



Urban Planning Committee

Agenda: *Urban Planning Committee*

Date: *Monday, 12 February 2007*

Time: *6.00pm*

Outline of Meeting Protocol & Procedure:

- The Chairperson will call the Meeting to order and ask the Committee/Staff to present apologies or late correspondence.
- The Chairperson will commence the Order of Business as shown in the Index to the Agenda.
- At the beginning of each item the Chairperson will ask whether a member(s) of the public wish to address the Committee.
- If person(s) wish to address the Committee, they are allowed four (4) minutes in which to do so. Please direct comments to the issues at hand.
- If there are persons representing both sides of a matter (eg applicant/objector), the person(s) against the recommendation speak first.
- At the conclusion of the allotted four (4) minutes, the speaker resumes his/her seat and takes no further part in the debate unless specifically called to do so by the Chairperson.
- If there is more than one (1) person wishing to address the Committee from the same side of the debate, the Chairperson will request that where possible a spokesperson be nominated to represent the parties.
- The Chairperson has the discretion whether to continue to accept speakers from the floor.
- After considering any submissions the Committee will debate the matter (if necessary), and arrive at a recommendation (R items which proceed to Full Council) or a resolution (D items for which the Committee has delegated authority).

Delegated Authority (“D” Items):

- To require such investigations, reports or actions as considered necessary in respect of matters contained with the Business Agendas (and as may be limited by specific Council resolutions).
- Confirmation of Minutes of its Meeting.
- Any other matter falling within the responsibility of the Urban Planning Committee and not restricted by the Local Government Act or required to be a Recommendation to Full Council as listed below:

Recommendation only to the Full Council (“R” Items):

- Such matters as are specified in Section 377 of the Local Government Act and within the ambit of the Committee considerations.
- Broad strategic matters, such as:-
 - Town Planning Objectives; and
 - major planning initiatives.
- Matters not within the specified functions of the Committee.
- Matters requiring supplementary votes to Budget.
- Urban Design Plans and Guidelines.
- Local Environment Plans.
- Residential and Commercial Development Control Plans.
- Rezoning applications.
- Heritage Conservation Controls.
- Traffic Management and Planning (Policy) and Approvals.
- Commercial Centres Beautification Plans of Management.
- Matters requiring the expenditure of moneys and in respect of which no Council vote has been made.
- Matters reserved by individual Councillors, in accordance with any Council policy on "safeguards" and substantive changes.

Committee Membership:

7 Councillors

Quorum:

The quorum for a committee meeting is 4 Councillors.

WOOLLAHRA MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Notice of Meeting

8 February 2007

To: The Mayor, Councillor Keri Huxley, ex-officio
Councillors Geoff Rundle (Chair)
 Isabelle Shapiro (Deputy Chair)
 John Comino
 Christopher Dawson
 Wilhelmina Gardner
 David Shoebridge
 John Walker

Dear Councillors

Urban Planning Committee Meeting – 12 February 2007

In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, I request your attendance at a Meeting of the Council's **Urban Planning Committee** to be held in the **Committee Room, 536 New South Head Road, Double Bay, on Monday 12 February 2007 at 6.00pm.**

Gary James
General Manager

Additional Information Relating to Committee Matters

Site Inspection

Other Matters

Meeting Agenda

Item	Subject	Pages
1	Leave of Absence and Apologies	
2	Late Correspondence	
3	Declarations of Interest	

Items to be Decided by this Committee using its Delegated Authority

D1	Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 29 January 2007	1
----	--	---

Items to be Submitted to the Council for Decision with Recommendations from this Committee

R1	Draft White City DCP – 1064.G Amend 59	2
R2	Planning & Urban Design Assessment, Woolworths Scheme for Kiaora Lands – 1133.G WP	112

Item No: D1 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 29 January 2007**
Author: Les Windle, Manager – Governance
File No: See Council Minutes
Reason for Report: The Minutes of the Meeting of Monday 29 January 2007 were previously circulated. In accordance with the guidelines for Committees' operations it is now necessary that those Minutes be formally taken as read and confirmed.

Recommendation:

That the Minutes of the Urban Planning Committee Meeting of 29 January 2007 be taken as read and confirmed.

Les Windle
Manager - Governance

Item No: R1 Recommendation to Council
Subject: Draft White City DCP
Author: Margaret Zulaikha – Team Leader Urban Design
Allan Coker – Director Planning and Development
File No: 1064 G Amend 59
Reasons for Report:

1. To provide the minutes from the Strategic Planning Working Party meeting held on 9 November 2006.
2. To submit a recommendation for further action on the Draft White City DCP

Recommendation:

That a principles based draft DCP for White City be prepared for the consideration of a future meeting of the Urban Planning Committee.

1. Background

The draft White City DCP was prepared following a series of meetings of the Strategic Planning Working Party in 2005. It combines highly prescriptive building envelope controls with a series of performance based controls for the development of the site. The draft DCP was placed on public exhibition in January 2006 and was generally well received by the public. However, and in response to a submission from John Alexander Clubs (JACs), Council at an Extra-ordinary meeting on 18 April 2006 resolved as follows:

- A. THAT Council, in noting the undertaking of John Alexander's Clubs Pty Ltd and Markham Corporation Pty Limited not to lodge a development application for the lands known as the White City lands during the continuing consultation and public exhibition, defer the DCP to reconsider the possible reconfiguration of building envelopes which are presently B1, B2 and B3 without adding extra floor space and examine further their controls as they relate to the centre courts and car parking on the site.*
- B. THAT a meeting be called within the next two weeks with senior staff, land owners and Councillors.*
- C. THAT all Councillors are to be consulted prior to the scheduling of the meeting and invited to attend the meeting.*
- D. THAT Council acknowledge that Annexure 2 of the Officer's Report to the Extra-ordinary Council meeting on 18 April 2006 is the latest version of the Draft White City DCP.*
- E. THAT a report on the establishment of a kerbside drop-off and pick-up zone for Sydney Grammar School in Neild Avenue be referred to Council's Traffic Committee.*

In response to items B. and C. of the 18 April 2006 resolution a meeting was held with Councillors and representatives from Sydney Grammar School and John Alexander Clubs (JACs) on 26 April 2006. After a presentation by JACs, Councillors formed the following recommendation:

That Councillors note:

1. The continued undertaking of JACs and the Markham Corporation not to submit a development application at this time.
2. The offer by JAC and the Markham Corporation to prepare and submit further information on or before 15 May 2006.
3. Subject to information being submitted as in 2, and subject to staff resources, a further meeting be held on 24 May 2004 allowing an informal presentation by JAC and the Markham Corporation to Councillors and the White City property owners.

On 15 May 2006 a short progress report on the outcome of this meeting was presented to the Urban Planning Committee. The committee made the following recommendation which proceeded, and was adopted as a matter of urgency, by council that evening:

The terms of the Council resolution were:

1. *That the progress report on the Draft White City DCP be received and noted.*
2. *That the meeting of the White City Working Party on 24th May 2006 not proceed.*
3. *That any further presentation to Councillors by the John Alexander Clubs be at an open meeting of the Urban Planning Committee.*
4. *That in the event no substantive proposal is put by the John Alexander Clubs at the next Urban Planning Committee meeting that immediate steps be undertaken for the current Draft DCP to be adopted.*

On 29 May a further progress report was presented to the Urban Planning Committee. At that meeting representatives of the Markham Corporation and the architect for JAC presented a revised development concept for the proposed tennis and recreation facility. The committee formed the following recommendation which was adopted by Council on 13 June 2006.

That a report be prepared for the Strategic Planning Working Party, with all Councillors invited, to consider the proposal as presented to the Urban Planning Committee on 29 May 2006 by JACs/Markham Corporation. The report to consider the new proposal in light of the Draft DCP and that a further report be submitted to the Urban Planning Committee on 26 June 2006 with recommendations from the Strategic Planning Working Party.

