

Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 03 February 2022

3 - DA2021 2362 - 1105 Barrenjoey Road PALM BEACH

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

This project, although well-presented has fundamental problems.

The proposal is for a 3 level development above ground which has an FSR of 1.6 to 1 and exceeds the height limit of 8.5 m. by almost 2 m.

Any non-compliance with planning controls will be considered by the Panel when compared to a complying scheme there is:

- a demonstrable improvement in amenity within the proposal, (overshadowing, privacy, access to rooftop open space etc.)
- reduced impact on adjoining sites (either existing or in relation to future development potential)
- contributions to the public domain or other public benefits (affordability, environmental performance)

In order to demonstrate the benefits of non-compliance the non-compliant proposal should be benchmarked and compared to a complying 'reference scheme'.

The **intention** of the 8.5 m height limit is to allow for variations in roof forms, and sloping sites. It is not intended to allow for a full 3rd storey as proposed.

(ADG 2C: "Ensure the maximum building height allows for articulated roof planes and building services or that architectural roof features are enabled by the LEP")

Although there is no FSR limit, squeezing 1.6:1 into a 2 ½-3 story form essentially fills the site and results in small internal courtyard/lightwells. A general rule of thumb would be for FSR of about 0.33:1 to a maximum of 0.4:1 per level. So, an FSR of 1.6:1 would generally result in a 4-5 storey building.

(ADG 2D: FSR 1:1= 3 storeys, FSR 2:1=6-7 storeys)

In summary the Panel considers the proposal and overdevelopment of the site.

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The site has a dual aspect to Barrenjoey Road and to Iluka Road.

The proposal's material palette and presentation to Barrenjoey Road is convincing and sensitive to it context. Although the 3 storeys exceeds the height limit, in the context of Barrenjoey Road and given the set back of the upper storey the Panel considers the form of the building acceptable.

The other side of Iluka Road near the subject site is dominated by garage doors built to the site boundaries and there is little street vegetation.

The proposal is out of scale with the adjoining development and is not set back from the road. Although no set back is required a continuation of the vegetated setback to the south would be desirable.

The Panel understands the objective of providing 'water views' to Pittwater from living areas located on the 3rd level over the top of dwelling on the western side of Iluka Road. If living spaces are to be located on the 3rd level a much greater set back would be required.

The 3 storey building above ground disregards Council's controls and is out of context with the predominant 2 storey residential scale of Iluka Road. A two storey+ attic form similar to the site to that south would be more appropriate.

Level 2 features 3 very large apartments of approximately 200 m². The attempt to conceal these apartments in the roofscape, while convincing along the Barrenjoey Road frontage, is unacceptable along Iluka Road where the 2 storey residential character of the neighbourhood is more well established and critical. The Panel is therefore of the view that the attempt to justify 3 stories to the west cannot be supported in its current form.

Recommendations

1. Significant reduce the floor area and increase the size of the courts. The amount of floor area should be determined by what is achievable within a 2 storey form. It may then be possible to discuss the merits of a redistribution of this quantum of floor space in to some parts of the building that may be 3 storeys if it can be shown to have no adverse impacts on neighbours, retains the two storey presentation to Iluka and provides improved amenity
2. Set back the third level so that the building has a 2 storey presentation to Iluka Road.

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

The serviced apartments are effectively 2 bed not 1 bed and would require an additional 3 spaces.

It is the Panels view that deep soil and the potential for mature tree planting should be given priority over precise compliance with car parking rates. However, the issue with the number of car spaces is driven by the overdevelopment of the site overall.

No bike parking is indicated

Recommendations

3. Give priority to the provision of deep soil.
4. Provide bike parking spaces Provide bike parking (claimed in SEPP65 report 3J-2; not on drawings) There should be at least one bike parking space per apartment.
5. Resolve conflicting service and access for residential and commercial use (claimed in SEPP65 report 3C-1; conflict is clear on drawings)

Amenity

The proposal has a very deep floor plate, and although there are small light wells, these cannot be considered to provide a 'dual aspect' to apartments.

There are three serviced apartments on ground level which have access from Iluka Road as well as the internal lift lobby giving residents access from the car park. The internal lobbies are shared with the retail units including access to waste rooms and retail/staff amenities. This is unsatisfactory.

