

## Urban Design Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2019/0239
<b>To:</b>	Daniel Milliken
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 1 DP 1001963 , 638 Pittwater Road BROOKVALE NSW 2100

### Officer comments

Urban Design Comments dated 30 October 2019:

The amended proposal has addressed the issues from the previous Urban Design Comments satisfactorily.

Urban Design Comments dated 30 October 2019:

The proposal cannot be supported for the following reasons:

1. "Illuminated light disk" roof feature should be integrated with the building design. More detailed information should be provided:
  - a. Proposed lighting design system/ concept design to illuminate the disk – types of colour lights, colour changes, frequency, etc. Will the disk be the only element illuminated on the overall building facade? Is there a time schedule for the disk to be lit up?
  - b. Construction material of the disk to compliment the rest of the building material finishes.
  - c. Service elements are integrated into the design for maintenance purposes.
2. There should be a knock-down wall panel located next to the service vehicle bay area to provide for possible future service entrance to the next door landlocked neighbour at 640 Pittwater Road. This is in addition to the basement level 1 knock-down panel to access future basement of the neighbouring site.
3. The proposed awnings to the street frontages should be dimensioned on the drawings. Where street trees are required, the street awning should be set back from the kerb along its entire length by not less than 1.5m to accommodate the trees. The minimum width of awning should be 2m.
4. To prevent visual and acoustic privacy issues in the small light well proposed, obscure glass block wall should be nominated for one side of the windows facing the light well at unit 13/14, 15/16, 19/20, 33/34, 35/36 and 39/40.
5. The development should be designed around the existing 'Tallowood' tree to enable retention with the inherent benefits such a tree brings to the site and the local environment as per landscape officer comment.

Urban Design Comments dated 17 April 2019:

The proposal cannot be supported for the following reasons:

1. The building height control of 11m has been breached by 0.7 to 3m. The additional building height and bulk will set an undesirable precedent for future development around the area. The site is located at a corner location and can justify a corner building element of exceeding the

11m height control by 1.1m at most. The “light disk” roof feature needs more clarification.

2. The 4.75m floor to ceiling height on the ground floor is excessive. Apartment Design Guide (ADG) recommends 3.3m minimum for shops/ commercial area. ADG recommends 3.1m floor to floor for residential area. Reducing the floor to ceiling height on the ground floor will help to reduce the overall building height breach.
3. The Right-of-Way to benefit the next door landlocked neighbour (640 Pittwater Road) to the north needs to be a 6m wide minimum corridor all the way from Orchard Road to the common boundary on the ground floor to cater for service vehicle access and egress. This is in addition to the basement level 1 knock-down panel to access future basement of the neighbouring site.
4. The basement commercial area for future car parking addition to cater for future Brookvale Structure Plan up-zone is unusual. It could be used as storage area for the commercial and residential units which would make it more acceptable as an underground space.
5. The acoustic impact for the new apartments will need to be justified with acoustic treatments to make it acceptable as a residential building located next to an industrial area.
6. Facade treatment can be further improved to contribute greater visual interest of the building and the character of the local area through a balanced composition of building elements, textures, materials and colour selections.
7. A light well could be created from the communal area courtyard to get sunlight to Soho units 2, 4 & 6.
8. Street trees are required so the street awning should be set back from the kerb along its entire length by not less than 1.5m to accommodate the trees. The minimum width of awning should be 2m.
9. The second floor plan (Drawing no. A07) is missing.

The proposal is therefore supported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

**Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:**

Nil.