In accordance with the 13 June 2006 resolution a meeting of the Strategic Planning Working Party was held on 14 June 2006. At that meeting Councillors were provided with the following information:

- Powerpoint presentation showing comparison of building footprints for the Draft White City DCP 2002, JAC schemes and Draft White City DCP April 2006.
- Tabulated analysis of JAC scheme (June 2006) using objectives, desired future character statements and planning principles of the Draft White City DCP, April 2006.
- Analysis of JAC scheme (June 2006) using key elements of Draft White City DCP April 2006.
- Concept plans from Michael Fountain Architects.
- Preliminary traffic and parking assessment by Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes Pty Ltd dated 13 June 2006.

A scale model of the proposal was also made available and used at the meeting.

After discussing various aspects of the revised scheme, together with the provisions of the Draft DCP, the Working Party formed the following recommendation for submission to the Urban Planning Committee:

- A. *That there be a further report to the Urban Planning Committee dealing specifically with the following:*
- i) *view losses and gains from Glenmore Road, including the impact of a building envelope equivalent in height to the third level shown on the JAC scheme and a desired height indicated as a reduced level (RL).*
 - ii) *Capacity for benefits from access to the viewing area (open area) on Glenmore Road*
 - iii) *Traffic generation having regard to the size and intensity of use and the external impact of this on the local traffic network*
 - iv) *Heritage and design considerations from raising the centre courts*
 - v) *Extent and impact of the north-east and north-west elements in terms of bulk, scale and views.*
- B. *That the current Draft DCP remain the status quo until further determination by Council.*

On 26 June 2007 the recommendations of the Working Party were presented to the Urban Planning Committee. The Committee formed the following recommendation which was adopted by the Council on 10 July 2006.

- A. *That there be a further report to the Urban Planning Committee dealing specifically with the following:*
- i) *view losses and gains from Glenmore Road, including the impact of a building envelope equivalent in height to the third level shown on the JAC scheme and a desired height indicated as a reduced level (RL)*
 - ii) *capacity for benefits from access to the viewing area (open area) on Glenmore Road, including legal access issues,*
 - iii) *traffic generation having regard to the current traffic levels, the size and intensity of use and the external impact of this on the local traffic network*
 - iv) *heritage and design considerations from raising the centre courts*
 - v) *extent and impact of the north-east and north-west elements in terms of bulk, scale and views.*
 - vi) *consideration of appropriate floor levels in relation to the 1 in 100 year flood levels.*
- B. *That the current Draft DCP remain the status quo until further determination by the Council.*

In response to the above resolution, JACs provided additional information on 31 August 2006 (**annexure 1**). The additional information was based on a revised scheme that was being developed at that time, rather than the June 2006 scheme.

Council staff met with representatives of JACs on two occasions, namely 9 August and 31 August 2006. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss a revised scheme for the clubhouse facility that was tabled, but not distributed, at the meetings. The following issues were raised by staff at these meetings:

- The elevation of the centre courts needs to be considered within the context of the total development. The focus of the development should be on the centre courts.
- We need to understand alternative solutions to ensure that the cultural values of the site are retained.
- The sense of arena around the centre courts is compromised by the single storey development around them.
- Tiered seating should be provided around the centre courts.
- The proposed tennis court on the north side of the centre courts will be the focus of the development rather than the centre courts.
- The building should be well articulated with a roof, rather than the proposed roof top tennis courts.

On 4 October 2006 we received architectural plans (Issue I) from JACs of the revised scheme. The main differences between the June 2006 scheme and the October 2006 scheme are as follows:

- The third levels on the north eastern and north western corners of the clubhouse were deleted and replaced with tennis courts on a flat roof.
- Two real tennis courts were relocated from within the building envelope of the clubhouse to a stand-alone building on the site of the existing carpark.

2. Strategic Planning Working Party

A meeting of the Strategic Planning Working Party was held on 9 November 2006. Minutes of the meeting are attached as **annexure 2**.

Councillors were provided with the following information:

- *PowerPoint* presentation that outlined staff issues with JAC's October 2006 scheme and options for how to proceed with the draft DCP.
- JAC's October 2006 scheme –Issue I
- Additional information from JACs (**annexure 1**)
 - Assessment of views from Glenmore Road
 - Benefits and management of viewing area
 - Centre court
 - Traffic and parking assessment by Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes Pty Ltd dated 30 August 2006
 - Comparative club information
 - Outline of real tennis facility
 - Detailed survey of Glenmore Road
- Council's Traffic Planner's comments
- Current version of the draft White City DCP

A scale model of a new scheme was made available by the proponents, but was not discussed. JACs advised that plans of this scheme would be provided the next day. Section 3 of this report provides an analysis of this scheme.

The discussion at the Working Party focussed on the built form aspects of JACs scheme together with the provisions of the draft DCP. There was no consensus as to the preferred built form for the clubhouse. Hence, the Working Party formed a recommendation as follows:

That there be a further report to the Urban Planning Committee to determine the preferred way of progressing the draft White City DCP.

3. JACs November 2006 scheme

Plans of JACs most recent scheme (Issue J) were received on 13 November 2006 (**annexure 3**)

This scheme provides the following:

- The footprint of the club building extends to the outermost extent of the four existing grandstands and clubhouse.
- Total gross floor area without the carpark is 6736m².
- Parking for approximately 259 cars (7216m²) within the floorplate of the ground level.
- The primary functional spaces of the tennis club including the offices, restaurant, gym, squash courts, pool and sauna are located on the first level. The centre courts and another tennis court on the north side of the building are also located on the first level.
- Second level development flanks the east and west sides of the centre courts for a day spa, medical, cinema and day care uses.
- Viewing platform at RL 10.20 on Glenmore Road.
- Access from Alma Street includes a turn around area which will facilitate drop-off and pickup for Sydney Grammar
- A loading bay is provided between the two buildings.,
- A tiered structure around the centre courts.

Tennis courts

- Ten grass courts on the north side of clubhouse retained for JACs use.
- Nine synthetic tennis courts for Maccabi's use to the north of Glenmore Road.
- Centre Courts on Level 1.
- One synthetic court on Level 1.
- Two synthetic courts on rooftop (Level 2)

Real tennis courts

- Two real tennis courts are located within a stand alone building on the site of the existing carpark. This building is approximately RL 14.0 or three storeys in height.

The November scheme is an improvement over the October scheme for the following reasons:

1. It provides some containment around the centre courts in the form of the third level on the east and west sides of the courts and,
2. The viewing platform is on a grade that will permit views across the site from Glenmore Road.

However, the scheme still presents outstanding issues that have an impact on the built form of the clubhouse.

3.1 Heritage Considerations

Council's Strategic Heritage Officer, Jodi Ayre has provided an assessment of the heritage impact of JACs latest scheme:

The latest scheme, Issue J, demonstrates an attempt to improve the quality of the Centre Court arena, through the provision of a surrounding tiered structure and a minor modification to the internal planning arrangement of the spaces which surround the centre court.

The tiered structure around the Centre Court does facilitate the interpretation of some aspects of the objectives of policy 29 within the Conservation Management Plan.

Policy 29

The Centre Court arena and the containment of the space should be enclosed to interpret and reflect the raked forms of the former grandstands

This could be achieved by:

- *Raking back the built form to interpret the profile of the original stands or*
- *Stepping back the built form combined with an interpretation of the stands at the lower level.*

The scheme demonstrates that the Centre Courts may be elevated to a new level while still achieving a sense of containment within an arena setting. There are a number of minor issues relating to the practical achievement of the scheme, such as access, court provisions and design details. For example, the space around the Centre Courts should be assessed against current standards for tennis courts to ensure that any reduction in the surrounding area does not compromise the continued use of the court. However, it is likely that such details would be provided at a more detailed design level.

