

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	REV2019/0014
To:	Lashta Haidari
Land to be developed (Address):	<p>Lot 1 SP 49558 , 1 / 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086</p> <p>Lot 2 SP 49558 , 2 / 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086</p> <p>Lot 3 SP 49558 , 3 / 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086</p> <p>Lot 4 SP 49558 , 4 / 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086</p> <p>Lot 5 SP 49558 , 5 / 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086</p> <p>Lot CP SP 49558 , 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086</p>

Officer comments

The revised scheme is unacceptable in its current form.

1. Site Planning and Design

Communal Open Space

The revised scheme demonstrates that further setbacks have been applied to the development on the northern boundary frontage. The increased setback to the north western most sector of the development can be supported, provided a significant planting buffer is applied to the street frontage to mediate to the hostile environment of the street frontages and vehicular proximity.

It is noted that this is now the outdoor communal open space. Whilst it can be supported a further or additional green break in the form of the building with through site links and a central courtyard would be a preferred additional treatment to mitigate the location and environmental conditions of being located adjacent to several arterial roads.

Commercial Tenancies

The revised scheme includes tenancies at the ground level that front Frenchs Forest Road to the north and at the first level are oriented to the south.

The elevation of the commercial ground level tenancies to the north lacks any articulation and modulation with the extent of glazed facades measuring approximately 40- 45 metres each (combined length of about 85 metres). Further articulation to address this by way of recessing entry ways into the building to assist to identify individual tenancies and provide interest, modulation and articulation to the bland elevation resulting from full height glazed partition walls to the entire elevation is recommended. The internal spaces and the interface with the external ground plane does not provide for any generosity in the circulation in spatial terms. In fact the doors opening out onto the verandah and pedestrian path to the north eastern commercial tenancies at ground level provide inadequate space or sufficient clearance for disabled circulation along this path. Further investigation and design detail should investigate the requirements for Disability Access to the commercial tenancies with equal access to the verandah spaces that front the tenancies.

2. Height, Mass, Bulk and Scale

Previous comments from the DA submission (DA2018/0995) encouraged a reduction in height and further breaking down of the building mass, bulk and scale. Whilst acknowledging the reduction in

height goes some way to alleviating the bulk and scale the break in built form, proposed as two building masses in the revised scheme is in fact only broken down in mass to the extent of the articulation by the slip in the plan form and a break in the mass at the upper level only.

The design revisions are insufficient to allow the building to be read as two smaller forms with reduced mass and still reads as a single 85 metre long building with no substantial break. A minimum building separation of between 12 - 16 metres with a clear break in built form down to ground level and the provision of a substantial landscaped treatment and internal courtyard between the two building masses would provide for increased amenity and a more fine grain urban design response to the character of the local area in the context of the B7 Zoning and adjacent R2 zone. The above mentioned planning arrangement would also provide for a more amenable indoor outdoor space as an adjunct to the communal and common area spaces at level one with the provision of verandahs and an atrium/indoor oasis for the amenity and use by the residents.

3. SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guide

As previously noted in the DA comments provided the main corridor through long section still represents an unarticulated long corridor that provides for no relief along its length (in both east and west wings of the plan).

The applicant is encouraged to address the SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guide principles in detail in any future design applications.

In summary almost all of the previous comments still apply to the revised scheme. Whilst the planning across the floor plate provides a slip in the form to represents a form of articulation the building still reads as an unarticulated form that demonstrates no through site links or connections to the greater neighbourhood and desired future character of the locality.

The revised design does not go far enough to address the concerns raised in the Urban Design referral for the original DA2018/0995 and as such cannot be supported.

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.