

Attachment F

**Design Advisory Panel sub-committee
advice sheet**

**DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL:
SUBCOMMITTEE**

Project	Kings Cross Urban Design Study
Review Dates	27 March 2018, 10 April 2018, 1 May 2018, 9 May 2018, 8 June 2018, 25 June 2018, 6 July 2018 and 6 August.
Subcommittee members	Ken Maher (KM) [Chair] James Weirick (JW) Peter Mould (PM) Rachel Neeson (RN)
COI Declaration	Nil
Urban Design Consultant	Michael Zanardo (MZ)
City of Sydney	Graham Jahn (GJ), Jesse McNicol (JMc), Benjamin Pechey BP), Sally Peters (SP), Matt Devine (MD), Chris Corradi (CC), Anna Kaskanlian (AK), Ken Baird (KB) (attendance varied)
Advice	<p>The subcommittee met on eight occasions commencing on 27th March with varying attendees. Notes have been prepared and issued to attendees following each meeting. In parallel the Council officers undertook a community consultation process to gauge the views of local residents.</p> <p>This Advice Sheet is based on material presented by MZ as he undertook the study, and in particular draft recommendations he presented at the last two meetings, ongoing discussions and panel comments, and the material presented on the final meeting of 6th August which included feedback by Council planners from the consultation.</p> <p>The DAP Subcommittee commends the council officers and the consultant on a comprehensive and professional study process.</p> <p>In general the subcommittee supports;</p> <p>Street frontage height and setbacks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street frontage height set by height of heritage and contributory items (refer note below) • Above street frontage height: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Specific setback for potential heritage items ○ 3m setback for contributory buildings (refer note below) ○ 0m setback for new buildings ○ 3m top floor setback (in some locations) <p>Land use mix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground floor – non-residential only + foyers/entries/service • First floor – non-residential only (may vary on back lane)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 50% non-residential - Potential for some flexibility (refer notes below) <p>Design for fine urban grain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflect subdivision pattern Max ground floor tenancy width 7-12m Max. units per core – As per ADG / DCP Separate residential entry foyers Façade proportions vertical <p>Dwelling unit mix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase 1bed up to 75% Allow reduced balcony sizes and depth subject to common open space (Juliet balconies and bay windows) <p>Development consistent with desirable character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated locality statement reflecting community consultation and study principles with carefully worded description <p>Revise/strengthen heritage provisions (Subject to final recommendations of Heritage Study)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed listings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kingsley Hall Bourbon - façade only, or all extant fabric Empire Hotel - social/historical; listing for use only Refer heritage specialists re. additional listings Contributory items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect existing contributory items as per current control <p>Active front at street edge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Max. 25% solid wall to street frontage Ground floor tenancies with own entry Upper level tenancies - shared commercial lobbies Basement tenancies – Potential direct street access <p>Tenancy sizes – diversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage small tenancies for fine grain Ground level tenancies – max. 300sqm Max tenancy width 7-12m (as above) <p>Proportion of windows to wall (above awning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Openings 20-40% wall surface area Discourage predominant glazing Encourage vertical window proportions <p>Material selection / appearance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage face brickwork and inherent masonry finishes
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage articulated parapet lines/skyline <p>Awnings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retain and provide awnings except where no awning is part of heritage significance • individual entry awnings for residential buildings permitted • coordinate with heritage amendments <p>Design for Noisy Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with Flux study outcomes <p>Car Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider introduction of maximum levels <p>While generally very supportive of the approach the Subcommittee recommends the following issues be addressed in refining the urban design controls before adopting the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general there is a concern that over prescriptive controls and built form envelopes can result in less successful outcomes. Council's competitive design processes are most successful where there is some scope for the architects involved and can be overseen by juries or selection panels, Council staff and the DAP to ensure design excellence. Overly restrictive controls can also unintentionally inhibit renewal of the precinct. The subcommittee recommends some flexibility in the approach with limited absolute controls to deal with critical issues, and with clearly expressed objectives to guide briefs for competitive design processes. • In regard to specific envelope controls the subcommittee recommends: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bourbon - Set back 6m parallel to boundary above heritage item. This varies from the heritage advice and is proposed to enable residential over to comply with SEPP 65 while still respecting the heritage fabric. ○ Lowestoft and Empire - Consistent 3m setback above contributory buildings, or zero setback with recessed horizontal articulation between old and new and recess/shadow line to read building junction with Kingsley House. ○ Radnor – vertical slot to protect existing adjacent windows only. ○ Empire – maximum envelope with requirement to allow reading of original 'Les Girls' building form to allow architects scope, and to ensure no negative impact from overshadowing of adjacent public space, and appropriate transition of scale to adjacent built form on Roslyn Street. (Important to craft words around articulation and scale).
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In regard to land use mix the subcommittee supports in principle the minimum 50% non-residential requirement, however recommends some flexibility with minor variation permitted (say 10% of the amount) on a merit basis e.g. for overall design excellence.
--	---