

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2020/0205
Date:	05/06/2020
To:	Renee Ezzy
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 9 DP 6984 , 18 Alexander Street COLLAROY NSW 2097

Officer comments

The proposal in its current form cannot be supported for the following reasons:

General

The proposed development of affordable rental housing in the R2 zone of Collaroy Basin locality cannot be supported.

The following comments consider the two applications lodged for the site and the relationship of the adjacent buildings.

Character/Context

The locality is predominantly R2 low rise residential in proximity to B2 local centre.

The proposed development of Lots 8 and 9, 18 Alexander Street Collaroy, I believe, need to be reviewed and considered side by side given the context of the development and the resulting adjacencies of the two buildings and the broader contextual relationship.

As such comments address both buildings generally where not specifically addressed as either Lot 8 or Lot 9 for the purposes of detailed planning and design assessment as they relate to each building.

Site Response/Lot Consolidation

It is acknowledged that the design of the two sites have a determined relationship to each other, however several issues arise when considering the development(s) in the broader context of the streetscape, character and bulk and scale.

Whilst two separate applications and Lots the considered adjacency and design elements that respond to the streetscape can almost be read as a single development; entry staircases to the Lots from the street sharing a zero lot adjacency.

Ultimately though the development will be read from a broader streetscape lens and effort to maintain similar characteristics and aesthetics, modulation and articulation are generally supported.

However the intensity of the two sites developed simultaneously and the considered adjacency of the building to the R2 low density sites to the west and east of the two lots will be significantly impacted by the intensity of the development.

Strategies that look to modularise each lot, with the potential for pavilions that bookend a central community landscape d open space is highly encouraged.

As such the current intensity and configuration of the site planning cannot be supported

Design/Aesthetics

Volumes, proportion and ratio of the elevation and material treatments have merit and can generally be supported. Whilst not identical and providing difference across the whole elevation of the two lots side by side there is an inherent bulk and scale issue with the minimum 0.9m side setback almost of inconsequence. Similarly the two entry stairs to the front elevation sharing the central boundary adds to the perceived bulk and scale of the development. No through site vistas to green space between buildings at the western and eastern boundaries is compounded by the zero lot alignment of the entry stairs. As such the development presents as a large RFB of design merit but overscaled somewhat.

Boundary

The opportunity to consolidate at a more finer grain detail should be further explored. Elevations that show adjacent relationships in terms of volume scale articulation and modulation are acknowledged. However the two lots adjacent developed simultaneously may share a relationship in terms of aesthetics and materials but requires further interrogation as to how the adjacent properties meet at the central boundary between Lots 8 and 9 does not necessarily need to be defined by a boundary fence.

The opportunity to develop the site considering the lots as a single development would reveal further finer grain detail possibilities for this central area.

Stairs on Boundary Fence – zero lot alignment

Removal of Boundary fence between Lot 8 and 9

Internal Fences

Lot 8

The level 1 floor plan shows fences internal to the boundary dividing units Manager, Bed 7 and Bed 6 annotating this as private open space (POS).

The value of these POS's at the size they are in terms of both orientation and amenity is somewhat diminished.

Would there be better value in treating this with a more refined landscape response potentially as a communal garden again across the two lots. It is noted that currently the orientation is not optimal with overshadowing covering the garden almost all of winter.

Further investigation into how this garden may provide opportunities to create a consolidated backyard with Lot 9 incorporating the pool should be tested in more detail (see swimming pool comments below).

The issue of solar access to the rear courtyard could be resolved by stepping the building back at the upper level to allow winter sun access to the rear yard all year round. Shadow diagrams demonstrating

the winter azimuth and clear solar access to the rear garden should be demonstrated as explored through the deletion of part of the top storey to the rear of the site(s) to optimise the winter sun azimuth.

Hard Surfaces

Paths at boundaries to the east show hard surfaces built to the boundary line, including stairs and egress routes similarly with hard surfaces built to the boundary.

