separated from the pedestrian entry to the building.</p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk collection area to accommodate 4m<sup>2</sup> per 10 units</li> <li>Provision of bins and bin room layout</li> </ul>	<p>A bulky storage waste room with an area of 20.93m<sup>2</sup> is provided at Basement level 1. This exceeds the minimum 14.2 required.</p> <p>The proposal accommodates sufficient area to contain the minimum required storage of bins with easy access for a caretaker.</p>
9) Stormwater Matters	A revised Stormwater Concept Plan accompanies this correspondence.

## 2.0 DESIGN REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

**Table 3** below provides a detailed response to the issues raised in the Design Review Panel report and recommendations from its meeting on 15 July 2020.

*Table 3: Response to Design Review Panel recommendations*

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>The Panel notes that this development application (DA) has been lodged pursuant to the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 (ARH SEPP).</p> <p>Under SEPP Affordable Rental Housing 2009 an additional 0.5:1 bonus floor space ratio applies to the proposed development. This brings the total permissible FSR for the site to 1.95:1 (1.45:1 + 0.5:1).</p> <p>The Panel considers that the proposal is a significant overdevelopment of the site that if built would deliver an unacceptable level of residential amenity for residents.</p> <p>The site is highly constrained by its irregular shape which impacts on its ability to satisfactorily accommodate a development of the proposed scale and density.</p> <p>Maximising the allowable FSR including the bonus FSR results in a development that is non-compliant with the maximum building height for the site as well as a number of non-compliances with the Apartment Design Guidelines which adversely impacts on the relationship with neighbouring developments as well as impacts on the amenity of the apartments.</p> <p>Primary impacts resulting from the excessive FSR include building height non-compliance, side and rear setback non-compliance, compromised floor plate layouts and cross ventilation, solar access non-compliances, removal of significant trees due to non-compliant setbacks and the basement design.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The GFA of the proposal has been reduced by 107.31m<sup>2</sup> and three (3) units have been deleted. Amenity issues have been addressed by Bechara Chan &amp; Associates as discussed in the Design Verification Statement accompanying this correspondence.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The amended proposal has an FSR of 1.87:1 which is less than the maximum 1.95:1 which is permitted with the affordable housing bonus. The amended proposal achieves suitable amenity to the neighbouring properties (refer to Clause 4.6 variation request) and achieves satisfactory residential amenity (refer to the Design Verification Statement accompanying this correspondence).</p> <p>Refer to Clause 4.6 variation request and Design Verification Statement accompanying this correspondence.</p> <p>The amended proposal retains trees 1, 3, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 26.</p>
<b>Tree Removal</b>	

ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>The proposal includes the removal of a large number of trees. The large native trees provide significant amenity to the subject and surrounding sites. The Panel recommends that the applicant work with the Council's Arborist to identify the trees that are required to be retained. The basement is excessive and its size results from the large number of units proposed. A smaller building footprint and a smaller basement would allow for deep soil and trees to be retained.</p>	<p>The proposal has been substantially amended with adjustments to setback at both basement levels as well as upper levels to permit the retention of trees 1, 3, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 26.</p> <p>A detailed discussion of the existing trees is provided in the Tree Root Mapping prepared by GBG Australia and the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Management Plan prepared by Redgum Horticultural which accompany this correspondence.</p>
<p><b>Location of garbage holding bay</b></p> <p>The garbage holding bay is located at ground level adjacent to the pedestrian entry. The location of this area is not suitable as it impacts on the configuration of the entry. It will also likely conflict with pedestrian traffic on collection day and pose odour nuisance both to future tenants as they pass this location upon entry and existing the building as well as to the north facing apartments in the adjoining flat building. The garbage holding bay should be relocated in an area which is separate from the entrance.</p>	<p>The garbage collection area has been relocated to the north western corner of the building at ground floor level and is setback approximately 9.005m from the front boundary. The bin room is now completely separated from the pedestrian entry to the building and will not impact on the amenity of the adjoining residential flat building to the south.</p>
<p><b>Pedestrian Entry</b></p> <p>The entry as proposed is awkwardly located down a long and narrow pathway to the side of the building, essentially half way down the site and adjacent to the basement driveway.</p> <p>The pedestrian entry should ideally be relocated to the front of the building for easy identification and improved interaction with the street and be adequate separated from the driveway for safety.</p> <p>The panel acknowledges that this will result in the front room to be deleted/relocated however will improve the presentation of the development to the street and improve the amenity and safety for future occupants.</p>	<p>The proposed building entry has been relocated to a central position within the front elevation to provide a prominent and pleasant environment for residents and visitors.</p> <p>The southern wall of the entry is completely glazed to maximise natural light and amenity for the space.</p>
<p><b>Sunlight</b></p> <p>The Panel questions if the existing residential flat building to the south will continue to receive sufficient sunlight to its apartments due to the non-compliant side setback. The panel recommends that the applicant undertakes a study that demonstrates how many units currently receive sunlight and how many will lose sunlight for Council's proper assessment. The applicant should synthesise this analysis and ensure that the objectives of Part 3B-2 of the ADG are complied with.</p>	<p>The proposal has been amended to reduce the bulk and scale of the building, and adjustments have also been made to southern side setbacks in order to minimise overshadowing impacts in relation to the adjoining residential flat building at No. 4 Eastbourne Road.</p> <p>Bechara Chan &amp; Associates have prepared detailed solar analysis diagrams which accompany this correspondence.</p> <p>Part 3B-2 of the ADG refers to solar access being in accordance with that specified at Part 4A which requires:</p> <p><i>"Living rooms and private open spaces of at least 70% of apartments in a building receive a minimum of 2 hours direct sunlight between 9 am and 3 pm at mid winter in the Sydney Metropolitan Area and in</i></p>

