

Urban Design Referral Response

| | |
|--|---|
| Application Number: | DA2020/1167 |
| Date: | 07/10/2020 |
| To: | Lashta Haidari |
| Land to be developed (Address): | Part Lot 28 DP 7413 , 9 Francis Street DEE WHY NSW 2099 Part Lot 28 DP 7413 , 28 Fisher Road DEE WHY NSW 2099 Part Lot 28 DP 7413 , 28 Fisher Road DEE WHY NSW 2099 |

Officer comments

The proposal has addressed some but not all of the Urban Design issues identified in the Pre-Lodgement Meeting:

Urban Design Comments:

1. The proposal is required to demonstrated the building built-to lines on Fisher Road, of 4m from the kerb for the first 2 storeys (podium) and 8m for the above storeys (tower).

Response: The proposal has complied with the building built-to lines on Fisher Road.

2. The awning on the Fisher Road facade should provide some street amenity/shelter to form a unified element within the streetscape, respond to streetscape conditions and complement the architectural style of the host building. The awning should be uncomplicated regular forms and constructed from high quality materials with simple detailing to reduce visual clutter in the streetscape and to provide visual continuity to the pedestrian realm. The new awnings are to be setback minimum 1000mm from the face of the kerb to accommodate utility poles and traffic /parking in the kerbside lane. Where street trees are required, the minimum awning to setback is 1500mm.

Response: The proposed awning can be supported.

3. The maximum building height to the Francis Street site should be 11m. The 16m (13m+3m) building height requirement should be applied on the Fisher Road site only, and presented as a slim tower sitting on top of the 2 storey building podium.

Response: The proposed built forms comply with the building height controls but the Fisher Road building could be treated with more vertical articulations to be more slimline and less blocky looking.

4. Façade treatment/ articulation should be considered for the common boundary elevation to provide some relief from the proposed blank walls presented at the PLM. In regards to the side boundary setbacks on the Francis Street site (R3 zone), side setbacks are to be a minimum of 3.5m to the north and south boundaries. A variation to the required setback of 4.5m can be considered due to the constrained width of the site. The side boundary setback to Fisher Road can consider a zero setback for the podium section.

Response: The facades treatment and material finishes are not clearly documented. The proposed building facades have a lot of blank wall area which is a concern. High quality facades are a balanced composition of building elements, textures, materials and colour selections to create visual interest.

5. The boarding room levels, should consider window to boundary distances of 6m and window to window separation of 12m. The tower design should take into account possible future adjacent commercial development of zero setback to the common boundary.

Response: The windows of some of the boarding rooms face each other directly and are only 6.237 to 7.155m apart.

6. Appropriate building separation is necessary as there will be future residential towers proposed around the site and appropriate amenity should be maintained between the towers.

Response: The tower sections of the Fisher Road block has zero setbacks to the common boundary and material finishes/ graphics proposed are not specified on the drawings.

7. On the ground floor, the 1m wide pathway linking Fisher Road and Francis Street cannot be supported as it will be an unpleasant space and with personal security and safety concerns.

Response: The pathway has been deleted from the proposal.

8. The roof top common open space areas are not supported due to overlooking and noise nuisance.

Response: The proposed rooftop garden should be made non-trafficable from the "MP Zone" - Multi-Purpose Zone?

9. The community multi-function halls, café and foyer proposed is required to have an adequate floor to ceiling height of 3.6m at a minimum. The entry lobby from Fisher Road is to be a more integrated, generous and welcoming area, with stairs/ lifts access to cater for big events such as church services and concerts. Amenities such as toilets and change rooms, etc must also be adequately provided.

Response: The proposed function area and amenities can be supported.

10. Shopfront to the café and foyer should activate the public footpath and be at the same entry level as the footpath.

Response: The proposed footpath address can be supported.

11. A detailed solar study to be provided to ensure solar penetration to adjacent residential development are not compromised.

Response: A solar study has been submitted.

12. A view loss/ sharing analysis should be undertaken to ensure developments on the higher slopes will not be affected by the increase in built form on the site.

Response: No view loss/ sharing analysis has been undertaken.

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.