

Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting 25 March 2021

DA2020/1517 - 49 Warriewood Road, WARRIEWOOD

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

The application proposes demolition works and subdivision of 3 lots into 13 lots to include 1 super lot, 11 Torrens Title residential lots and 1 lot containing the creek line corridor, civil works and the construction of two residential flat buildings containing 34 apartments including basement parking, swimming pool. It requires the removal of 47 trees (32 exempt).

A pre-lodgement meeting (PLM2019/0109) was held on 6 June 2019 in relation to development of the subject site. The concept plans raised significant issues with the proposal. The proposed development is substantially different to that presented at the PLM.

Council officers have provided the Panel with a comprehensive briefing in relation to the planning controls and intention of the development controls in relation to the site and the proposal.

The Panel will not repeat these comments in full but notes:

Pittwater LEP Built Form Controls

- Height. Clause 4.3 (2) Height RFB = 12.34m (max 17.5% breach)
- Density Clause 6.1 Density Buffer 1F = 21 dwellings Buffer 1G = 23 dwellings Max 44 proposed 45

Pittwater DCP Warriewood Valley Controls

- C6.8 Residential Subdivision Principles RFB require 10% studio, 10% 1 bed 10% 2 bed
- The rear setback of 10m has not been complied with for lots fronting Warriewood Road.

As noted by the Contributions Officer, it is not clear how dual occupancies could be proscribed from being developed after the approval of this application unless the limit in the DCP continues to have effect.

Overall comment

The proposed number of dwellings exceed the maximum permissible by 1 dwelling (45 compared to 44).

This appears to be a minor non-compliance but ignores the DCP requirement for a mix of dwelling typologies and a mix of dwelling sizes in terms of the number of bedrooms.

The proposed units in the residential flat building component have a very large internal floor area, (in the order of 210sqm per apartment on ground and first level partly due to inefficient internal planning) that combined with very large lobbies results in a very bulky and repetitious form that is unnecessarily large and would be significantly reduced if the proposal complied with the unit mix as shown in the following table.

Current proposal

Detached		%	GFA approx.	GFA
assume 4br	11		180	1980
Apartments	num	%		
4br	20	59%	208	4160
3br	14	41%	130	1820
2br		0%		
1br		0%		
Studio		0%		
	34			5980

note GFA excludes circulation

Complying scheme

Detached	num	%	GFA approx.	GFA
assume 4br	11		180	1980
Apartments				
4br	17	50%	160	2640
3br	7	20%	130	858
2br	3	10%	100	330
1br	3	10%	80	264
Studio	3	10%	60	198
	33			4290
				72%

Note that the assumed GFA for the units are well in excess of the minimum required by the ADG

In other words, the current proposal has a floor area about 140% of that that could be expected in a scheme that had the required unit mix.

This has a number of 'flow on effects' including building bulk, height, activation of the common area, possible setbacks and the extent of the footprint and landscaped area and car parking numbers.

Many if not all of the more detailed issues could be easily resolved if the scheme were redesigned to comply with the required dwelling mix.

Scale, built form and articulation

The Panel supports different typologies of lots, but the sizing and layouts needs redesign to realise their potential and provide improved amenity to future residents.

It is not clear why lots 1-7 need to be so small, why the apartment blocks are so regular and the plans simply mirrored with no consideration of the different aspect (north or south) or context (overlooking of neighbouring properties and the type and configuration of development on them).

The Panel notes that the current easement for sewer cuts awkwardly through the site from north to south may not be required and that negotiations are currently underway with Sydney Water. This would remove a constraint that appears to have generated the geometry of the apartment block.

Overall layout and relationship between the apartments and Torrens title lots needs to be refined to ensure the opportunity for high amenity in all the new dwellings and better separation with good landscape buffering.

Overall layout for the apartments is not well considered and needs to be redesigned to optimise the public open space.

The apartments have regimented, repetitious form that is not in keeping with the character of the area.

No justification or rationale has been provided for non-compliance.