Refer landscape officer comments for further commentary on required Landscaped Open Space.

Swimming Pool

The adjacency of the swimming pool including enclosure to beds 4 and 5 on level 1 are such that privacy without the opportunity for visual connection to the outdoors is disrupted by the need for pool compliance fencing. Privacy screening for the units may provide some visual and acoustic privacy however the imposition on the residents to be constantly screening their lives for the multiple resident pool users is not an ideal planning outcome for resident amenity.

Consideration of a substantial planting buffer between the level 1 residences at the rear of the site and the pool activity area is highly recommended. This may have the impact of pushing the private open space requirements further into the unit plan, thus reducing the floor areas potentially leading to a revised planning scheme or substantial modification to these units.

Currently the drawings show the pool fence line is in fact also the balcony balustrade. Balustrading of balconies or private open space balustrading should not also be the pool fence.

Refer compliance and regulation for pool fencing and consideration of the amenity comments above are highly recommended.

Through Site Green Links

The fact of the proposed two developments being lodged together (date etc) suggests the strategy for a development of two lots consolidated allowing for a greater developable footprint whilst remaining numerically compliant.

If the lots were consolidated the development would be outside the allowable zoning effectively taking on the typology of an RFB.

As such the development would be significantly reduced in bulk and scale should the development application have been lodged as a consolidated site.

A simple cut and paste collage of the two lots developed when viewed from Alexander Street demonstrates a significant bulk and scale issue. This is clearly demonstrated such that upon completion of the two sites there would be no through site green link to view aspects beyond the façade. As previously mentioned there is no doubt the development would read as a large single development.

The planning regime may have merit if further consideration to the consolidation of the lots and a more fine grain and considered response to the site as a whole is explored. This may reveal opportunities for a more considered response to the context. At present if the two lots were developed side by side as is the resulting outcome would not be supported.

There is inherent merit in the design response in terms of materiality and aesthetics, even to the switching of materials and colours so as not to be read as the same development or a cookie cutter response but with quite distinct characteristics to each. This aspect of the proposed development is supported. However a more fine grain response and consideration of neighbouring amenity, site orientation in terms of solar gain throughout the year and clearer through site links through greater side setbacks that provide vegetation and the opportunity for established planting is highly recommended.

Internal Planning

There are two instances (Lot 8 – Bed 9 and Lot 9 – Bed 7) where Door circles cross over into the turning circle of another door coinciding with the front entry door to the unit(s) and the internal bathroom door to the unit(s). The circulation in these areas is not ideal.

1. SEPP Affordable Rental Housing (ARH) 2009

Clause 29(2) Wall Height Maximum Storeys and Rear Setbacks

The following controls under the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP are not achieved;

- a. Maximum wall height – 7.2m
- b. Rear setbacks – 6m

Wall height exceeds the 7.2 metre restriction on the northern wall/elevation zone of the building.

A reduction in height of building at the rear of the site (south) t

Clause 30 A – Character of Local Area

The design of the two developments demonstrates merit in the design approach. There are several tactics used across the two developments by adjacent structures up to boundaries; the open stair access to level 1 and what will be a greater central staircase to each development, which will undoubtedly have the impact of a much larger RFB type development.

The applicant is encouraged to investigate smaller modules/pavilion type strategies across the two sites to reflect the low density character of the area.

2. Built Form Controls:

WLEP 2011

Aims of the LEP in relation to residential development, are to:

- (d) (i) protect and enhance the residential use and amenity of existing residential environments, and*
- (ii) promote development that is compatible with neighbouring development in terms of bulk, scale and appearance, and*
- (iii) increase the availability and variety of dwellings to enable population growth without having adverse effects on the character and amenity of Warringah.*
- (f) (i) achieve development outcomes of quality urban design, and*
- (iv) ensure that development does not have an adverse effect on streetscapes and vistas, public places, areas visible from navigable waters or the natural environment, . . .*

The aims of the zone, to ensure residential environments are in harmony with the surrounding single and double storey houses, have not been achieved.

