

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2021/0179
Date:	26/03/2021
To:	Rebecca Englund
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 8 DP 604034 , 255 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093

Officer comments

The proposal should address the following additional issues:

1. The boarding rooms around the middle courtyard are facing each other directly at 9m apart. The courtyard width should be increased to 12m to improve room amenity. Boarding rooms should also be reorientated to prevent direct overlooking as a priority and use appropriate privacy screening as a secondary solution. The proposal should consider reducing room numbers to achieve the above suggestion. The middle courtyard should be aligned with the courtyard of the adjacent northern neighbour as much as possible to maximise solar access.
2. Building height breach of 11m should be supported with solar analysis as compared with a complying 11m development to ensure no additional shadows are casted to surrounding neighbours. As such, setting back the top floor might be required on the common southern boundary.
3. The bottom balcony proposed that breach the rear setback should be deleted to maintain adequate building separation distances to neighbouring sites.

Previous PLM comments:

The 37 rooms proposal has more potential provided the following issues are considered:

1. Setback of the boarding rooms/balconies to the northern side boundary is increased to 6m as a minimum. Consider applying 9m setback to rooms 4,5, 15,16,23 & 24 as they will be facing directly onto the balconies and private open spaces of the next door residences. The 9m setback will also create an indent to break up the long linear northern façade proposed.

Response: The current scheme proposes a central courtyard to break up the building into two blocks.

2. The top floor proposed will completely breach the 11m building height control. It will also diminish sunlight access to the southern neighbouring property future development potential. Considering the constrained site condition and the neighbouring developments (approved and future), the fourth storey should be broken up to have a 12m wide gap to line up with the courtyard of the approved DA to the north. The southern facade of the top storey should also be set backed 3m to allow the 11m building height transition to potential development to the south.

Response: The central courtyard should be widened to 12m and the top floor be setback as required on the south boundary to not cast additional shadow compared to a complying scheme.

3. The residential development to the north will be expecting a similar residential proposal on the subject site to continue the concept of the 12 wide courtyard which ideally should be continued to the Freedom furniture site to the south. The proposal should investigate this option of re-orientating boarding rooms into a central courtyard, Condamine street and rear boundary. The issue of 24 rooms potentially overlooking the residential development to the north can be minimised with this approach.

Response: The rooms looking into the central courtyard can be supported but they should be 12m apart (balcony to balcony). Privacy screens to prevent direct line of sight should also be incorporated.

4. The front façade facing Condamine Street should consider the ground floor opening height reduced

to 2.7m (subject to service vehicle requirement) to avoid the cavernous look proposed. It should be treated as part of the public domain footpath and ideally should have shopfront spaces activating the public footpath. Nonetheless, it should be a fitting space with quality finishing and treatment for a front lobby majority of the time while also acting as a service area.

Response: The proposal could be improved further with an awning to lower the scale at the pedestrian entry point. This will help to lessen the impact of the hostile environment created by the high traffic flow on Condamine Street.

5. Awning on the street facade should be considered to provide some street amenity/ shelter. New awnings 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 from the kerb is 1500mm.

Response: Consider the awning suggestion in point 4 above.

6. Access to the creek bed and riparian area could be considered as part of the recreation area for the residents. Fern garden with shade plantings could be a unique recreation opportunity.

Response: A staircase to access the creek bed and riparian area has been provided.

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.