



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting

**DA2020/117254 Bardo Road, NEWPORT NSW 2106**

## **PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### ***General***

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and construction of a seniors housing development to accommodate six units including associated car parking and landscape works on a 1,226.32 sqm site.

The Panel agrees with the comments made by Council staff at the Pre Lodgement Meeting in particular in relation the lack of justification for expanding beyond the FSR of 0.5:1 (FSR 0.569:1 proposed) that has an additional impact on the vegetation on the site. The mature vegetation makes a significant contribution to the character of the area. The additional floorspace has a series of flow-on effects included additional carparking that in turn affects the excavation and impact on the trees on site.

### ***Strategic context***

The provision of additional affordable housing in close proximity to services and amenities is consistent with state and local policies.

### ***Urban context: surrounding area character.***

The site is zoned R2 Low Density Residential under the provisions of the Pittwater Local Environmental Plan and the proposed development is permissible with consent, under SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 (HSPD).

Set in a low-density area with many significant endemic native trees and high canopy % cover.

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

The proposed built form fits with the general character and built form of the area, however the six generously sized three-bedroom units creates an unacceptable FSR. The additional floorspace also means that the proposal does not comply with the required set backs:

Side and Rear Building Line (East side – 1.5m to 3.715m West side – 1.5m to 3.0m Rear – 6.5m)

Front Setback (Balconies – 4m) - The proposed non-compliance with the front setback control is not supported. Given the impacts on the site this is considered an over-development of the site.

### ***Recommendation***

1. The proposed development should be redesigned to reduce the FSR closer to 0.5:1.
2. The proposal should comply with setback controls to minimise bulk and integration of landscaping across the street frontage.
3. The upper level of the building should be set back behind the front building line of the ground floor so as to minimise bulk and scale.



### ***Landscape context, Façade treatment***

There are several significant endemic trees on site of great size, in good condition and providing over 50% canopy cover to the site.

The Panel is concerned that the plans including excavation for basement and external structures will intrude into the tree protection zone of valuable trees worthy of retention.

The Panel is not satisfied the encroachment calculations have adequately calculated encroachments of the Ground floor Level including the landscape plans including ramps/access paths.

Panel is of the opinion that the encroachments on trees numbers 11-13 at 22/45/48% will not allow these significant trees to be retained or survive the construction and building development in its current form.

### **Recommendations**

4. Provide a peer review or independent assessment of impacts of the proposed development on trees proposed to be retained and to demonstrate the encroachment calculations have adequately calculated encroachments of the Ground floor Level including the landscape plans.
5. Revise the arboricultural advice if necessary and modify site planning and building layout to establish non-intrusion clearances from existing trees, based on the arboricultural assessment of the tree protection zone and structural root zone.
6. Review the site planning and need for separation between the two buildings forms and explore a single-story building at the rear connected to the front and located closer to the western boundary and overlooking a deep soiled landscaped courtyard.
7. Decrease basement/ground level footprint to provide deep soil to provide for tree retention of trees 4, 11-13 and potentially other trees.
8. To minimise encroachment on Tree No. 4, comply with front setback and increase length of landscape along front boundary: -
  - Relocate Waste enclosure from front boundary front boundary to the basement.
  - Remove waiting bay at top of ramp with traffic light system; and
  - Remove private pathway from unit G01 and install to east off main entry path.
9. Ensure a number of large endemic street trees are selected for planting in consultation with Council in the public domain both on Clients setback and in Council verge to assist in meeting GANSW Urban canopy targets.
10. Ensure setback for planting areas on private courtyards on Ground level is minimum 300mm for Ground covers, 600mm for shrub planting and 1000mm for trees.

### ***Public domain: relationship to public domain, safety/security.***

Large extent of front boundary taken up by carpark entry, waiting bay, rubbish enclosure entry, Unit G01 private entry and common entry.

The panel questions the need for a 'waiting bay' and suggests a traffic light may be an appropriate alternative.

### **Recommendation**

11. Re-arrange the layout of the pathways, driveway, garbage and letterboxes in order to minimise the amount of impervious surface in the front of the building.



### **Common areas, Amenity**

Common areas limited to a long linear entry path with minimal opportunity for landscaping. Plus, a small courtyard entirely dominated by Trees 11-13 which will be in shade and provide little amenity. Opportunity for outlook onto this space has been limited by internal layouts of bathrooms and bedrooms out on this space and high level windows only been planned.

### **Recommendation**

12. Increase and improve design of outdoor common space. Move out from overshadowing of retained trees No. 11-13. Redesign units to overlook this space.

### **Sustainability and resilience**

No EV charging noted.

3 star toilets have been included. 3 Star is quite inefficient and actually quite difficult to get on the market. 4 Star will perform better and be easier to source.

No PV noted. Recommend that PV is included, and may be required pending the response to the following points

A/C condensers are noted on the plans but the BASIX cert says A/C ducting only. Once A/C is included in the BASIX certificate the Energy section in BASIX may fail.

Car park and garbage room are ventilation supply only - typically it is exhaust only - can the applicant confirm this is correct?

Gas has been included, Electric would be preferable.

### **Recommendations**

13. Provide EV charging.
14. Provide 4 star toilets.
15. Consider all electric powered water heating, space heating, cooking in line with de-carbonisation of the grid

### **Car parking**

The spatial layout of the car park could be improved to greatly reduce excavation, materials use and health of the landscaping. The sizing of spaces is generous, by reverting to a shared access aisle the spatial requirement is dramatically reduced.

Private garages with garage doors and accommodating disabled car spaces for each of these leads to a very large basement footprint.

Access sweep paths/ access very difficult and may cause danger of collision for aged drivers.

The central courtyard and deep soil planting further create a long basement driveway and access to lifts. This too could be shortened if the left access was relocated or potentially shared by residents.

### **Recommendations**

16. Reconfigure car parking to:
  - maximise deep soil planting and
  - minimise the impact on existing trees to be retained,
  - improve the ease of movement within the carpark
17. Include consideration of:
  - Reverting to a shared access aisle for disabled parks.
  - Making a safer more legible driveway layout.



- Reducing unit numbers. /beds to reduce car spaces required.
- Provide a security door at the base of the ramp and eliminating individual garage doors to individual car spaces. This would also allow 2 accessible parking spaces/shared area and reduce the building footprint

## **PANEL CONCLUSION**

**The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.**

The Panel is of the view that the recommended changes in the design, particularly those related to the protection of trees to be retained, trees on adjoining properties, and the possibility of retaining more trees should be given priority.

The Panel does not consider there is any merit in the proposed FSR as claimed in the SEE.