

Elizabeth Street Redfern - State Significant Precinct

Project Review Panel Meeting – 31 October 2019

Panel Members	Graham Jahn – Director City Planning, Development and Transport, City of Sydney (Chair) Ben Hewett – A/Executive Director Government Architect, NSW Government Architect's Office Malcolm McDonald – A/Executive Director, Eastern Harbour City, Greater Sydney, Place & Infrastructure DPIE Elisabeth Peet – A/Director Precincts and Urban Design, TfNSW
Attendees	NSW Dept Planning, Industry and Environment Adrian Melo, Senior Planning Officer, Eastern District Joseph Burraston, Senior Planning Officer, Eastern District City of Sydney Sean Kaufman, Specialist Planner Tim Wise, Manager Planning Policy Land and Housing Corporation Peter Andersen, Executive Director – Communities Plus Nigel McDonald, Development Director Mark Attiwill, Program Director Matt Davis, Design Manager Land and Housing Corporation – Design Team Jane Freeman, Architectus Nick Cappetta, Architectus Penny Fuller, Silvester Fuller Dan Sharp, Tyrell Studio

Introduction

The Project Review Panel (PRP) meeting was held for LAHC to present the outcomes of community consultation for the Elizabeth Street SSP (proposal) and to seek the Panel's feedback on their preferred scheme.

The preferred scheme presented by LAHC included an indicative yield of 450-500 homes which would comprise private, social and affordable dwellings and involves the relocation of the existing PCYC to a new site within walking distance of the precinct. The reference scheme indicates 39,000sqm residential GFA and 1,500sqm non-residential GFA. Building heights range from a 5-6 storeys on Walker Street, 6-9 storeys on Elizabeth Street and a tower on Kettle Street up to 19 storeys.

Key proposed controls include an FSR of 3.7:1, B4 Mixed Use Zone and maximum building heights ranging between 26m and 66m.

This report summarises the commentary and recommendations of the Panel.

Density and Built Form

The Panel supported the rationale and principles of the campus scheme however considered that the quantum of floor space and dwelling yield targeted is too high and is generating a series of issues for the site that could otherwise be avoided. This included impacts of overshadowing, built form scale and interface/transition to the surrounding low scale residential and Redfern Park. The Panel noted that there is limited supportable justification for a 19-storey tower on the site.

Recommendation

The Panel did not support the proposed Floor Space Ratio of 3.7:1, noting that the proposed FSR provision exceeds those generally in the recent urban renewal areas of Green Square and Zetland (excluding the Town Centre). The Panel recommended reducing the density of the development (i.e. FSR provision of 2.5:1) to provide better transition to adjacent conservation area and key significant public space of Redfern Park. Past approvals on the site for a lower density have evidenced a more appropriate response to the context and constraints of the site.

Overshadowing

The Panel did not support the overshadowing impacts created by the proposal on the neighbouring dwellings and on Redfern Park as the key significant open space within the area.

The Panel noted that the overshadowing impacts created by the proposal are contrary to two of the Premier's Priorities of "Greener public spaces" and to "Green our city" which aim to increase and protect the proportion and quality of public green spaces in urban environments.

The Panel recognised that the overshadowing impact on Redfern Park would eventually exceed the 2.7% presented by the design team if future Redfern Estate blocks are developed with similar density and building heights.

Additionally, the Panel noted that the proposal created significant overshadowing of its own ground floor level communal private open spaces which are in shade for the majority of the day in mid-winter. The Panel did note that there were rooftop areas proposed, however the poor amenity of the ground floor central courtyard was unacceptable.

Recommendation

The Panel recommended reducing the development density to address the proposal's overshadowing impact on the surrounding dwellings, key public and communal open spaces and self-shading impact. This includes reducing height in the tower element and along the Elizabeth Street frontage to comply with the no additional overshadowing requirement on Redfern Park.

