



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 28 October 2021

6 - DA2021 1426 - 51 Kalang Road ELANORA HEIGHTS

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

The subject site is located on the southern end of the Elanora village centre zoned as B2, and adjacent to a current car park of an SP2 Community Facility (Elanora Community Preschool). It is triangular shaped and has 2 significant angophoras – one within the front setback garden and the other a street tree.

The applicant attended a PLM with council officers on 25 June 2020 prior to the establishment of the Design and Sustainability Advisory Panel.

Pittwater 21 DCP has site specific setback and building requirements 7m aligned with lots to the north (primarily for at-grade car parking) increasing to 12m around the curve. A min 3m side setback to the south and the geometry for the rear then aligns with the 8m setback of lots to the north.

Strict compliance with these quite complex set back controls on this irregularly shaped site appear to have been the principal generators of the built form and consequently the interior planning is convoluted and has also resulted in a complex stepped built form.

It is the responsibility of Council officers to advise the applicant of compliance with the controls.

One of the roles of the Panel, particularly at pre-DA stage, is to assess whether any noncompliance is acceptable if it can be demonstrated that there would be a better result.

The panel recommends this approach:

Any non-compliance with planning controls can only be considered where there is:

- a demonstrable improvement in amenity within the proposal, (overshadowing, privacy, access to rooftop open space etc.)
- reduced impact on adjoining sites (either existing or in relation to future development potential)
- contributions to the public domain or other public benefits (affordability, environmental performance)

In order to demonstrate the benefits of non-compliance the non-compliant proposal should be benchmarked and compared to a complying 'reference scheme'.

Should the applicant wish to revise the design, to simplify the layouts, circulation and the improve the buildability, the current scheme could be used as the 'reference scheme' in the process outlined above.

The Panel strongly encourages the applicant to revise the design.

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The proposed use is consistent with the zone objectives and is permissible development.

The Panel brings the importance of design quality in light of obligations under the DBP Act for Class 2 development.

The complicated form of the building with balconies over living areas, wet areas over living areas as well as the convoluted interior layouts, suggest that the compliance with the precise setback requirements have driven the design rather than a concern for minimising the exposure of design teams to risk of poor detailing and construction.

Building form appears quite disordered and as if too many ideas and elements have been put together.



It is the Panel's view that the building might extend to the point '1-C' on the ground and first levels. This would continue the alignment of the building to the north without having any significant impacts to the south, with the aim of simplifying the built form.

The Panel supports the setbacks above the 2nd level but considers the 3m set back C-B unnecessary and potentially reduced to 1.5m

The Panel does not consider a further set back to alignment B by 3m necessary and does not understand why the sense of having a large balcony serving Bed 1 and 2 in unit 2.1 and a very small balcony serving the living dining area.

Setbacks from the south eastern boundary should be retained.

Basement protrusions are poorly resolved and indicative that too many car spaces are being accommodated for this site.

Recommendations

1. Revise the design to simplify interior layouts, minimise the amount of balconies over habitable spaces and simplify the overall building form.
2. Investigate how the design and overall layout and arrangement of rooms could be improved if the building extended to C-1 on the ground and first floors and the set back from C to B was reduced to 1.5m. on the second floor
3. Notwithstanding 1 and 2, the areas of excavation should be reduced by eliminating the inefficient garbage store
4. A very high priority should be given to the protection and retention of the mature angophora T01
5. Building form should be simplified and made more coherent.

Public Domain and Landscape

Satisfactory landscape plan and scheme.

Arborist report indicates a minor encroachment to the Angophora on Councils verge. This is supported subject to the specified Tree management plan being prepared and site tree protection adopted. Any subsequent revisions to the design should not cause any greater impacts.

Recommendations

6. Given two large Angophora will be removed from site we would encourage the planting of one semi mature Angophora in the location of the driveway entry in deep soil (replaces Tree 42) to offset this loss. Internal layouts need to be simplified so both ground floor tenancies have a streetscape presence, and the residential entry is clearly defined.
7. Investigate whether the north western most tree 'T02' (there are 3 T02a) could be retained if the basement were replanned.

Internal planning and amenity

The internal planning is inefficient and poorly resolved:

- The split-level approach also seems to have been driven by a concern for strict compliance with height limits. This results in excessive areas around the lift, stairs between half levels and increase in the bulk of the building overall to accommodate this excess circulation space.
- G.1 and g.2 stores occupy valuable external wall area
- Accessible toilet in G.1 not naturally lit and ventilated
- Note clear why G.2 has an accessible WC and another WC, neither of which are naturally lit and ventilated -the store for G.2 is on an exterior wall instead
- Poor access to 1.1 balcony from living
- 1.1 small bedroom as main bedroom



- Awkward shaped balcony for 1.2
- 1.2, 1.3 very small areas for kitchen /living/dining
- 2.2 awkward shaped 2nd bedroom, small main bedroom
- 2.1 balcony of bedrooms larger than of living
- 2.1 2.2 bathroom could be naturally lit and ventilated from above
- 2.1 2.2 main bedrooms very small
- level excessive circulation space level 1 and 2
- stair and lobby on level 2 could be naturally lit and ventilated
- 2.1 ensuite without window

Residential FL-FL height needs to increase to 3.1m. In particular, note where balconies or wet areas are above habitable rooms below.

It is not uncommon that effective resolution of waterproofing at thresholds and set-downs in structure, accommodating services etc requires 3.2m where terraces are above habitable rooms below to ensure no bulkheads intrude into habitable rooms.

Recommendations

8. Reconsider mix of units
9. Replan internal layout in response to point outlined above
10. Check egress arrangements for required stairs

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

At-grade car space impacts on the streetscape and appears has been included in part to resolve the somewhat awkward basement configuration for the garbage store below.

It is the Panels view that the retention of the angophora should be given priority over compliance with car parking numbers. The long-term health of protected trees is at risk with complex or impractical excavation.

Recommendations

11. The at-grade car space should be removed
12. Simplify the car parking layout
13. Consider not requiring parking for patrons on site to reduce the amount of excavation required

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

The glazed balustrades are not supported and not necessary at the ground level –this is not consistent with the character of the area.

Recommendations

14. Remove the glazed balustrades at ground level.
15. Reconsider the use of glazed balustrades in this part of the centre that is more residential and vegetated in character.

Sustainability

Cross ventilation and private open space will be improved with alternative internal layouts that should also better resolve controlled solar amenity and shading when needed.



Recommendations

16. Electric charging for 100% of vehicles should be accommodated as this is likely to be needed within the life-cycle of all new developments.
17. Apartments 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 seem to have no or minimal shading over the living room glazing which will result in them being hot in summer
18. Switch from gas to electric for hot water and stoves
19. Include PV on the roof
20. No roof plan – suggest a skylight on the top of the lobby/stairwell to provide natural light to the space.
21. Include some rainwater recycling and connect it to landscaping and toilets.
22. Provide shading to all ground level apartment living room windows.

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.

The Panel strongly recommends that the design be revised to improve internal amenity, room sizes, efficiency of layout and to ensure the retention of one or more trees.

To facilitate this, some breaches of the precise setback controls and car parking to be accommodated on site may be considered.