In terms of the impact on the cultural significance of the site, conservation analysis within a statement of heritage impact, which would be required at development application stage, should provide an understanding of alternative development options that were considered before the preferred option was chosen and why those alternatives were discounted.¹

In a presentation to the Strategic Working Party on 9 November 2006, Council staff presented an alternative design for the north south section of the site in sketch form. This demonstrated that the ranked/ stepped quality created by the existing grandstands may be interpreted in a different form which has the potential to more appropriately respond to Policy 29. This has the potential to provide the sense of arena for the Centre Courts which is in keeping with the degree of significance assigned to this space, with an additional outcome of providing an important public interface with the Glenmore Road street frontage.

It is not possible, nor good heritage practice, to consider the issue of the raising of the centre court in isolation of the context of the proposed scheme. The contribution of the built form, the relationship of the development to Glenmore Road and traffic implications must also be considered in terms of the impact on the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area.

A statement of heritage impact would be required to assess the impact on the scheme on the cultural significance of the site, in addition to the impact on the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area. The impact on aspects of cultural significance could then be assessed in terms of the scheme, how the significance is interpreted and what measures have been taken to mitigate any negative impacts on the significance.

¹ Woollahra Municipal Council, *Statement of Heritage Impact*, 22 October 2004, page 1.

The proposed scheme will impact on all aspects of the fabric of the place and provide irreversible changes to the site. The complete loss of fabric associated with the existing grandstands and the raising of the Centre Court will extensively impact on the setting of the place and negate any opportunity for adaptive re-use.

Currently, the existing grandstands and the relationship with the Centre Courts facilitate the understanding of the highly significant historic and social values of the core precinct of the tennis complex.

Due to the extent of impact on the fabric of the site, it is vital that other alternatives are provided and considered, as required by Council's Statement of Heritage Impact guidelines. This is to ensure that Council is fully satisfied that a particular scheme is the best outcome for the White City site. It is Council's responsibility to ensure the cultural values of the site are appropriately managed within the context of the significance of the site itself and its location within the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area.

3.2 Unarticulated roof/tennis courts on roof

The rooftops will be highly visible when viewed from Glenmore Road and the surrounding area. The proposed tennis courts on the roof of level 2 limit the opportunity for three dimensional modelling of the built form. The roof(s) should be well articulated, not flat. Apart from breaking up the expanse of roof, articulation also provides an opportunity to interpret the raked form of the grandstands.

3.3 Traffic

The draft DCP places limitations on traffic generation to ensure that the environmental capacity of nearby roads is not exceeded. Council's Traffic and Transport Planners have identified that the traffic generation of the proposed scheme may have an unacceptable impact on the local roads, particularly Lawson Street:

This proposal cannot be adequately assessed at this stage as Council does not have any independent data for a development of this nature. Further the information supplied by Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes Pty Ltd presents unsupported assumptions. These are outlined below:

- 1. No reason is given as to why it would be appropriate to use (and at times exceed) the Maximum flow rather than the Environmental Goal. This is not considered to be valid.*
- 2. Lawson Street is not a collector road. In Council's road hierarchy Lawson Street is a local road.*
- 3. In relation to the figures quoted for traffic generation as stated above, Council does not have any independent data and has no experience of a development of this character. Accordingly we do not have a benchmark to assess the quoted peak generation of 110vph.*
- 4. It is considered unlikely that the traffic generation of the club would be essentially the same on a weekday afternoon and Saturday lunchtime. No explanation of the figures and assumptions made is given to support this data so it is not possible to ascertain its validity.*
- 5. Lawson Street already exceeds both the Environmental Goal and Maximum flow figures in the peak hour traffic flows provided.*

It is not considered appropriate, from a traffic perspective, to develop this site in a manner which will add a quoted 110vph to the surrounding road network. The quoted impacts are:

- a. Traffic flows in Alma Street would increase to 180 to 265vph – exceeding the environmental goal of 200vph.*

- b. *Traffic flows in Lawson Street would increase to 265 to 455vph – easily exceeding both the environmental goal of 200vph and the maximum flow of 300vph.*
- c. *Traffic flows in Glenmore Road would increase to 165 to 480vph –exceeding the environmental goal of 300vph.*

Accordingly it is not considered that this development would comply with Clause C3 of the Draft DCP.

It is not considered appropriate to assess the required parking provision at this stage. It is very likely that the design will change before a DA is submitted.

4. Comparison between draft White City DCP and JACs November 2006 scheme

The main differences between the draft White City DCP and JACs November scheme are:

- JACs scheme presents the clubhouse as a single consolidated building rather than as three separate buildings. The proposed floorspace (excluding the real tennis building and carpark)) is similar to the floorspace envisaged by the draft DCP.
- JACs scheme extends the building over the eastern stand
- JACs scheme reduces the height of the building on the north side of the centre courts to allow views over the development from Glenmore Road
- JACs scheme raises the centre courts to enable carparking beneath
- JACs scheme adds the real tennis court building on the existing carpark
- JACs scheme has lower scale buildings around the centre courts than was envisaged by the DCP.

The following table details the differences:

Elements	Draft White City DCP	JACs November 2006 scheme
3D modelling	Clubhouse is expressed as three separate buildings with two storey well articulated building (B1) on north side of centre courts	Clubhouse is a single consolidated building with single storey development on north side and two storeys on the east and west sides of centre courts.
Footprint	Buildings B1,B2 and B3 approximately cover the footprint of existing north, south and west stands.	Building extends to outermost extent of existing north, south west and east stands.
Height	Maximum RL15.0 (three storeys)	Maximum RL15.9 (three storeys)
Eastern stand	No	Yes
Level of Centre Courts	Retained at existing ground level	Elevated above carpark
Carparking	Two levels on existing carpark + possibility of utilising building envelope	Occupies most of ground floor floorplate
Floorspace of clubhouse	Approx.7900m ² (without articulation)	6736m ² (with articulation)

Views from Glenmore Road	Eastern extent of B1 reduced to allow improved views. View of treeline in Rushcutters Bay Park from viewing platform.	View over north east corner as per existing + new view available over development from viewing platform. Tennis courts on roof and elevated tiered seating structure around the Centre Court would obscure views.
Building on existing carpark	No	Yes – three storeys high
Scale of building surrounding centre courts	Two-three storeys	One – two storeys
Roof design	Well articulated ie raked, hipped, domed.	Flat

5. Options

There are a number of different ways of proceeding with the built form controls for the clubhouse in the draft DCP. It should be noted that we are not considering any major changes to other components of the DCP such as heritage, landscape, traffic and parking and pedestrian access at this stage.

Option 1: Retain the building envelopes as per the current draft White City DCP

The current version of the draft White City DCP is attached as **annexure 4**. The advantages of adopting the current draft DCP are that the plan has the support of the community and, as the current document is essentially the same as the exhibited version, there would be no need to re-exhibit. However, the building envelopes of the current DCP are highly prescriptive and limit a range of other potentially acceptable built form options. The current DCP would not allow a JACs style development. For this reason, if the Council wants to provide for a wider range of development options to that permitted by the draft DCP it should not proceed with the exhibited draft DCP. On the other hand, if Council does not want to continue discussions with JACs on a scheme similar to what is currently proposed it should proceed to adopt the draft DCP.

Option 2: Amend building envelopes to reflect JACs November 2006 scheme

Since the Urban Planning Committee meeting in June 2006, JACs has made a number of amendments to their original scheme, many of which are regarded positively. These include a reduction in the overall size from 11,630m² to 6,736m², the introduction of some three dimensional modelling to the built form around the centre courts, the proposed viewing platform on Glenmore Road and vehicular access arrangements. It is also acknowledged that the range of proposed facilities in the JAC's scheme complies with *Section 1.5: Objectives of this Plan* of the draft DCP. However, we consider that there are still outstanding unresolved issues that require further development and/or information. We, therefore, do not recommend amending the building envelopes in the draft DCP to reflect JAC's November 2006 scheme. Such an action could be regarded as giving tacit approval to the scheme, before we fully understand the implications of its traffic generation and heritage issues. Furthermore, if JACs do not proceed with their proposed development, the built form controls may not be suited to another proposal.