Public Domain/Open Space

The Panel acknowledged that it was previously agreed that public domain/open space provision did not necessarily need to be accommodated on site fully, but noted that the SSP Study is required to outline the local and state infrastructure contributions.

Recommendation

The Panel noted that a framework for long-term provision of public open space and streets in the Redfern Estate will be submitted as part of the SSP proposal (rezoning proposal), consistent with Study Requirement 3.3. The Panel recommended that the SSP proposal include an outline of the

scope and delivery mechanism for provision and embellishment of open space in the wider Redfern Estate to be consistent with Study Requirement 15.

Development Feasibility and Staging across Redfern Estate

The Panel noted that the drivers for development feasibility of the proposal, especially as they relate to build to rent (BTR), have not been adequately presented and are unclear.

The Panel recognised that the proposal is seeking maximum returns on one parcel within the larger Redfern Estate and noted that this block would not be required to accommodate such a high yield/density if the development outcome was considered in the context of the wider Redfern Estate.

The Panel noted that supporting the high density on this site would set a poor precedent for the remaining Redfern Estate. The Panel expressed concern that if the redevelopment of Redfern Estate was to proceed on a block by block basis, without a coordinated rationale for the wider precinct support of the high density on this block would be committing to poor place outcome and an overdevelopment of the whole Redfern Estate precinct.

Recommendation

The Panel recommend that the targeted development and density outcomes be considered within the wider context of the Redfern Estate precinct and that the project team provide information/evidence of the development feasibility drivers for the project.

Housing Tenure Mix

The Panel noted that the site has the opportunity to deliver a higher number of social housing dwellings as it is currently unoccupied and is not subject to the same requirements as Waterloo Estate to redevelop and replace an existing high quantum of social housing.

Recommendation

The Panel consider the current split of private and affordable to social housing is not the only solution or guiding principle for the provision of social housing for the Elizabeth Street site. The Panel recommended that the project team explore delivering a higher proportion of affordable housing. The Panel also recommend the project team provide evidence of the rationale for the proposed tenure split in relation to development feasibility and provide greater certainty on the proposed percentage of social housing within the development outcome, noting that 'up to 30%' could be interpreted as substantially less than 30%.

PCYC – Community Facilities

The Panel noted the proposed relocation of the PCYC facility currently onsite to another nearby area. The Panel recognised that the previous design schemes retained the PCYC and that the proposal is not consistent with Study Requirements (S.R. 14) or the key 'Purpose of Study' outlined for the proposal.

Recommendation

The Panel recommended that appropriate community facilities/uses remaining onsite should be a key priority of the proposal, especially to cater for the increased demand resulting from

redevelopment of the site. The Panel also recommended that the proposed future location for the PCYC be nominated as part of the proposal.

Additional Recommendations

The Panel raised a number of additional concerns that were not addressed by the preferred scheme's proposal, including:

- Environmental Amenity and Performance
 - The Panel noted the scheme did not provide evidence of the proposal's environmental amenity in relation to solar access, wind and noise performance.
 - Compliance with the Apartment Design Guide, Sydney LEP and Infrastructure SEPP noise criteria are required to be evidenced.
- Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD)
 - ESD strategy and targets have not been adequately outlined in the proposal.
- Site Contamination
 - The Panel notes that the site is potentially contaminated and there are significant geotechnical issues. A previous report for the site indicated a proposed basement structure will be required to be hydrostatically tanked.
 - The Panel noted that this may have a significant impact on the cost of development of the site and question the proposal for a two-level basement and its impact on economic viability.
- Car parking
 - The Panel noted that the car parking provision has not been presented for the scheme or justified in the context of the future Waterloo Metro and proximity to Redfern Station.
- Tree canopy
 - Given the loss of existing trees on the site the Panel recommended there is a commitment to a specific target for tree canopy which could be delivered in larger street setbacks as well as the central courtyard.

Recommendation

The Panel recommended that the proposal address each of the additional recommendations above and provide appropriate evidence to demonstrate how they can be adequately addressed.