

Public Exhibition for the Explanation of Intended Effect New State Environmental Planning Policy (Design and Place)

Your Name

Your Organisation

stephen pearse architect pty ltd

Postcode

2095

Phone

Email

Stakeholder group

Industry Council Aboriginal Community Community State Agency

Age demographic

18-25 26-45 46-65 65+

Your feedback

How to make a formal submission

We welcome your feedback on the Explanation of Intended Effect for a New Design and Place State Environmental Planning Policy. **Submissions close on 31 March 2021.**

Feedback is sought on all parts of the document. Please consider if the proposal:

- Reflects contemporary understanding and practices
- Clearly articulates the intentions of the policy
- Should consider other opportunities.

Explanation of intended effect (EIE)

PART 1

Introduction

PART 2

Proposed new State Environmental Planning Policy (Design and Place)

PART 3

Key components of the new State Environmental Planning Policy

PART 4

Proposed amendments to existing State Environmental Planning Policies

PART 5

Relationship with other planning instruments and policies

PART 6

Planning pathways

APPENDIX A

Proposed Amendments to the Apartment Design Guide and SEPP 65

My feedback is based on experience in design of place and items such as apartments and mixed use as well as my role in design review with various agencies private and LGA.

I support the consolidation and the updating of the documents and welcome the improved approach to achieving better places.

My concern here is specifically around the content and approach for the ADG upgrade.

It is not entirely clear how the current hierarchy of advice will be implemented within the new ADG and SEPP.

The current ADG while a guide document includes a hierarchy of specific objectives, criteria, guidance etc and this is a very valuable tool in guiding clients and in the case of design reviews, professional applicants towards a successful quality outcome.

My concern that in adopting a higher-level principal approach the specifics of the current objectives and enforceable "Numerics" will be lost. The concern is principally in 2 areas of application:

1. Should the clarity of objectives/criteria and specific numeric be removed or watered down then developers /applicants will be able to use the process to redefine the bottom of the design market through exploration of designs which may well be substandard. This will mean that the design review process will be open to long and complex review and debate.
The current document provides good starting point for good design.
2. The current documents can often assist the architects advising the clients within the review process by empowering them to argue for better response to their clients. This is evident in many instances where the review of designs by external LGA representatives or advisors of a less than perfect design is assisted by the highlighting of departures from the numerics/criteria, without benefit to the overall design outcome. The ability to highlight numerics/criteria is a clear and valuable tool to define objectives to point out shortcomings and lead to redesign and better results.

Ideally this approach would not be necessary with architects and clients adopting a good/better design approach from the beginning. The reality however is that applicants/developers often have a specific agenda/approach and the review by external parties needs to hold them to account and effectively reinforce the best outcome approach and empowering the architects to achieve better designs.

So, my advice to the department is that we do not water down the ADG to more principle and less detail/specifics as this will lead to more confusion and instability in the market and within the design and review process.

My hope is that the document maintains and strengthens the specifics of the key issues and adds new areas and refines/defines principles and objectives, but still supplies the metrics as a base model.

APPENDIX B

Proposed New Public Spaces and Urban Design Guide

My feedback is based on experience in design of place and items such as apartments and mixed use as well as my role in design review with various agencies private and LGA.

An area where I am constantly in discussion with applicants/developers is the street edge/boundary/public domain.

The number of services and their impact upon this edge is often an afterthought. The role of utilities and providers should be included in the design of place with clear guidance on how to achieve good outcomes for such things as substations, Boosters, meters, garbage control, service areas etc.

The inclusion within the site planning and the site strategy could be enforced in very early thinking to ensure adequate understanding by all of the spatial, access and design aesthetic implications of these items. This is an area where constant discussion and focus is given to certain developer types and is an area where the design team often lacks the fundamental understanding of what is needed for their particular development. This can lead to reactive solutions rather than properly integrated site wide solutions which work to create a street scape and public domain.

Is there going to be a more inclusive approach to the utilities and engineering providers within the SEPP?

I would recommend that these suppliers be bought into the discussion and provide design lead options for the market.

APPENDIX C

Sustainability in Residential Buildings

Additional comments

Thank you for your time in preparing this submission.