ISSUE	RESPONSE
	<p><i>the Newcastle and Wollongong local government areas.”</i></p> <p>The diagrams show that all north-facing openings and balconies to No. 4 Eastbourne Road will receive solar access at 2pm and 3pm on 21 June and indeed all openings apart from one (1) receive sunlight at 1pm on 21 June. To this end, the building at No. 4 Eastbourne Road will receive solar access in compliance with Part 4A of the ADG.</p> <p>Similarly, the western elevation of Nos. 5-9 Hornsey Road are not affected by the proposal at all until 1pm on 21 June.</p>
<p><b>Cross ventilation</b></p> <p>The Panel questions the cross-ventilation calculations provided by the applicant and does not agree that the development achieves compliance with the cross ventilation requirements of the Apartment Design Guidelines.</p> <p>The applicant should review apartments 1.08, 2.08, 3.02, 3.08m and 4.02 as the panel recommends that these apartments are not cross ventilated in the current design.</p>	<p>Bechara Chan &amp; Associates has reviewed the proposal and prepared a detailed Design Verification Statement which accompanies this correspondence. The DVS indicates that 23 or 66% of proposed apartments achieve cross ventilation in accordance with the ADG.</p>
<p><b>Setbacks</b></p> <p>The setbacks to all sides of the development are unacceptable and do not comply with the setback requirements to the ADG. The Panel acknowledges the irregular shape of the site however, advised that the non-compliant setbacks clearly indicates that the development is an over development of the site and a development of this scale is not feasibly due to site constraint. The panel recommend that all ADG setbacks are complied with to preserve the amenity of both the subject site and the surrounding buildings.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposal does not comply with the setback requirements of the ADG. Notwithstanding, as discussed herein, the proposal has been substantially amended in order to reduce the bulk and scale of the proposal, to enable the retention of a number of significant trees and to ensure satisfactory levels of amenity both within the proposed development and also neighbouring properties. To this end, and having regard to the fact that the site is considered to be an infill site, with residential flat buildings to the east and south, the proposed setbacks are considered acceptable.</p>
<p><b>Apartment Layout</b></p> <p>The floor plate layout to a number of apartments is less than satisfactory and results in impractical and useless spaces that although add to the overall size of the apartments does not increase room size or amenity.</p> <p>A number of apartments include unreasonably long corridors/hallways, in particular units 1.06, 2.06 and 3.06 have awkwardly shaped long and useless corridors and a number of apartments have awkward shaped rooms, especially, units 1.05, 2.05 and 3.05. The Panel recognises that the irregular shaped allotment impact on the built form to some extent however, the compromised floor plate layouts is a direct result of maximising yield.</p>	<p>Bechara Chan &amp; Associates has reviewed the proposed layouts and made a number of design changes to ensure more efficient unit layouts.</p>
<p><b>Adaptable Units</b></p> <p>The Panel notes that the adaptable apartments appear below the required size to be easily adapted into ample sized apartments post adaptation and recommends that this is considered further in consultation with an access consultant.</p>	<p>Bechara Chan &amp; Associates has reviewed the proposed adaptable units and provided post-adaptation plans.</p>

### 3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the issues raised in Council's correspondence have been generally addressed.

Should you require any clarification or additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned prior to determining the Application.

Yours sincerely,



Genevieve Slattery  
*Principal Planner*