

## Urban Design Referral Response

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Application Number:</b>             | Mod2021/0793   |
| <b>Date:</b>                           | 20/12/2021   |
| <b>To:</b>                             | Lashta Haidari   |
| <b>Land to be developed (Address):</b> | Lot 101 DP 1209504 , 5 Skyline Place FRENCHS FOREST NSW 2086 |

### Officer comments

Thank you for providing some of the additional information requested; however, some of the information required to demonstrate compliance with the ADG has not been supplied.

This application (Mod2021/0793) has been submitted to modify the consent issued under REV2019/0014, which has been subject to a previous revision under Mod2019/0654. The proposed modifications include consolidating existing apartments, resulting in a reduction in 3 apartments, modifications to basement parking, storage and associated building services layout, landscaping changes, increasing the non-residential floor space by 65sqm (from 1,758sqm to 1,823sqm), an increase in 9 parking spaces (to a total of 142 spaces), an increase in overall building height by 510mm to accommodate refinements to structural design to a maximum building height of RL176.51/25.11m. There have been changes to the space-planning and layout of several apartments, and the mix of units has changed. The Apartment Design Guide (ADG) criteria for solar access, natural cross ventilation and other criteria are based on a percentage of the proposed units, and because the number of apartments proposed has changed it is necessary to reassess the proposal against the ADG criteria. To be able to complete assessment of the application the proposal would need to address the following issues, and provide the additional information requested previously.

1. The applicant has now provided some shadow diagrams that illustrate the increased overshadowing to neighbouring sites because of the increase in height; however, they are not in hourly intervals, and they do not demonstrate compliance with the ADG. Please provide a clear solar access study, preferably view from sun drawings that accord with the requirements of a solar access study in AGD appendix 3, and should include the number of hours of solar access to all units living rooms and private open space at hourly intervals between the hours of 9am and 3pm at mid-winter to demonstrate compliance with the ADG. Diagrams denoting which apartment it is claimed comply with the solar access requirements of the ADG do not demonstrate compliance, nor enable consideration.
2. The proposal does not appear to comply with the solar access requirements of the ADG. The number of apartments receiving no direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm at mid-winter does not appear to comply. It is unclear if some of the apartments claimed to achieve the ADG solar access requirements of 2hrs direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm at mid-winter can achieve the requirements.
3. The proposal does not comply with the minimum requirements for natural cross ventilation required by the ADG. The number of apartments able to achieve natural cross ventilation appears to be below the minimum percentage required by the ADG, and less than the number claimed in the application. As one example, apartment A1C does not appear to comply.
4. The common circulation areas should have access to daylight and natural ventilation.
5. There are many areas of concern regarding privacy. In particular, the area between the two apartment blocks. The space-planning of several areas has been amended. Some examples of an areas of concern include apartment A1C on level 2 and the communal balcony to the east,

apartments B1A, R1, A1A, and S, on level 4, overlooking of the private open space between the apartment blocks for apartments A1A, B1A, B1C, A2 on level 3. The area between the two apartment blocks could be re-designed to ameliorate many of the privacy issues. One option for consideration may be to re-design the area between the two-apartment block to ameliorate privacy issues, and provide an open, quadruple-high, atrium-like circulation space to provide daylight and natural ventilation to all circulation areas at all levels, and provide a focus for the 1<sup>st</sup> floor communal area of the building.

6. ~~The ADG design criteria checklist supplied by the applicant refers to drawing DA602 for the calculations of Deep Soil & Communal Open Space, but no such drawing appears to have been provided, and therefore it is not possible to ascertain if the development has met the requirements of the ADG.~~ Thank you to the applicant for supplying the drawing requested. The area noted as Deep Soil includes area with a minimum dimension of 3m. The site area noted on the drawing is 4760m<sup>2</sup>, which is greater than the 1500m<sup>2</sup> and so a minimum dimension of 6m is required to accord with the ADG and qualify for inclusion in the calculation of deep soil area.

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.