

## Urban Design Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2018/1800
<b>To:</b>	Daniel Milliken
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 101 DP 868560 , 93 McIntosh Road NARRAWEENA NSW 2099

### Officer comments

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

#### 1. SEPP 65-Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development (ADG)

The applicant is advised that compliance with the requirements of the ADG are to be demonstrated inclusive of, but not limited to, the following clauses which have not been achieved in the proposed development;

##### 3D-1 Communal and Public Open Space

It is noted there is no allowance for communal open space. Design guidance under the ADG suggest . . . provision of communal open spaces elsewhere such as landscaped roof terrace or common room. . . , . . . provide larger balconies . . . , . . . demonstrate good proximity to public open space . . . where developments are unable to achieve the design criteria.

The drawings demonstrate balconies that are of an average size. The pre-lodgement advice to reduce the bulk of development by setting back further from the building to a prescribed area within nominated grid lines could provide the opportunity to address the shortfall in communal space. If this area if unsuitable for additional apartments it could be activated with a rooftop terrace common open/semi open space, so as to better address the ADG requirement.

##### 4C Ceiling Heights

The ground floor commercial floor to ceiling height does not achieve the recommendations for tenancies that are cafes or restaurants. An increased floor to ceiling height of 4 metres should be achieved if there will be café or restaurant tenancies in the building. Refer figure 4C.1 page 86 of the ADG.

##### 4D Apartment Size and Layout of Rooms

The planning and the site constraints coupled with the requirement for every habitable room to have an external window has resulted in the issues discussed below in Acoustic Privacy. Options that have the living space oriented toward the open balconies or external walls, as recommended in the ADG, should be explored further.

##### 4H Acoustic Privacy

Units 4, 3 and 2 have bedrooms adjacent to neighbouring unit outdoor living area. To address issues of acoustic amenity the internal plans need to relocate bedrooms further back into the unit. Bedrooms should be relocated deeper within the floor plan to allow for balconies to be an extension of the living spaces.

If the requirement for windows to habitable rooms discussed above outweighs the acoustic adjacency of balconies to bedrooms, the floor plan could be mirrored so no bedrooms are adjacent outdoor balconies with bedrooms mirrored back to back.

### Universal Design

Circulation door clearance templates should demonstrate compliance with Australian Standards

(AS1428.1) and overlayed onto Unit 1 floor plan to demonstrate adequate compliance with the standard.

The entrance door to Unit 1 has an expandable folding door/screen behind it with what seems like insufficient clearances either side of the door in accordance with door and latch-side clearances. As a rule the circulation template overlay on Accessible units demonstrating compliance with the standard should accompany any future submissions.

## **Built Form Controls:**

### **2. WDCP 2011**

#### *B2 - Number of Storeys*

##### *Objectives*

- *To ensure development does not visually dominate its surrounds.*
- *To minimise the visual impact of development when viewed from adjoining properties, streets, waterways and land zoned for public recreation purposes.*
- *To provide equitable sharing of views to and from public and private properties.*
- *To ensure a reasonable level of amenity is provided and maintained to adjoining and nearby properties.*
- *To provide sufficient scope for innovative roof pitch and variation in roof design.*
- *To complement the height of buildings control in the LEP with a number of storeys control.*

##### *Response*

The proposed design was subject to a pre-lodgement meeting with advice nominating a reduction to the upper level floor area to approx. 50% of the floor plate.

The proposed development application demonstrates this advice has not been represented in the current plans and as such represents an over development of the site. The intent of the advice was to assess the DA on merit based on a reduced upper level footprint, which would be a breach of the height but reduced so as not to have impacts on the streetscape. As such the development cannot be supported given the building is in breach of the height control and has not considered the advice imparted in the pre-lodgement meeting to reduce the upper level building envelope.

#### *D9 – Building Bulk*

##### *Objectives*

- *To encourage good design and innovative architecture to improve the urban environment.*
- *To minimise the visual impact of development when viewed from adjoining properties, streets, waterways and land zoned for public recreation purposes.*

##### *Requirements*

1. *Side and rear setbacks are to be progressively increased as wall height increases.*
2. *Large areas of continuous wall planes are to be avoided by varying building setbacks and using appropriate techniques to provide visual relief.*
3. *On sloping land, the height and bulk of development (particularly on the downhill side) is to be minimised, and the need for cut and fill reduced by designs which minimise the building footprint and allow the building mass to step down the slope. In particular:*
  - *The amount of fill is not to exceed one metre in depth.*
  - *Fill is not to spread beyond the footprint of the building.*
  - *Excavation of the landform is to be minimised.*
4. *Building height and scale needs to relate to topography and site conditions.*

##### *Response*

The proposed design resolution and aesthetic of the development in terms of proportion and scale, and the general articulation, contrast and integrity of the materials selection is supported. Generally the

building reads holistically in its contemporary and uniform finish. The face brick with its fenestrated finish assists to relieve the bulk. Continuation of the face brick parapet elevational treatment up to the height of the top of level 1 balustrade is recommended in lieu of the glazed balustrade evident on the perspective drawings.

The mass and bulk of the form is over scale due in part to the upper level which is in breach of the height control. The advice offered in the pre-lodgement meeting to limit the upper level habitable floor plate to grid lines B-C and 2-5 has not been considered and as such the increased bulk as viewed from the pedestrian level urban environment is unsupported.

Amendments to the internal planning of the units along with a reduction in building bulk will be required.

**Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:**

Nil.