Option 3: Principles based DCP with no building envelopes + design review panel at DA stage.

It is apparent that there are a number of design solutions available that could adequately satisfy the functional requirements of the clubhouse and address heritage and urban design issues. The draft DCP prescribes one such solution but there are also other solutions that may achieve good planning, heritage and environmental outcomes. For this reason, an alternative approach to the built form controls that deletes *Figure 5: Buildings B1, B2 and B3 Building Envelopes* and expands the performance based controls is proposed.

The DCP would need to clearly establish a suitable scale and the location of new development. In this regard, it is recommended that the policies in the White City Conservation Management Plan inform the controls. The following objectives and controls for an amended draft DCP are proposed:

Objectives

- O1 To maintain the horizontal line of the existing Clubhouse's basic building form (to reflect the building's role as a 'base' to the Paddington slopes, as viewed from New South Head Road and the surrounding areas.
- O2 To maintain the cultural significance of the centre courts and the arena quality created by the existing spectator stands
- O3 To encourage a built form of a scale and character in keeping with its function and having regard for its position within a landscape setting.
- O4 To retain and/or enhance views from Glenmore Road across the site.
- O5 To protect the visual privacy and amenity of nearby and adjacent residences
- O6 To protect the cultural values of the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area

Controls

- C1 Development is to be a maximum of three storeys in height
- C2 Development of the clubhouse is to be contained within the outermost alignment of the existing clubhouse and the four grandstands.
- C3 The alignment of buildings is to reflect the alignment of the existing grandstands.
- C4 The centre courts should be retained in their current locations and be the focus of any new development
- C5 Buildings should display three dimensional modelling to reflect the volume and arrangement of the existing grandstands and their focus on the centre courts.
- C6 The design of buildings should interpret the former grandstands and provide a sense of arena around the centre courts. This could be achieved by tiered seating and/or other architectural features.
- C7 The northern and eastern elevations should positively address the open landscape.
- C8 Any area of roof terrace (or flat roof) must be detailed as part of the landscape of White City. Design consideration must be given to any expansive flat roofed areas. Vents, air conditioning units and similar structures should, to the extent possible, be hidden from view. Tennis courts on upper roofs are not permitted.
- C9 New development is to exhibit a hierarchy of elevations. A positive address to the centre courts and open space, having regard for the centre courts' heritage significance, is to be established.
- C10 Development must permit views across the site from the eastern end of Glenmore Road.
- C11 A publicly accessible viewing platform is to be provided with direct access from Glenmore Road.
- C12 Any building fronting Glenmore Road must present a positive address to the street frontage.

C13 A building on the site of the existing carpark may be permitted.

It is also recommended that the DCP include a requirement that the applicant develop the design in consultation with a Design Review Panel. Council would assemble the panel, the members of which would have expertise in heritage, urban design and/or sports venue design. We have in the past established design review panels for major development projects, such as Babworth House, Royal Hospital for Women and Kiaora Lands and achieved very good design outcomes.

Because the deletion of Figure 5 from the DCP constitutes a major change to the document, the principles based DCP would need to be readvertised.

Option 4: DCP prepared with input from design review panel

Another option to be considered is the preparation of a new DCP with input from a design review panel. This approach has the advantage of bringing independent and expert opinion on the best means of achieving a desired built form. The panel would be required to review the current draft DCP and JAC's scheme and make recommendations on how to proceed.

In the context that Council has, to date, not been able to resolve the precise built form provisions of the draft DCP this is a viable option but one which will delay its finalisation.

6. Draft LEP amendment

At a meeting on 19 December 2005, Council resolved to prepare a draft LEP that would apply to the White City site. The LEP was to be based on the draft plan presented to the Urban Planning Committee on 14 November 2005.

The key provisions of the draft LEP are:

Rezoning

Rezone land on New South Head Road (carpark site - 81-83 New South Head Road) from Zone No. 6 – (the Open Space Zone) to Zone No.3(b) – (the Special Business “B” Zone)

Note: A broad range of uses is permissible within this zone including dwellings attached to commercial and retail buildings. The objectives of the 3(b) Zone are:

- (a) *to establish a commercial zone allowing a mix of commercial, residential and tourist accommodation purposes,*
- (b) *to prohibit all retail and high service generating uses which result in traffic, parking and vehicle access constraints, and*
- (c) *to allow residential development both independently of and mixed with non-residential development in order to promote urban consolidation.*

Development Standards

- a maximum gross floor area of 1620m² for the business zone (Lot 22 DP 609145) and maximum height limits (RLs to AHD) of 13.5m and 19.5m for the business zone and 15.0 and 7.5m for the open space zone.

Heritage Provisions

- list site as a heritage item (excluding the stormwater channel)

Special Development Provisions

- requirements for a comprehensive development application
- requirement for the provision of public access ways

Note: This provision takes into account the need for site-specific controls rather than the use of those generic controls applying to other lands in the municipality

- requirement for consideration of conservation management plan
- requirement for consideration of applications against the White City DCP
- allowance for the additional uses of restaurants and shops, but only at ground floor level, for development along New South Head Road

Note: Restaurants and shops are prohibited in the Business 3(b) zone. Notwithstanding this, it is considered reasonable to allow these uses at the ground floor level of development along New South Head Road in order to facilitate better public usage of the pedestrian access ways that open onto New South Head Road.

The resolution to prepare the draft LEP also provided that the plan be amended as follows:

- Provisions be made for the reservation of the proposed public access ways
- Provisions relating to a comprehensive development application be deleted.

The resolution also provided that Council proceed with the public authority consultation in relation to the draft LEP as a matter of urgency.

Consultations with relevant public authorities, in accordance with section 62 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* were completed in October 2006 but have not been reported to Council and there are no further resolutions of Council in relation to the fate of the draft LEP. This is because subsequent considerations have been focussed on the built form issues associated with the proposed tennis/recreation club development.

The draft DCP has been designed as a stand alone DCP and does not rely upon or need the draft LEP. Therefore, any of the four options discussed above may proceed without the need for a complementary LEP. A separate report will be submitted in relation to the draft LEP.

6. Conclusion

Once adopted, the White City DCP should provide a development framework that will allow the very best design for the clubhouse. The current draft DCP prescribes one solution but restricts the exploration of alternative design options for the clubhouse. There are a number of elements of the JAC's scheme that are regarded positively, but because the scheme is also inconsistent with the envelope controls in the draft DCP, we could not recommend proceeding with this scheme if the current draft DCP is adopted. We therefore recommend that a principles based DCP be prepared for consideration at a future meeting of the Urban Planning Committee.

Margaret Zulaikha
Team Leader Urban Design

Allan Coker
Director Planning and Development

ANNEXURES:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Annexure 1 | Additional information from JACs |
| Annexure 2 | Minutes of the Strategic Planning Working Party held on 9 November 2006 |
| Annexure 3 | Plans of JACs November 2006 scheme (Issue J) |
| Annexure 4 | Current version of draft White City DCP (April 2006) |

Item No: R2 Recommendation to Council
Subject: **Planning and Urban Design Assessment, Woolworths Scheme for Kiaora Lands**
Author: Allan Coker, Director Planning and Development
Margaret Zulaikha, Team Leader Urban Design
File No: 1133.G WP
Reason for Report: To respond to Items 4 and 5 of Council's resolution of 24 July 2006 on how the new scheme for the Kiaora Lands site responds to the Double Bay DCP and to present Woolworth's response to the issues Council asked that it address.

