

## Urban Design Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2019/0332
<b>To:</b>	Claire Ryan
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 92 DP 564686 , 55 Kalang Road ELANORA HEIGHTS NSW 2101

### Officer comments

#### CURRENT COMMENTS

Revisions to the previous submission have addressed most of the urban design concerns previously raised with the application.

The application can be supported.

#### END COMMENTS

#### PREVIOUS COMMENTS

The proposal in its current form cannot be supported for the following reasons:

The site was the subject of a previous Development Application DA2018/0142. The current application has made minor changes to the previous proposed development, however the changes have not had any significant impact on the general impacts of bulk and Scale, height and articulation. Further amendments to the development application are detailed below in order to achieve a built form that is in keeping with the character of the locality and its relationship to the broader neighbourhood context and adjacency to residential areas..

### 1. Built Form Controls:

#### ***Pittwater 21 LEP 2014 (PLEP) - Part 4 Principal Development Standards***

*(1) The objectives of this clause are as follows:*

- (a) to ensure that any building, by virtue of its height and scale, is consistent with the desired character of the locality,*
- (b) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,*
- (c) to minimise any overshadowing of neighbouring properties,*
- (d) to allow for the reasonable sharing of views,*
- (e) to encourage buildings that are designed to respond sensitively to the natural topography,*

### RESPONSE

Revisions from the previous application do not go far enough to achieve a more sympathetic response to both the eastern, and western elevations. Thus the height breach to the rear of the site is unacceptable. Given the nature of the fall of the site to the east the building height breach is exacerbated. The additional 3m setback in addition to the 8m rear setback should be applied level 2 apartments with the external line of the balcony behind this setback line. The level 3 apartment should be further setback with the articulation zone containing no habitable rooms.

The western elevation/zone of the building that fronts Kalang Road shows hard walls that conceal habitable rooms with the 3 metre articulation zone. Deletion of the habitable rooms in this zone will be

required at both level 2 and 3. The visual articulation is supported with the opportunity to provide a screened outdoor balcony to these areas.

***Pittwater 21 DCP 2014 (PDCP) D5.19 – Setbacks to upper Levels – Elanora Heights Village Centre***

***Outcomes***

*The bulk and scale of the built form adjacent to adjoining low scale residential properties and to courtyard spaces is minimised.*

*To ensure a reasonable level of privacy, amenity and solar access is provided within the development site and maintained to adjoining residential properties.*

*To ensure the built form of new development transitions are in scale to existing development surrounding the village centre.*

***Controls***

*A minimum setback of 3 metres is to be provided to the third floor of all development to the rear of the lot.*

*A minimum setback of 3 metres is to be provided to the third floor of any development on Block D and to the southern lot.*

*An articulated setback to the front building line, as shown in Section Diagram AA and BB is required.*

**RESPONSE**

As discussed above the bulk and scale is exacerbated by the infill walls that front the Kalang Road Elevation. As discussed the bulk and scale as a result of the infill walls containing habitable rooms add to the perceived impacts of bulk and scale with the added impact of the additional storey in comparison to the adjacent buildings.

***2. SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings***

*4(1)(b) the building concerned is at least 3 or more storeys (not including levels below ground level (existing) or levels that are less than 1.2 metres above ground level (existing) that provide for carparking),*

**SEPP 65 Comments**

As previously advised if the proposed development were to comply with the above mentioned Pittwater DCP and LEP controls the SEPP 65 Clause 4(1) (b) need not apply, however consideration of the Apartment Design Guide as tools for improving the design is recommended.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Blank Walls to the North**

The blank walls of both apartments 3 and 5 contain living and kitchen spaces that have no access to natural light. The treatment with use of fire rated glass blocks to the south elevation should be repeated on the north elevation in order to improve internal amenity. This would also provide further articulation to the blank wall treatment.

**Privacy Screening Rear Elevation**

Further privacy screening should be provided to the eastern elevation in order to address overlooking into private open space of the eastern neighbouring properties.

**Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:**

Nil.