



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 24 March 2022

4 - DA2021 2600 - 45 Warriewood Road WARRIEWOOD PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

The application proposes demolition works and subdivision of 3 lots into 13 lots to include 1 super lot, 11 Torrens Title residential lots and 1 lot containing the creek line corridor, civil works and the construction of two residential flat buildings containing 34 apartments including basement parking, swimming pool. It requires the removal of 47 trees (32 exempt).

A pre-lodgement meeting (PLM2019/0109) was held on 6 June 2019 in relation to development of the subject site. The concept plans raised significant issues with the proposal. The proposed development is substantially different to that presented at the PLM.

The project was presented to the Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting on March 25th, 2021. The Panel did not support the scheme as it was presented, and a series of detailed comments/recommendations were made.

The applicant/planner ran through a detailed list of changes undertaken in response to the comments, these changes were highlighted in both the planning report and clouded on the drawings. The Panel acknowledge these amendments, however, are of the view that the substantive issues relating to side setbacks, building bulk and site planning and fundamental issues with the mix of dwellings and resulting bulk have not been addressed.

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The number of dwellings are controlled with a density limit. The proposal seeks to maximise the size of the development by providing large units. While the Panel supports the provision of family sized units as an appropriate response to the demands of the area, no consideration has been given to the impact the substitution of larger for smaller units on bulk.

This is discussed in detail in the previous minutes and has not been addressed at all in the revised submission nor during the Panel presentation.

For this reason, the Panel repeats and provides further detail and rationale for its concerns.

Pittwater DCP Warriewood Valley Controls

- C6.8 Residential Subdivision Principles RFB require 10% studio, 10% 1 bed 10% 2 bed:

Residential Flat Buildings and Multi-dwelling housing

Residential Flat Buildings and Multi Dwelling Housing developments with 10 or more dwellings are to provide at least:

- 10% studio apartments/units;
- 10% 1-bedroom apartments/units; and
- 10% 2-bedroom apartments/units.

The Panel provided a detailed analysis of the proposal compared to a complying scheme.

The applicant should refer to those notes and analysis, however in the interest of clarity the analysis is repeated with areas and mixes more precisely matching those in the proposal and accompanying documentation.



The table below shows how much greater the floor areas are compared to the minimum recommended by the ADG and greater even and increased allowance for what might be 'expected by the Northern Beaches market'.

	DCP mix	Units					Proposal***			
		num	ADG sqm	ADG + sqm	"NBmarket" sqm	add 20%** total sqm	Mix	num	sqm	total sqm
Studio	10%	3.4	35	35	42	143				
1br	10%	3.4	50	35	42	143				
2br	10%	3.4	70	75	90	306				
3br*	29%	9.8	90	95	114	1,117	41%	14	125	1,750
4br*	41%	14	102	107	128.4	1,798	59%	20	206	4,120
						3,506				5,870
Total Units		34						34		167%

* adopts same split of 3 and 4 bedroom as proposal

** "Northern Beaches market - add another 20% for 'upmarket expectations'

*** refer to drawings and schedule in CPS "Assessment of Apartment Design Guide" p121

The point here is that compared to a proposal that allowed for a 20% increase in the minimum unit sizes in the ADG to 'meet the expectation of the Northern Beaches market', and if the proposal complied with the mix of dwellings required by the DCP the proposal exceed the floor area by 67%.

No allowance has been made for the change in mix nor the excessive floor areas, as previously clearly identified as a matter of concern.

As noted previously:

This has a number of 'flow on effects' including building bulk, height, activation of the common area, possible setbacks and the extent of the footprint and landscaped area and car parking numbers.

Many if not all of the more detailed issues could be easily resolved if the scheme were redesigned to comply with the required dwelling mix.

Recommendations

1. The total floor area should be reduced to better align with the bulk that would result from a complying mix of dwellings.
2. Recommendations are as per the previous comments and notes from the previous Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting on March 25th, 2021.
3. Particular attention should be paid to the ends of the residential flat buildings. The awkward angular townhouses and the orientation of the upper-level apartments should be reconsidered, and the site setback concerns should be addressed by increased setback, rather than higher balustrades.

Scale, built form and articulation

In accordance with the previous comments, the Panel believe that the current scheme is an overdevelopment of the site. The impact of the overall size of the build form is exacerbated by the regular and monolithic nature of the architecture. Refer to previous notes for a more detailed discussion.

The fundamental problem is the way the density control has been expressed and interpreted. Instead of a Floor Space Ratio that would have the effect of limiting the bulk of the building, the density has been expressed as a number of dwellings, presumably to achieve a certain urban density in the area overall according to various strategic planning imperatives.

Recommendations

4. Reduce the size of the development, particularly at each end. This will provide a more successful interface between the RFB and the Torrens Titled Lots.



5. Provide a more varied and rich architectural treatment to the facades of the building. In particular the architect should investigate further ways to break up the length of the buildings with more articulation at the entry points and foyers. The oversized framed expression on the facades should also be reconsidered to break down the scale of the building.

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

As per previous comments the carpark extends beyond the footprint of the building, thus reducing the amount of deep soil, particularly within the mews between the two RFB's. The recommendations are as per the previous Panel Comments. The panel is not convinced with the overall storage strategy for the development, and it would appear from the plans that there is oversized storage for some units at the expense of other units which have no storage.

Recommendations

1. Redesign the carparking so that the carparking footprint is underneath the building footprint.
2. Provide usable storage for each unit/townhouse within the basement.
3. Reorganise garbage and waste management and minimise amenity impacts (visual, noise, odour) on adjoining dwellings.

Landscape

No discernible changes have been made to the landscape design. Previous comments still apply.

Sustainability

The Energy Efficient Design strategies in the Design Statement are very general, and not indicated on the drawings.

Recommendations

1. The rainwater tank should be connected to landscaping and toilet flushing
2. Investigations to electrify the gas hot water and cooking
3. Make sure there is at least one bike parking space per apartment (in addition to the storage spaces for the terrace style dwellings)

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form which remains substantially the same as the earlier scheme.

A complete redesign is required.

The building bulk is far greater than anticipated by the controls and no justification has been provided.

No attempt has been made to reduce the bulk of the building or to comply with the required dwelling mix.

The scheme should be redesigned to improve the relationship between the residential flat building and the Torrens titled lots. The basement should be redesigned for greater storage and to improve the deep soil planting. The architectural expression of the buildings exacerbates the scale and should be redesigned to provide a more domestic interface with the internal mews. The applicant should provide more attention to the sustainability measures for this project.

The applicant should also refer to the detailed previous notes provided by the Panel.