Recommendations:

1. That, if Council decides to have further discussions with Woolworths, (after considering the report to the Corporate and Works Committee on probity and direct negotiation issues) that Woolworths be requested to commission a full traffic report, including computer simulation modelling to determine the acceptability of the proposed traffic circulation, loading and unloading and parking arrangements of their proposed scheme for development of the Kiaora Lands site.
2. That the traffic report be reported back to a future meeting of the Kiaora Lands Working Party.
3. That, subject to that study confirming the acceptability of the proposed traffic circulation, loading and unloading and parking arrangements, Council indicates that it is prepared to work with Woolworths in the further design development of the proposed scheme.
4. That a further report be prepared that includes the alternative processes available to obtain other adjoining parties interest in the development of Council's land, including this process running parallel with the consideration of the Woolworths proposal.
5. That a report be prepared that identifies appropriate land uses for the properties on Kiaora Road that formed part of the approved Kiaora Lands scheme, excluding 1 Kiaora Road.

1. Background

At its meeting on 13 February 2006 the Urban Planning Committee considered a report on planning controls and future commercial decisions for the Kiaora Lands in Double Bay. The Council adopted the following recommendation on 27 February 2006:

- A. *That the report on Kiaora Lands, Double Bay be received and noted.*
- B. *That Council retain the current planning controls for the Kiaora Lands site pending a review of Council's assets and investigation of alternate schemes.*
- C. *That Council urgently convene a Working Party to consider the future of Council's Kiaora lands. The Working Party to comprise the Double Bay and Cooper Ward Councillors and any other interested Councillors.*

- D. *That Council request that the DA Consent be surrendered to Council.*
- E. *That Council extends the Section 94 Plan to include all the land covered by the Kiaora Lands development consent.*

2. Consideration by the Kiaora Lands Working Party

The first meeting of the Working Party was held on 16 May 2006. The minutes and recommendations from that meeting were presented to the Urban Planning Committee on 29 May 2006. The committee received and noted the report.

The second meeting of the working party was held on 27 June 2006 to hear a presentation from Woolworths in response to recommendation 3 from the working party of 16 May 2006. Recommendation 3 provided that, "subject to 2, the owners of lands comprising the Kiaora Lands site be invited to make representations as to their lands at a future meeting of the Kiaora Lands Working Party."

At this working party meeting Woolworths presented a new scheme for the site, involving only that part of the site owned by Woolworths and council. The new scheme involves:

- The closure of Patterson Street near midway between Manning Road and Anderson Street
- Closure of Anderson Street north of the rear boundaries of the properties with frontage to Court Road
- Car parking at ground level over most of the consolidated site with specialty retail and supermarket entry to/from Kiaora Lane
- New 3 storey retail and commercial office development on the site of the existing Woolworths supermarket with arcade connecting the proposed supermarket with New South Head Road
- New supermarket at first floor level over most of the consolidated site accessed by travelers from the Kiaora Lane entry level
- Car parking on the roof of the supermarket with pedestrian travelator access to the supermarket
- Loading and unloading off Kiaora Lane west of the supermarket/car parking building.

Councillor response to the new scheme is recorded in the minutes of the working party meeting of 27 June 2006. Suffice to say that there was a general consensus that council should continue to work with Woolworths in developing an alternative scheme. The minutes and recommendations of the working party were presented to the Urban Planning Committee on 10 July 2006 and subsequently to Council on 24 July 2006.

Council resolved in the following terms:

1. *That Woolworths Ltd be advised that Council has made no commitment in relation to the sale, lease or development of Council's land.*
2. *That staff report to the next meeting of the working party on the probity and direct negotiation issues that arise from Woolworth's approach to develop the Kiaora Lands site. That the report consider in what circumstances Council may enter into direct negotiations with Woolworths Ltd, and if Council proposes to do so, how the process should be managed to ensure that it is conducted in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Independent Commission against Corruption (ICAC).*

3. *That the report also consider any alternative to direct negotiations with Woolworths Ltd, the benefits and processes for an open tender.*
4. *That, as part of the report required by recommendation No. 2, staff report on how the proposal may or may not satisfy the objectives of the Double Bay DCP and whether the development of the site, including Council and Woolworth's owned lands will provide the opportunity to produce a better planning outcome than separate development by the land owners.*
5. *That Woolworths be requested to address the following issues at the next working party meeting:*
 - a. *proposals for loading and unloading*
 - b. *traffic circulation and traffic impacts on the local street network, including the intersections with New South Head Road*
 - c. *how the west, south and east walls of the supermarket will be designed to achieve an attractive design and minimise impacts on adjoining properties*
 - d. *proposals for open space and landscaping*
 - e. *evaluation of the scheme against the objectives of the Double Bay DCP, Section A2.3, and how it will achieve a connectivity between north and south Double Bay*
 - f. *calculation of the site lands owned by Woolworths and Council, including public roads*
 - g. *proposals for making the development fully accessible*
 - h. *proposals for making Kiaora Lane more pedestrian friendly.*
 - i. *opportunities for greater access to the site from Kiaora Road to improve the pedestrian amenity on Kiaora Road.*

The third meeting of the working party was held on 14 November 2006 to consider two reports, one of which addressed probity and direct negotiation issues and the other which provided a planning and urban design assessment of Woolworths scheme. The minutes and recommendations of this meeting are attached as **Annexure 1**. The working party recommended that the reports be presented separately to the relevant Council Committees, namely the Urban Planning Committee and the Corporate and Works Committee.

This report provides a planning assessment of Woolworths scheme and responds to Items 4 to 5 of the above resolution. Items 2 and 3 relate to probity issues and will be reported separately to the Corporate and Works Committee.

3. The Double Bay Centre DCP.

3.1 How the scheme complies with the objectives of the Double Bay DCP

The following table provides an assessment of Woolworth's proposed scheme against the objectives of the Double Bay Centre DCP. JBA Planning, on behalf of Woolworths, has also prepared a similar assessment table which is attached as **Annexure 3**.

Section	Objectives	Woolworths Proposal	Complies
3.2.1	Enhance and improve the public domain and the provision of public facilities	The scheme will provide improvements to the public domain, mainly in the form of the upgrading of Kiaora Lane. The closure of Anderson Street and Patterson Street significantly reduces the quantum of public domain and possibilities for access to the centre from the south. No public facilities are proposed.	Partial
3.2.2	Ensure that the centre maintains its commercial viability and competitive position within the Sydney retail market	The scheme will provide a new expanded supermarket and a range of retail floorspace, which is likely to function as a major new attractor to Double Bay. While it does not provide the diversity of uses envisaged by the DCP in that no residential is included, it is likely to result in increased expenditure and economic activity within the Double Bay centre.	Partial
3.2.3	Develop the particular qualities of different parts of the centre	The redevelopment of the Woolworths site on New South Head Road has the potential to greatly improve Double Bay's "front door". The redevelopment of Kiaora Lane will bring a new local focus to the south side of the centre.	Yes
3.2.4	Retain and enhance pedestrian access and amenity in and around the centre	The scheme reinforces the scale, active retail frontages and pedestrian amenity that are characteristic of the lanes/walkways in the centre. Setback and footpaths on Kiaora Lane will enhance the pedestrian environment. The inclusion of the arcade between Kiaora Lane and New South Head Road will improve pedestrian connectivity between the north and south sides of the centre. However, the closure of Anderson Street and Patterson Street reduces the connectivity of the Kiaora Lands site within the existing network of local roads.	Partial
3.2.5	Improve Double Bay's built form to provide appropriate definition to the public domain	The scheme will provide buildings that spatially define New South Head Road and Kiaora Lane by promoting street wall buildings and active frontages. Awnings at street frontages will provide weather protection.	Yes
3.2.6	Promote sustainable design principles and objectives in the development and use of the built environment	Potential for design of commercial floorspace to include ESD principles, although the proposed arcade does not provide natural ventilation/lighting.	Potential for compliance
3.2.7	To preserve and enhance the visual and environmental amenity of all buildings and places of heritage significance in the centre	The Golden Sheaf Hotel is a listed heritage item. The scale of the proposed development adjacent to the hotel complements the heritage item.	Yes
3.2.8	Improve parking and traffic conditions in the centre	The scheme will more than double the number of public car parking spaces, but this needs to be considered against the increased car parking requirements generated by the development. It is unlikely that traffic conditions will be improved since the development is predicted to generate approximately 89% of the peak hour vehicle trips proposed by the approved development but without additional accessways and with all traffic ingress by Manning Road.	No

This analysis is considered in conjunction with Appendix 2 of the DCP which provides specific objectives and controls for the Kiaora Lands site. Section A2.3 lists the objectives for development of the site.