Recommendations

1. Comply with dwelling mix, height and setbacks.
2. The layout for the lots is to be adjusted to create improved layouts and separations once the resolution to the easement is finalised.
 - Improved separation and additional landscape buffer between terrace / apartment blocks and adjacent allotments
 - Improved planning and articulation of the terraces / apartments to reduce the regimented approach and redesign with something that is more in keeping with the character of the area.

Car parking and services

The car parking extends beyond the footprint of the buildings above due to inefficient planning. This reduces the amount of deep soil area available in the courtyards and common space.

Although compliant, the entry ramp appears to be designed to the absolute minimum clearances.

It is not clear how the garbage from the underground store is accessed or taken to the above ground bin area at the rear of Lots 5-7, or why this needs to occupy valuable deep soil. The unshaded paved area allocated for access to the bins is excessive.

Recommendations

3. Car parking should not extend past the footprint of the building above
4. Reduce the number of car spaces from 77 to 69 (possible with a complying dwelling mix)
5. Provide landscape buffer between the entrance to the underground car parking and Lots 3 and 4
6. Reorganise garbage and waste management and minimise amenity impacts (visual, noise, odour) on adjoining dwellings
7. No external clothes drying spaces are indicated.

Privacy

Units C13 and C15 look directly into the adjoining properties rear yards.

Units C11, C12, C16, C17, D11, D12, D16, D17 look directly into and over the private open spaces of the Torrens lots.

Recommendations

8. Ensure the principal outlook of units is not directly into or over adjoining properties - this should be easily achievable on a site of this size.

Landscape

The current proposal appears to remove all vegetation for the 'development lots' between Lorikeet Grove and Warriewood Road.

Recommendations

9. Ensure the many environmental and biodiversity issues are satisfactorily addressed
10. Redesign the common landscape areas to ensure high amenity for all residents
11. Provide more details for all the landscaping across the site
12. Use landscaping to provide screening for private spaces

Unit Design and Amenity

Overall, the internal planning, layout, excessive area in the units and repetitious panning of the units that does not take into account different orientations results in a poor design.

- It is not possible to achieve 2 minimum sized bedrooms (including a main bedroom minimum dimension of 3.6m) within a 6m module when internal and common walls that will have to achieve a minimum acoustic performance is taken into account.
- The room sizes are unnecessarily large without providing any additional amenity but contributing to the bulk of the building.
- Circulation spaces both in the common areas and within the units are excessively large without providing any additional amenity (including the stair, 27sqm is devoted to circulation on the upper level of the maisonette apartments)
- Stairways from the basement are currently not closed off with no room for a door.
- Cross ventilation is good but solar access is poor for many of the apartments (on the eastern block living room face south-east, as do some of the top-level living areas that also then overlook the neighbouring properties).

The triangulated apartments and terraces on the ends of the terrace/apartment rows have poor amenity due in part to the minimal setbacks and separation distances amenity

Recommendations

13. Remove low amenity triangular terraces and apartments
14. Redesign terraces and apartments to address issues noted above, ensuring:
 - Main bedrooms have a minimum width of 3.6m
 - Efficient planning with less wasted space
 - Enclosure to stairs from the basement car parking
 - Strong relationship between internal and external spaces
 - Cross ventilation to all apartments.

Sustainability and resilience

The Energy Efficient Design strategies in the Design Statement are very general, and not indicated on the drawings.

Recommendations

15. Identify where all sustainability aspects are on the drawings.

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel does not support the proposal.

The proposal should comply with the total number of dwelling permissible (45/44) and more importantly should include the mix of dwelling sizes specified by the DCP.

The design is in need of further development to properly address the context and apartment design standards. Overall the proposal has poor amenity and poor, inefficient planning that does not adequately consider its relationship to adjoining development, aspect, privacy, solar orientation resulting in a design that is unnecessarily bulky and monolithic that cannot be easily rectified by small adjustments to the design of the buildings. These issues require a different approach to the overall site planning and arrangement of built form.