

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2020/1597
Date:	06/01/2021
To:	Anne-Marie Young
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 25 DP 7002 , 67 Pacific Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

Officer comments

The proposal has not responded to all the issues identified in the Pre-Lodgement Meeting held previously:

1. The proposed boarding house is a big increase in unit density and as such, amenities to surrounding neighbours should be protected as if a residential flat building is going to be proposed.

Response: The proposal does not comply with the built form controls and as such the amenities to the neighbouring residences are affected.

2. Proposal should comply fully with the front building setback of 6.5m and side setback of 4.5m, 2m at basement levels and building envelope of 5m at 45 degree. Amenities such as sunlight and privacy to neighbouring residences should not be compromised.

Response: The proposal has not complied with the side setbacks, side boundary envelope controls and basement setback. Amenities to neighbouring residences have been compromised.

3. No building sections are provided. Building height should comply with the 11m control but concern is raised with the deep excavation of the two basement carpark levels, two levels of communal rooms and three level of boarding units at the rear of the site. Basement carpark should not protrude above natural ground by more than one metre. Communal rooms proposed at the rear in subterranean conditions could be redesigned to face a central courtyard to be located in the middle of the building.

Response: The extent of basement excavation of about 3.5 storeys is a concern on a narrow site. Structure such as contiguous bore piles to the basement walls have not been indicated on drawings and will encroach into the 2m setback. The common rooms proposed are still lacking in sunlight amenity.

4. Middle units facing the west boundary have overlooking issues, a suggestion will be to re-orientate to the north by creating central courtyard to look into.

Response: Middle units are still facing the western boundary.

5. Building articulations could be improved with bigger gaps to preserve existing trees and by creating a central courtyard for middle units to face into.

Response: These suggestions have not been explored.

6. Landscape requirement of 50% site should be provided for adequate landscape buffer to soften the impact of the increase in density of living units.

Response: Inadequate landscape (39%) has been proposed.

7. The roof terrace should address the street primarily and to be setback from building edges and have landscape planters to minimise overlooking and noise nuisance issues to next door neighbours.

Response: The proposed terrace can be supported.

8. Generally, 30 units is an overdevelopment of the site with the side boundaries and building envelope breaches. The façade treatment consisting of mainly repetitive window boxes void of balconies could be

softened with a more residential look with green walls and a variety of material finishes.

Response: The 26 rooms boarding house is still an over-development with excessive building control breaches. Facade articulations and finishes treatment could be improved and refine further.

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.