Section A2.3 – Objectives for development of the Kiaora lands site	Woolworths Proposal	Complies
To maximise the public benefit from ownership and development of the Council owned lands that form part of the site	<p>The scheme will deliver a number of public benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased public parking • improved access between the public car park and New South Head Road • upgrading and activation of Kiaora Lane • improved food shopping • improved trading conditions. <p>Council could redevelop its own lands as a multi-level carpark with retail at ground level which could achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased public parking • upgrading and activation of Kiaora Lane 	Yes
To develop a high quality public domain that demonstrates a high standard of planning, urban design and landscape architecture	<p>The proposed built form and landscape works will achieve a satisfactory urban design outcome on New South Head Road and Kiaora Lane.</p> <p>The site layout involves the closure of two streets which will significantly reduce the permeability of the site.</p> <p>The interface between the supermarket and adjacent residences is not well resolved.</p>	Partial
To protect and enhance the commercial role of the Double Bay Centre both locally and generally throughout metropolitan Sydney	The provision of an expanded supermarket and increased car parking numbers will encourage higher patronage of the centre	Yes
To provide a catalyst for increased business activity and private sector development in Double Bay	The development could be the catalyst for the revival of Double Bay as it will encourage higher patronage to the centre and create a new focus on Kiaora Lane	Yes
To increase the attractiveness of Double Bay as a place to live, work and shop	The scheme would increase public car parking and provide improved food shopping	Yes
To improve traffic and pedestrian safety in local streets within and immediately adjoining the site	Traffic and pedestrian safety is unlikely to be improved.	No
To minimise the effects of traffic, parking and loading on local residents	The proposed arrangement that all traffic access the site from Manning Road will not minimise the effects of traffic, parking and loading on local residents.	No
To provide sufficient accessible and safe public and private parking for development on the site	<p>A legible parking layout is proposed, albeit with a concentration of traffic accessing the site from Manning Road.</p> <p>The proposed diversionary route through the car park may be a safety issue.</p>	Partial
To provide additional public parking that assists with meeting future needs within the Double Bay centre	The proposed public parking is likely to be satisfactory	Yes
To establish community facilities and an open public space as a central focus	Not provided	No
To establish a balance of new high quality retail, commercial and residential development including an expanded supermarket	<p>Retail and commercial uses, including an expanded supermarket to be provided.</p> <p>No residential</p>	Partial
To establish separate car parks for public and private parking	Public parking only to be provided.	Yes

Section A2.3 – Objectives for development of the Kiaora lands site	Woolworths Proposal	Complies
To integrate the new private and public domain development with Double Bay's existing public spaces and built form	The scheme will integrate with the public domain of New South Head Road and Knox Street and the existing arcades off New South Head Road. The proposed built form on New South Head Road matches the height and scale of adjacent development and is appropriate. The supermarket is not well integrated with the existing public spaces or built form in the area to the south of Kiaora Lane.	Partial
To maintain or improve the amenity of adjoining residential areas and to protect the surrounding environment	The amenity of adjoining residential areas will be affected by increased traffic and the built form of the supermarket.	No
To minimise the impact of development on adjoining properties and properties in the immediate locality	The box like structure of the supermarket does not minimise the impact of the supermarket on adjoining properties. However, the scale is much lower than the approved scheme and there is potential to better minimise adjoining property impacts.	No
To ensure that development on private and public land is accessible	Insufficient information provided. Scheme has potential to be fully accessible.	Potential for compliance
To provide a prominent public connection between Kiaora Lane and the public spaces of Knox Street and Guilfoyle Park	The proposed arcade will provide this connection	Yes
To ensure that the development meets best practice in environmentally sustainable design	Insufficient information provided. Arcade must have natural lighting and ventilation	Potential for compliance

The above analysis indicates that the Woolworths scheme partly satisfies the objectives of the Double Bay Centre DCP. The main areas of non-compliance with the DCP relate to the non-provision of residential uses, traffic impacts, the lack of community facilities and a public plaza, the impacts on the adjoining residential areas and the disconnected street pattern.

3.2 Positive elements of the proposed scheme

Expanded supermarket and new retail space

The Double Bay commercial centre serves as both a local and a regional shopping precinct. The *Dimasi* report (2003) commissioned by the joint venture partners for the approved Kiaora Lands development identified that the availability of take-home and grocery shopping is not strong in Double Bay and that this is unusual in a centre that is primarily local in terms of its retail hierarchy. The existing Woolworths supermarket is small and dated by modern day standards and is not supplemented by specialty food stores within close vicinity. Although, there are some food outlets in the Cosmopolitan Arcade and on Bay Street, there is no one location which offers a good collection of specialty food stores and retail services together with convenient carparking. The report also stated that one of Double Bay's clear shortcomings is the difficulty of finding a carpark during any busy shopping period such as Thursday evenings, Friday and weekend periods.

At the regional level, Double Bay has traditionally featured a substantial number of fashion stores including a concentration of upmarket labels. However, in recent years, Double Bay has undergone a major decline with a number of the upmarket stores moving elsewhere, notably to *Westfields* in Bondi Junction. This decline can be attributed to a number of factors including:

- the opening of the *Westfields* development which is a large and high quality regional centre. It offers two department stores, two supermarkets, specialty shops (including upmarket fashion labels), a cinema and ample parking. It has obviously had competitive implications for Double Bay.
- high rents charged by landlords and a reluctance to reduce rents to attract new tenants. This has led to higher vacancy rates in the centre.
- downturn in retail spending on clothing across Australia.
- closure of the cinema in Double Bay, which has reduced patronage of the centre particularly at night.

The Woolworths proposal could potentially be a catalyst that brings about the revival of Double Bay. The provision of a new expanded supermarket and specialty food retail outlets on Kiaora Lane, combined with convenient and sufficient carparking would provide an attractive alternative to Westfields for local shoppers. Increased patronage of food shopping will contribute to the stimulation of greater pedestrian and shopper activity throughout the entire Double Bay shopping precinct, as the proposed arcade will provide ready access between the Kiaora Lands site and the north side of Double Bay.

Adequate public car parking

The Woolworths proposal will provide approximately 380 car spaces at the ground level and roof top level of the supermarket building. Approximately 155 car parking spaces are currently available in the carparks on Kiaora Lane and Anderson Street. The scheme will therefore, deliver a substantial increase in the number of car spaces, although this increase needs to be considered in conjunction with the increased floorspace of the development. Woolworths has provided a letter written by Bruce Masson of Masson Wilson Twiney (dated 10 July 2006) (**Annexure 4**) which outlines the proposed parking:

“The proposed provision of 380 parking spaces represents an increase of 236 spaces over the present provision on the site. Based on the Double Bay DCP, the additional retail floor area would require 163 parking spaces (at a rate of 3.5 spaces per 100m² of lettable floor area). This yields a total requirement of 307 spaces (existing 144 spaces plus 163 required spaces).”

It is noted that the above calculations do not include any parking provisions for the office space (2,858m²) that is included in the Woolworths scheme. If the commercial space is factored in, additional parking spaces are required (at a rate of 2 spaces per 100m²). Nonetheless, overall it appears that the parking aspects of the Woolworths scheme are likely to be satisfactory, but this would need to be tested against a more detailed analysis of the breakdown of the proposed retail and commercial space.

Pedestrian access to the carpark from Kiaora Lane and the supermarket is from travelators located on the street frontage, making access safe and relatively easy.

