

Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 25 November 2021

## **4 - DA2021/1912 - 389 Pittwater Road NORTH MANLY**

### **PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### ***General***

Proposal is for the re-purposing of the former Queenscliff Community Health Centre designed by E H Farmer. The proposal is for a boarding house comprising 12 rooms and 25 Seniors Housing dwellings

The Panel identified some problematic aspects of the proposal that would require amendment to gain the Panel's full support.

#### ***Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character***

The Panel recognises the need for housing of the type proposed and is supportive of the provision of housing diversity

Whilst surrounding development is predominantly dwelling houses, the proposal seeks to adaptively re-use the existing building, which has an inherently non-residential character.

The Panel commends the decision to retain and improve the existing built fabric and recognises the design challenges involved, particularly the retention of many of the building's charming features.

We note the site's flood risk and that the applicant has found a suite of solutions which appear to allow for the safe refuge of occupants

Directly to the North of the subject site, three adjoining residential lots have been shown. Unusually, the applicant has had a say in the shape and size of the new lots and where the boundaries have been positioned as they derive from the same parcel of land.

#### ***Scale, built form and articulation***

The proposal exceeds the height limit. Although the roof has been designed to not exceed the maximum height of the existing building, the proposal does seek to increase building height by one (1) or two (2) storeys for most of the building's footprint. This represents a significant increase in the building's bulk which for the most part would have limited impact due to existing vegetation, lines of sight and in the case of the western wing, due to generous setbacks having been retained.

The Panel is generally supportive of the proposed height of building, but does not support the added bulk above the proposed bin room. This is not sympathetic to the existing fabric, is not consistent with the streetscape and is set too close to the boundary.

Due to this component of the building being three (3) storeys in height and having virtually no setback from the street, the proposal is not an acceptable built form outcome.

#### ***Recommendations.***

1. Remove mass comprising bin store and part of apartments 1.12 and 2.12.
2. Consider consolidation of apartments G.11, 1.11 and 2.11 with remaining portion of apartments G.12, 1.12 and 2.12 respectively to configure larger apartment type.
3. Consider options to add back mass at western side of building. Solution shall require to retain winter sunlight to communal area.
4. Relocate bin store and instate landscaped setback in place.

## **Access, vehicular movement and car parking**

Vehicle access is via driveway at south western corner of site and leads to an efficient, on-grade parking area incorporating 8 spaces in total including 6 designated Accessible spaces and two in which flexible access to the vehicle may be possible.

Whilst the rate of parking allocated is significantly lower than suggested in WDCP, the traffic report indicates that the proposal is relatively compliant with the relevant parts of SEPP (ARH) and SEPP (HSPD). The Panel is supportive of the number of car spaces given the intended use and would expect the approval to be have conditions to manage car parking.

### **Recommendations**

5. Consider approach to parking management

## **Landscape**

Landscape has been designed to utilise features of the original building, retaining and drawing focus to high quality established trees. and complemented by endemic plantings.

Communal areas have been provided as discrete sanctuary spaces and offer a high level of amenity.

Entry sequence has been well considered, but retains some of the institutional quality as a result of the configuration of the original built fabric.

A number of existing trees are very mature/senescent.

### **Recommendations.**

6. Provision for greater number of canopy succession plantings. Consider planting some larger succession specimens e.g. Cook pine; *Araucaria columnaris*

## **Amenity**

The amenity of dwellings has in some cases been limited by the existing fabric, but in the context of adaptive re-use may be considered appropriate with some changes. For instance:

Few apartments receive natural cross ventilation, but in most cases, apartments are configured to ensure room depths are minimal, hence living spaces are more likely to benefit from beneficial daylighting and air flow than if the spaces had been deeper. Top level apartments should benefit from natural ventilation through roof via clerestory or the like.

Ceiling heights on Ground and First levels of the building are limited by the existing building, however, the panel see that the top level of the building would benefit from clerestory windows for additional sunlight and ventilation, and ceiling height.

Private open spaces are small, but proportioned appropriately to dwellings, given the intended use and are bolstered by generous communal spaces.

Privacy interface about Northern Boundary is not ideal as Level 1 and 2 dwellings face boundary and may overlook neighbouring POS.

### **Recommendation.**

7. Incorporate clerestory windows to top level dwellings to enable greater access to sunlight and cross ventilation.
8. Relocate northern boundary to allow for adequate privacy and demonstrate adequacy

## **Façade treatment/Aesthetics**

In most cases, where additional massing and alterations have been proposed, the building elements are well articulated and integrated, enhancing the existing fabric.



## ***Sustainability***

Adaptive re-use supported, however additional measures required to improve performance.

### **Recommendations**

9. Consider utilising electric heat pump hot water and induction cooktops to replace the use of gas.
10. The Panel recommends maximizing the amount of rooftop PV given the management regime that will apply to the site
11. Add external windows to bathrooms and utility rooms wherever possible.

## **PANEL CONCLUSION**

**The Panel is supportive of the proposal overall, but cannot support the scheme in it's current form. Redesign of aspects outlined in the recommendations above is required.**

Although the proposal's breach of the height control is generally supported by the Panel, the applicant would need to demonstrate;

- adequate amenity to existing and future neighbouring development;
- appropriate streetscape response; and
- higher levels of amenity to all top floor dwellings