

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2020/0824
Date:	08/09/2020
To:	Daniel Milliken
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 21 DP 11320 , 323 - 325 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093 Lot 22 DP 11320 , 323 - 325 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093 Lot 123 DP 737259 , 327 - 329 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093 Lot 25 DP 11320 , 331 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093 Lot 20 DP 11320 , 321 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093

Officer comments

The proposal is for 33 residential units shop-top housing in a four storey configuration. The proposal should address the following:

1. Floor to ceiling height to the residential lobby (facing Sunshine Street) and retail 4 is too low (2.8m fl to fl proposed). Apartment Design Guide recommends 3.3m floor to ceiling height minimum for retail at ground floor.
2. The sunken retail facade along Sunshine Street does not promote footpath activation.

The proposal has not addressed all the issues identified previously in the Pre-Lodgement Meeting:

1. The building height control of 11m has been breached in multiple areas by up to about 3 metres. The proposed breach comprises the whole top floor comprising of 10 apartments. The proposal has self-imposed building setbacks on the west boundary to create a 6m wide laneway and on the Condamine Street boundary to allow for the change in level of the two building blocks. Nevertheless, the resultant top floor units terrace setback should be increased to 4m to allow for the top floor to be more recessed and not be visible from the street views as they are already breaching the building height control substantially. The proposed roof light structure should not be prominent and top-heavy with the big roof overhangs. Essentially the street view should read like a three storey building with a recessed roof form.

Response: The top floor units are not setbackted adequately to be not visible from the street level.

2. The west elevation of balconies faces a neighbouring free-standing house with a pool courtyard. The proponent should review the number of units facing this orientation to minimise visual and acoustic privacy issues. Privacy screens introduced will only work to a limited capacity. The proponent suggested to study the option of reducing the number of units overlooking the pool courtyard. A more diverse unit mix with bigger units will also reduce the number of balcony spaces on this facade. Option of maisonette units can provide double volume balconies/ courtyard spaces allowing bigger landscape plants to be incorporated.

Response; The number of balconies facing the west has not been reduced and privacy issues to the house and garden space across the laneway have not been resolved.

3. The proposed light wells should have a blank wall effect facing the bedroom windows to qualify for the 6m separation (ADG pg. 62). Obscured glass block walls with adequate noise attenuation might be appropriate to get some daylight into the end units 10, 22 and 32. Bedrooms separation between units 25 and 34 needs to be 12m. Use of translucent glass windows to achieve the effect of blank wall is not a robust solution as they can easily be modified or tampered with. Coordination with the next door apartment block light well on the common boundary will need to be demonstrated.

Response: Glass blocks has been proposed on one side of the 6m wide lightwells.

4. Artwork on facades should not look like advertising panels. They should be integrated into the façade concept and perhaps used to highlight entrances to apartment lobbies or a prominent corner to create an identity for the development. They should be constructed from a robust material to minimise maintenance.

Response: The proposed facades have been designed appropriately

5. Footpath and awnings – Generally shopfronts should have zero setback and be on the same level with public footpaths to activate public domain spaces. Areas designated for alfresco dining should be purpose full, adequately sized and located in a desirable location.

Awnings should generally be set backed 1m from the kerb. If there are street trees required, 1.5m setback from kerb will be required. Awning cut outs/ holes for trees are not desired.

Response: The shopfronts have been set-backed from the footpath and are not on the same level as the footpath. The awning clearance height over the footpath should be 2.7m minimum

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.