Upgrading of Kiaora Lane

The Woolworths scheme proposes upgrading works to Kiaora Lane that will include the creation of a shared zone for the busy portion of the lane in front of the supermarket, setback areas on the north and south sides in front of the development and street tree planting within a deep soil zone. Active retail frontages will help to activate the lane and make it a new focus for the centre. The existing arcades running through the New South Head Road block will also benefit from these improvements to Kiaora Lane.

New arcade

A new arcade is proposed linking New South Head Road to Kiaora Lane. As the arcade is located close by the traffic lights on New South Head Road, it will provide an effective means of connecting the north and south sides of Double Bay.

Redevelopment of Woolworths site on New South Head Road

A primary benefit of this scheme is the redevelopment of the existing Woolworths site on New South Head Road. This redevelopment would not necessarily occur if Council was to redevelop its own land separate from Woolworths. The existing supermarket, which is located on New South Head Road, is inappropriate in terms of scale, setbacks, and architectural resolution. It is also adjacent to the Golden Sheaf Hotel which, as a heritage item, deserves a more sympathetically designed neighbour. The redevelopment of this site will result in activation of the street, improved building design and a fitting entry to Double Bay.

3.3 Issues requiring further resolution

Disconnected street pattern

One of the unique features of Double Bay is its labyrinthine network of streets, lanes, walkways and arcades. The Double Bay DCP seeks to reinforce this permeability with controls for the provision and design of lanes, arcades and walkways.

At A2.4.1, the DCP outlines a development framework for the Kiaora Lands site, a key element of which is a well connected street pattern. The layout and street pattern:

- *provides pedestrian connections*
- *provides a large footprint for supermarket*
- *provides a robust street pattern that could be adapted to other uses in the future*
- *directs traffic away from residential streets*

The Woolworths scheme proposes the closure of Anderson and Patterson Streets which would effectively block all pedestrian movement through the southern portion of the site. Pedestrian movement in a north-south direction is indicated through the car park, but such access is barely satisfactory. Of the four listed outcomes, only the provision of a large footprint for the supermarket would be achieved. The proposed dislocated street pattern would make the supermarket site unsuited to other uses in the future.

In terms of the street pattern, the Woolworths scheme is similar to the scheme submitted by Woolworths and Solotel when Council invited expressions of interest for the development of the car park sites in 2001. The Urban Design Advisory Service (UDAS) provided the following comments on that scheme which were included in a report to the Urban Planning Committee on 17 December 2001:

The layout of the supermarket on the site(s) has unfortunately obliterated the fine grain urban structure unique to this location and pays little regard for maintaining the existing and successful street and laneway connections that provide good pedestrian access and a permeable street system.

The scheme will need to be redesigned to accommodate the existing street and laneway alignments and to successfully resolve the interface between the busy retail areas, car parking entries and maintaining safety and privacy on adjoining residential lots.

The building needs to be carefully resolved to ensure the bulk and scale of the building suits the built form context within the area. This will mean reducing the size of the building and modulating its form to avoid the building resulting in a large footprint, podium style development.

These comments are equally relevant to the current Woolworth's proposal.

It is acknowledged that the provision of the large footprint required for the supermarket and a permeable street pattern are not readily achieved. At the masterplan stage of the approved DA, many design options were explored in the early stages, largely in an effort to develop a scheme that would provide both outcomes. The result of these investigations was a realignment of Patterson Street and a new street connecting to Kiaora Road. A connection to Kiaora Road is not possible with the Woolworths scheme as the site does not include the properties on Kiaora Road. However, a well designed pedestrian connection between Patterson Street and Anderson Street and between Anderson Street and Kiaora Lane should be provided. It is possible that these outcomes could be achieved with a smaller supermarket footprint.

Interface between the supermarket and adjacent residences

A suitable landscaped buffer should be provided between the supermarket and adjacent residences.

Lack of community facilities

One of the objectives for the Kiaora Lands site is the provision of community facilities. The approved DA included a new library (approx 2000m²) within the existing Woolworths site. There is the potential for community facilities to be included within the new scheme. However, this will also be dependent on successful landowner negotiations and arrangements between the parties.

Walkway

The DCP stipulates that a new public plaza should be provided between Kiaora Lane and Patterson Street. In the new scheme a new landscaped through site link is proposed between Kiaora Lane and Patterson Street at the western boundary of the site but the scheme does not, and cannot, provide a plaza of similar dimensions to the approved scheme. This is because the loading and unloading area is located to the west of the supermarket with access from Kiaora Lane. There is no alternative location for the loading dock as a consequence of the reduced site area. While it would be preferable if the walkway was more centrally located, again this is not possible at ground level because of the location of the proposed loading dock.

Arcade design

The DCP encourages the provision of good quality arcades and walkways with a light and airy character and stipulates that they have natural lighting and ventilation. The Woolworths scheme proposes a covered arcade at ground level only, which will not provide a good pedestrian environment. The proposed arcade should have top lighting and should be designed in accordance with the controls in the DCP at 6.4.3 and A2.6.8. The scheme has the potential to achieve this outcome.

Supermarket design

The supermarket should be designed so that it does not present as a blank box on the side and rear elevations and ideally, it should have active frontages to all areas of the public domain. The roof of the proposed supermarket will be overlooked by properties in Double Bay, Edgecliff and Bellevue Hill. The roof space should be designed with an articulated roof, so that the parked cars are not visible when viewed from above and the roof itself is an attractive form.

ESD

ESD should be holistically incorporated into the proposal. Issues such as natural lighting and ventilation, water retention and recycling should be considered.

Traffic and loading issues

Council's Traffic and Transport Planner, Lorna Oliver, has provided comments on the proposed loading facilities and assessed the traffic circulation and traffic impacts on the local street networks:

Proposal for loading and unloading

There are areas of considerable concern in the loading area contained in this proposal as it will place heavy vehicles and delivery trucks in direct conflict with vehicular traffic accessing the carpark and additionally with pedestrian traffic in the shared zone. Similar arrangements have been used in other large developments, however, these arrangements do not permit heavy vehicles to conflict with pedestrian movements in a high-use pedestrian area as detailed in this proposal. The magnitude of this conflict is considered to be far from acceptable due to the obvious safety risks for pedestrians. The conflict between heavy vehicles and vehicular traffic accessing the carpark is also a cause for concern, however the magnitude and risk associated with this conflict is more easily managed.

Traffic circulation and traffic impacts on the local street network, including the intersections with New South Head Road

This development is predicted to generate approximately 89.3% of the peak hour vehicle trips proposed in the approved DA (370vph compared with 414vph in the approved DA). The traffic report submitted with this proposal appears to imply that this is acceptable as it consists of a total volume of peak demand that is less than that of the approved DA. The problem with this apparent assumption is that the approved DA had far greater site permeability due to the retention of public roads and the implementation of additional accessways. This resulted in a greater dispersion of the generated traffic within the local roads than the proposed development does in its current form.

In the current proposal, all vehicles accessing the site must access the site via Kiaora Lane and therefore Manning Road, and must egress the site via Kiaora Lane and Kiaora Road (and to a lesser degree via Anderson Street). Whilst it is acknowledged that this is the arrangement on the site currently, given the intensity of the proposed development, the increase of this movement is considered to be a significant concern due to the number of heavy and delivery vehicles likely to be executing the movement through Kiaora Lane from Manning Road to Kiaora Road.

Another concern for Council is the lack of detailed information on the impact of these large vehicle numbers, particularly heavy vehicles, on local intersections, including those intersections with New South Head Road. The traffic report provided by the proponent does not include detailed information or analyses such as those generated by traffic analysis software (i.e. SIDRA and INTANAL). This makes it impossible for Council to assess the likely traffic impact of this development on intersections in the area.

Additionally no information is provided on the source and destination of the quoted additional 370 vehicles per hour in the peak hour demand. This information is needed to assess the potential impact of this development on local roads, particularly Manning Road.