The proposed bulk and scale of the development needs to be in keeping with the local character, bulk and scale, in sympathy the neighbouring houses.

The western and eastern boundary setback of 0.9 should be increased to 3m to allow for deep soil planting zones. This will assist to achieve a balance of open space whilst addressing the non compliance of the building envelope control. A considered response to the site coverage and appropriately distributed open landscaped space is required to achieve a development that is more in sympathy with the surrounding neighbourhood and low rise residential character of the area..

WDCP 2011

B1 – Wall Heights

Requirements

- 1. Walls are not to exceed 7.2 metres from ground level (existing to the underside of the ceiling on the uppermost floor of the building (excluding habitable areas wholly located within a roof space)).*

There are missing dimensions on the drawings demonstrating wall heights of 7.2 metres have not been breached. Refer cross section 2 on drawing DA200.

B3 – Side Boundary Envelope

Requirements

1. *Buildings on land shown coloured on the DCP Map Side Boundary Envelopes must be sited within a building envelope determined by projecting planes at 45 degrees from a height above ground level (existing) at the side boundaries of: 4 metres*

There are no drawings that demonstrate compliance with this control however a visual assessment of the drawings clearly indicates that the control is breached by the compounding issues of height and minimal setbacks.

B5 – Side Boundary Setbacks

Objectives

- *To provide opportunities for deep soil landscape areas.*
- *To ensure that development does not become visually dominant.*
- *To ensure that the scale and bulk of buildings is minimised.*
- *To provide adequate separation between buildings to ensure a reasonable level of privacy, amenity and solar access is maintained.*
- *To provide reasonable sharing of views to and from public and private properties.*

The creation of a 2-3 m setback to the western and eastern boundary will assist to create deep soil planting zones. Refer Landscape referral for a comprehensive analysis of Landscaped Open Space and recommendations for deep soil planting to achieve the required controls.

B7 Front Boundary Setbacks

Objectives

- *To create a sense of openness.*
- *To maintain the visual continuity and pattern of buildings and landscape elements.*
- *To protect and enhance the visual quality of streetscapes and public spaces.*
- *To achieve reasonable view sharing.*

Requirements

1. *Development is to maintain a minimum setback to road frontages.*
2. *The front boundary setback area is to be landscaped and generally free of any*

*structures, basements, carparking or site facilities other than driveways, letter boxes, **garbage** storage areas and fences.*

It is assumed the front boundary setback is compliant. No dimensions on the drawings.

B9 – Rear Boundary Setbacks

1. *Development is to maintain a minimum setback to rear boundaries.*
2. *The rear setback area is to be landscaped and free of any above or below ground structures*

Exceptions

Corner Allotments on Land Zoned R2 or R3

On corner allotments for land zoned R2 Low Density Residential or R3 Medium Density Residential, where the minimum rear building setback is 6 metres, the rear building setback does not apply.

It is assumed the rear boundary setback is compliant. Pool in the setback zone will have significant impacts on the neighbouring properties as a result of the increased intensity of the site.

D1 Landscaped open space and bushland setting

1 Requirements

1. *The required minimum area of landscaped open space is shown on DCP Map Landscaped Open Space and **Bushland** Setting. To measure the area of landscaped open space:*

- a) *Driveways, paved areas, roofed areas, tennis courts, car parking and stormwater structures, decks, etc, and any open space areas with a dimension of less than 2 metres are excluded from the calculation;*
- b) *The water surface of swimming pools and impervious surfaces which occur naturally such as rock outcrops are included in the calculation;*
- c) *Landscaped open space must be at ground level (finished); and*
- d) *The minimum soil depth of land that can be included as landscaped open space is 1 metre.*

Required percentage of landscaped area has not been achieved (40%). Deck structures and impervious finishes are not to be calculated as Landscape open space.

Refer Landscape officer comments.

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.