The opportunity for the retail spaces to borrow natural light from larger landscaped courtyards would greatly enhance the scheme. This would provide opportunities for retail spaces (cafés and the like) to have internal courtyards and better amenity and access to light and ventilation.

The 'media rooms' in the serviced apartments on the ground level will clearly be used as bedrooms and should be annotated as such.

Residential lobby B appears to be shared with the retail servicing and access to toilets and to the garbage room. The Panel does agree with this statement in the SEPP65 report 3C-1:

Proposed: Residential access point is carefully and appropriately located for legibility for residents and visitors; the residential lobby will be designed to be secured to control access and to appropriately separate circulation routes;

The Light wells are small and have acoustic and privacy issues if used for natural ventilation.

Given the privacy issues it is likely that the media room in Units 102, 201 and 202 will remain closed meaning that effective distance glass to glass is greater than 18m recommended maximum in the ADG No common space is provided.

Recommendations

6. Re-plan ground floor to avoid conflicts between retail and residential access and servicing
7. Reduced the depth of the floor plans as part of re-design.
8. Consider relocating all residential access from Iluka Road

Landscape

The landscape design comprising two small light wells and perimeter landscape treatment around the site is inadequate.

The site is totally occupied by basement parking making it impossible to provide deep soil planting of large canopy trees to provide shade.

The proposal is to remove existing trees from the site along Barrenjoey Road.

The highly treed character of the Palm Beach locality should be maintained. Provision of replacement trees is critical.

No trees or vegetation are provided to shade the west facing apartments along Iluka Road -either on the Council verge or on site.

Street Trees nominated on Barrenjoey Road are very small growing and will add little to the streetscape character or Palm Beach bushland character

The light wells are too small to realise the full benefits of this approach. A large central courtyard is a great opportunity to provide through flow ventilation, cooling and visual amenity. Opening the retail shops to this courtyard and the residential lobbies to this courtyard will provide added value to the development.

The SEPP65 report 3E-1 claims that the plan provides 150.5 sqm of 'landscaping':

"The proposal includes 150.5sqm of landscaping (11% of the site area). Minimum required however is from ADG 7% = 95.655m²

This is simply incorrect and a misinterpretation of the ADG which makes it very clear that the requirement is for 7% of the site area to be **deep soil**. The ADG goes further to say

On some sites it may be possible to provide larger deep soil zones, depending on the site area and context: 10% of the site as deep soil on sites with an area of 650m² - 1,500m²

Given that the site is 1366sqm 10 % or 133.6 sqm of deep soil available for mature tree planting should be provided.

Most of the deep soil in the design is located on Barrenjoey Road where only 3 trees are proposed. Elsewhere the basement car park is built to the boundary.

Recommendations

9. Reduce and reconfigure the basement parking to provide 136sqm of deep soil to allow for planting of large canopy trees on both street frontages.
10. Provide trees to shade the west facing apartments on site.
11. Liaise with Council, to explore to provide large endemic canopy street trees to Barrenjoey Road in as part of the public domain. Relace *Tristanopsis laurina* with bigger endemic species
12. Investigate an alternative overall planning approach that would comprise a large central planted courtyard to provide through flow ventilation, cooling and visual amenity. Open the retail shops and the residential lobbies to this courtyard.

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

Materials and finishes are appropriate and fit well with the context.

Sustainability

The light wells can work well for cross ventilation but as previously noted there are acoustic and privacy issues. ventilation but there may be some privacy issues, for example between apartment 201 and 202 and vertically between the apartments

Rainwater for landscaping is included, but no other uses have been identified.

Gas cooktops and hot water are proposed.

Fridges provided

No photovoltaics are indicated.

Recommendations:

13. Reconsider design of the air wells to ensure privacy is maintained. Investigate significant increase in their size to
14. Connect the rainwater tanks to toilets and/or laundries to increase reuse of the rainwater
15. Recommend changing to electric systems including heat pump hot water and induction cooktops
16. Provide EV charging for on of each units allotted spaces
17. Maximise the amount of PV on the roof and investigate low maintenance ground cover to the non-trafficable roof areas

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. Many of the issues stem from the excessive site coverage. Breaching of height limits has not been adequately justified and setbacks to Iluka Road are insufficient. As noted any breaching of the height controls would need to be supported by an analysis of the benefits compared to a complying scheme.

The Panel refers the applicant to the Apartment Design Guide for aspects related to amenity and internal planning of apartments.