General comments

It is recommended that, should this development proceed, adequate consideration be given to pedestrian amenity and permeability of the site. Currently, the suggested route through the basement carpark, for pedestrians accessing the site from Anderson Street, is not desirable from a traffic perspective as it increases risk by increasing the volume of the conflicting movement (pedestrians) within the basement carpark. As the route through the carpark is considered to be a less pleasant route for pedestrians without considering the traffic concerns, it is recommended that alternatives to this movement are developed by improving the pedestrian and vehicular permeability of the site.

These comments strongly suggest that there are likely to be problems with the proposed traffic, parking, loading and unloading arrangements largely due to the lack of dispersed access and egress arrangements and the resultant concentration of inbound traffic on Manning Road and Kiaora Lane. More work needs to be done to better understand and test these arrangements.

4. Information provided by Woolworths

In response to Item 5 of the Council resolution of 10 July 2006, Woolworths has provided the following additional information attached as **Annexure 5**:

Calculation of the site lands owned by Woolworths and Council, including public roads

Comment

According to the table provided by Woolworths, Council owns 11,817.5m² (including roads), and Woolworths owns 4,053.9m². Council therefore, owns just under three quarters of the site.

Elevation treatment of supermarket

Comment

A variety of methods are proposed to alleviate the blank walls of the supermarket – modelling of the façade and the use of materials such as coloured and patterned concrete/brickwork. These elevations would be improved by including windows that look onto the public spaces of Patterson and Anderson Streets. The parapet at the roof level should be designed to provide an appropriate termination of the building.

Site permeability diagram

Comment

The submitted diagram shows good permeability between Kiaora Lane and New South Head Road as well as a landscaped through site link along the western boundary of the site between Patterson Street and Kiaora Lane. Otherwise pedestrian movement from the south would be through the car park, a less than desirable outcome.

Open space and landscaping

Comment

The proposed landscape works to Kiaora Lane appear satisfactory and have the potential to provide a significantly upgraded public domain. An increased landscape buffer is desirable between the supermarket and adjacent residences. This buffer could potentially include pedestrian/vehicle access.

Proposals for making the development fully accessible

Comment

The following design characteristics will achieve a fully accessible development:

- all entries at grade
- arcade graded to match at grade levels at entry
- at grade pedestrian crossing from arcade
- provision for disabled parking around entries
- at grade retail frontages to Kiaora Lane
- lift access to upper floors including roof parking.

Pedestrian safety

Comment

A diversionary route is proposed through the car park to reduce traffic in the proposed shared pedestrian vehicular zone of Kiaora Lane. However, council's Traffic and Transport Planner has raised concerns about the potential conflict between vehicular and pedestrian traffic, including heavy vehicles in the shared zone.

Access through the car park may be a safety issue for pedestrians, particularly if this is the primary pedestrian connection between Anderson Street and Kiaora Lane.

Proposals for Loading and Unloading

Comment

A loading dock is proposed on the western side of the proposed supermarket with access and egress from Kiaora Lane. This location has several disadvantages:

- The primary access for both heavy and light vehicles will be from the western end of Kiaora Lane. Both heavy and light vehicles will pass through the shared pedestrian zone of Kiaora Lane.
- The loading dock is placed next door, albeit separated by a landscaped through site link, to a residential flat building at 11 Patterson Street and opposite residences at 4-8 Patterson Street. There are likely to be amenity conflicts due to this location unless impacts can be addressed by building design and operational limitations.
- The loading dock will not provide an attractive entry to Kiaora Lane from one of the Royal Arcade links from New South Head Road.
- The loading dock prevents the development of any significant public open space or plaza.

Traffic Circulation and Impacts

Comment

The submitted diagram illustrates the proposed traffic circulation and traffic impacts. It will be noted that the only access points to the development are from Kiaora Lane (west end) and from Patterson Street. All egress will be from Kiaora Lane and Anderson Street. As noted in section 3.2 we have considerable concern about these arrangements, the concentration of traffic onto Manning Road and the possible impacts on the operation of the intersection of Manning Road and New South Head Road, particularly due to increased right hand movements from New South Head Road to Manning Road. In these circumstances more detailed traffic modelling will be required to ascertain the acceptability of the proposed arrangements.

Public Domain (e-mail from Leonard Lynch, Design Director for CLOUSTON Landscape/Urban Design)

Comment

We agree generally with the comments contained in this e-mail, in particular that:

- The proposal will draw people through the arcades from New South Head Road to Kiaora Lane and strengthen and link the operation of these arcades
- Kiaora Lane, as a shared pedestrian and trafficable precinct, will add much to the vitality, utility and improved appearance of Double Bay
- Additional street trees will need to be removed but the opportunity is created to plant extra street trees along Kiaora Lane in good, natural soil conditions.

5. Discussion of Options

As, discussed in section 3.1, the proposed scheme has many positives and satisfies many of the objectives of the Double Bay DCP. Being a scheme that does not require underground parking and substantial excavation it avoids many of the complexities of the approved scheme. It also has the potential to significantly improve the quality of the public domain and create a positive shopper experience around a new and significantly upgraded supermarket and quality food retailing precinct. It is, however, constrained by the smaller site and the lack of access to Kiaora Road. This has resulted in a compromised arrangement for loading, unloading and traffic circulation, and a disconnected street pattern not consistent with the prevailing pattern of connected streets, laneways and arcades in Double Bay.

Notwithstanding these concerns the proposal would be a significant improvement on current conditions and would undoubtedly have a significant positive impact on the trading conditions within the centre. Council has a number of options:

Option 1 – Proceed with the Woolworths Scheme

For the reasons outlined above it is open to Council to continue to work with Woolworths to develop and further test the current scheme. If this option is adopted detailed traffic modelling should be undertaken to test the acceptability of the proposed traffic, loading, parking and circulation arrangements. If this testing confirms the acceptability of the proposal the scheme could proceed to the next stage of design development taking on board the comments we have made in this report about the box like nature of the proposed structure and its relationship with the residential properties to the east south and west.

Option 2 – Not Proceed with current scheme

Given the concerns we have expressed about the traffic circulation, loading and unloading and the disconnected street pattern Council could decide to take a longer term position and not proceed until a larger consolidated site is available. This may place some additional pressure on the landowners to achieve again the larger consolidated site which has greater potential to achieve a better planning and urban design outcome. However, it appears that there are no short term prospects of the landowners, Woolworths and Solotel, getting to an agreement to enable this to occur. There is also the possibility that Solotel may want to prepare an alternative scheme involving its land holdings with Council's land.

Option 3 – Proceed with another Expressions of Interest Approach

Council could proceed with another 'expressions of interest' process for development of its lands either alone or in conjunction with adjoining lands. This approach may result in some new proposals for development of Council's land but is unlikely to deliver a result as good as can be achieved by consolidating its land with that of Woolworths and/or Solotel, noting that there is little prospect of achieving new site links to New South Head Road other than through the Woolworths site.

6. Conclusion

On balance, it is recommended that Council proceed with Option 1, subject to traffic modelling confirming that the proposed arrangements for traffic circulation, loading and unloading and parking will operate in a satisfactory manner.

Allan Coker
Director Planning and Development

Margaret Zulaikha
Urban Design Team Leader

ANNEXURES:

1. Minutes of the Kiaora Lands Working Party meeting 14 November 2006
2. Table by JBA Planning showing how the proposed scheme satisfies the objectives of the Double Bay DCP
3. Letter dated 10 July 2006 from Masson Wilson Twiney on the Traffic Implications of the Modified Kiaora Lane Development Scheme
4. Papers supplied by Woolworths, titled Planning / Built Form, including:
 - Calculation of the site lands owned by Woolworths and Council, including public roads
 - Elevation Treatment
 - Site Permeability
 - Open Space and Landscaping
 - Proposals for making the development fully accessible

- Diversionary Route and Shared Zone to Improve Pedestrian Safety
- Proposals for making Kiaora Lane more pedestrian friendly
- Loading and Unloading
- Traffic circulation and traffic impacts
- E-mail from Leonard Lynch on the Public Domain.