Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 02 February 2023

3 - DA2022/2105 - 32 Orlando Road CROMER

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The proposal is for a new industrial building with four (4) units and seven (7) parking spaces. The site is on the boundary of a Low Density Residential (R2) zone.

There is no density control for the site. The proposal has 511sqm of GFA on a site area of 596.9sqm. Given the location of the site and the challenging topography and required setbacks, 511sqm GFA may be unachievable.

Recommendations

1. Reduce the GFA and set back the building by 3m to the rear boundary

Scale, built form and articulation Façade treatment/Aesthetics

The site is in a transitional location at the edge of an industrial zone, adjoining a residential zone to the east. A single-story cottage in a densely landscaped site is to the east and a childcare centre to the south. To the west is an industrial development constructed boundary to boundary. Because of the topography of the site and the lack of setback, the scale of development on the southern and eastern boundaries is significant. The 1.71 metre exceedance of the Height Control is unreasonable and has an undesirable impact on its neighbours.

Although the shadow diagrams show solar access to the neighbour at #30 is provided in winter between 9am-12, shadow impacts on the Child car Centre to the south are more extreme and would occur all day. These shadow impacts may be technically compliant but the visual impact of the boundary walls on both neighbours is avoidable.

The suggestion of articulating the concrete walls along the southern and eastern boundaries via concrete joint detailing and use of colour as suggested by the proponent is not an effective approach to overcome the impact of the proposed development. A more appropriate approach to mitigate impacts is to relocate the form.

This could be achieved if the building mass was located at the front of the site where the ground is higher and along the western boundary adjacent to the new development on the common western boundary and away from the neighbours.

This would reduce shadow and visual bulk impacts on the neighbours, provide opportunities for deep soil landscaping and provide better amenity for the users of the facility.

The side setbacks for the site are based on ‘merit’. The Panel considers the zero setback along the entire depth of the block unacceptable, having a significant impact on the adjoining neighbour and therefore lacking ‘merit’.

The large blank areas of façade do not respond to Control D9 in the Warringah DCP, specifically:

- Side and rear setbacks are to be progressively increased as wall height increases
- Large areas of continuous wall planes are to be avoided by varying building setbacks and using appropriate techniques to provide visual relief
- Building height and scale needs to relate to topography and site conditions
- Landscape plantings are to be provided to reduce the visual bulk of new building and works

- Articulate walls to reduce building mass.

While the Panel recognises that this is a small site, and that it is zone industrial, it is at the interface with a residential zone and so the DCP controls should be given even more consideration.

Recommendations

2. Give more consideration to the treatment of the façade and respond to the directions and approaches outlined in the DCP
3. Redesign the proposal to set back from the rear boundary, concentrate height towards the west where it may be more acceptable to exceed the height limit, and step down to the east to minimise impacts on the residential property

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

It's unclear whether the facility is designed for SUV, 4WD, small or semi rigid vehicles however a turning radius of up to 12.5 metres and head clearance of 4.5 metres may be required to access the lower-level units. As an alternative to the current arrangement, a common lift with loading dock should be considered for goods and materials to avoid these problems with access to an upper level only off Orlando Road. Car parking closer to existing grade is desirable.

The Panel. observed that there is no 'one size fits all' approach to light industrial units and that different premises would have limitations in terms of size of vehicle and what might be needed by a tenant. However, it was not clear to the Panel how the loading and unloading would work and what size of vehicles could be accommodated and how manoeuvring and unloading could work for the below ground units.

Recommendations

4. Clarify anticipated vehicle sizes and manoeuvring
5. Consider alternative parking and access arrangements including a goods lift

Landscape

While the height and siting of the proposed development is unacceptable the lack of substantial Landscaping on the site is an additional problem. Given the density of tree canopy to the east, an abrupt transition to a treeless site is undesirable and unnecessary.

The landscape proposed is minimal and does nothing to mitigate the bulk and scale of the proposed bulky buildings, provide amenity or reduce urban heat island effect. The adjacent hard urban environment is not a precedent that is supported.

The north facing paved carpark will be extremely hot in summer for visitors/tenants to the site and likewise the very low planting in the front setback will provide no mitigation.

4 trees are proposed to be removed - 2 of them are significant "High Retention" Value large Endemic *angophora costata*. The proponent has also got neighbours consent to remove an adjacent tree which also currently provides shade on the property.

The current canopy cover is approximately 25-30%. The removal of all trees and the replacement of only one small endemic species is inadequate and not supported. The future canopy proposed would be more like 5%.

The setback intent at the frontage is to add value to the public domain and the proponents landscape indicates this is not successful in adding any real amenity. We recognise the proponents desire to maximise carpark space, but this need to be balanced with an outcome that adds to the public domain, amenity and mitigates urban heat.

Recommendations

6. Provide planting areas in the carpark to allow for large trees to shade the park cars and visitors. Properly designed these will not significantly reduce parking spaces and deep soil in not always necessary-just sufficient soil volumes.

7. Put in larger planting along the frontage to mitigate the bulk and scale of the proposed buildings and more endemic shade Trees
8. Redesign the layout to retain the 2 significant “High Retention” Value large Endemic *angophora costata*. These are at the edges of the property at the rear so should be possible to retain.
9. Ensure future canopy cover is maintained as a minimum at the current 25-30%. If not the NSW 40% target.

Amenity

Although this is an industrial development, the users of the building should have the opportunity for fresh air and natural light to enhance their experience and be afforded a decent standard of accommodation. The suggested reconfiguration of the industrial units should consider the amenity of users and the provision of fresh air and light to all units. The long eastern facade off the boundary as well as the northern facade to the street would provide opportunities for light and ventilation.

Recommendations

10. All industrial units should have natural lighting and ventilation

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

The large blank area of façade does not respond to Control D9 in the Warringah DCP, specifically.

- *Side and rear setbacks are to be progressively increased as wall height increases*
- *Large areas of continuous wall planes are to be avoided by varying building setbacks and using appropriate techniques to provide visual relief*
- *Building height and scale needs to relate to topography and site conditions*
- *Landscape plantings are to be provided to reduce the visual bulk of new building and works*
- *Articulate walls to reduce building mass.*

While the Panel recognises that this is a small site, and that it is zone industrial, it is at the interface with a residential zone and so the DCP controls should be given even more consideration.

Recommendations

11. Give more consideration to the treatment of the façade and respond to the directions and approaches outlined in the DCP

Sustainability

Although the proposal is for a simple industrial building, it is the Panel’s view that every opportunity should be taken to improves sustainability and resilience to climate change including in industrial areas.

Recommendations

12. Provide windows to the industrial units to improve amenity
13. Include solar panels on the roof. Consider a green roof under the solar panels
14. Use light coloured surfaces to reduce heat island effect
15. Increase landscaping and canopy cover
16. Use low carbon concrete
17. Provide bike parking for staff and visitors
18. Reuse rainwater for washdown and toilet flushing
19. Allow for bi-directional (2-way) charging of EV batteries for powering the building.

northern beaches council

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form. A complete redesign and substantial reduction in the floor area is required.

.