

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2018/1761
To:	Renee Ezzy
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot CP SP 30021 , 24 Aitken Avenue QUEENSCLIFF NSW 2096

Officer comments

Please find Urban Design Comments

The proposed development application is generally supported.

APPLICATION OF CONTROLS

General Comments

The proposed development demonstrates an increase in overall floor areas to the top three level apartments which have been extended southward with 1.5 – 7 metres of length to the top three level apartments. The increased projections of the balconies have the sense of creating additional bulk to the overall form and mass of the built form. The result of these changes to the floor area have resulted in a breach of the height control. Refer also height of buildings control comments below.

1. Built Form Controls

WLEP 2011

Aims of the WLEP in relation to residential development, are to:

- i. protect and enhance the residential use and amenity of existing residential environments, and*
- ii. promote development that is compatible with neighbouring development in terms of bulk, scale and appearance, . . .*

4.3 Height of Buildings

(1) The objectives of this clause are as follows:

- (a) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,*
- (b) to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access,*
- (c) to minimise any adverse impact of development on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments,*
- (d) to manage the visual impact of development when viewed from public places such as parks and reserves, roads and community facilities.*

(2) The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the Height of BuildingsMap.

RESPONSE

We note the upper level accommodation and rooftop terrace has been deleted with landscape area represented on the drawings. The extended/increased floor plate of this upper level, given the requirement to form the roof slab of the apartment below has resulted in the following effects.

As mentioned above the increase in floor area of the upper level apartments has the resultant effect of breaching the building height control by virtue of the balconies pushing further out to the south and the nature of the topography across the site falling quite dramatically across the site. As such the height control is breached.

As previously discussed in the pre-lodgement meeting the roof typology is markedly different, from a hip

to parapet type roof. The increased bulk at this upper level exacerbated by the increased floor plates at upper levels and the reduced front setback, not so much from the ground level car park entry but by the increased bulk and scale toward the front of the site, still presents as an over development which will have impacts relevant to the surrounding sites and expected future development. See comments below regarding reduction of floor plates at upper levels.

WDCP 2011

B1 – Wall Height

Objectives

- *To minimise the visual impact of development when viewed from adjoining properties, streets, waterways and land zoned for public recreation purposes.*
- *To ensure development is generally beneath the existing tree canopy level.*
- *To provide a reasonable sharing of views to and from public and private properties.*
- *To minimise the impact of development on adjoining or nearby properties.*
- *To ensure that development responds to site topography and to discourage excavation of the natural landform.*
- *To provide sufficient scope for innovative roof pitch and variation in roof design.*

1 Requirements

1. Walls are not to exceed 7.2 metres from ground level (existing) to the underside of the ceiling on the uppermost floor of the building (excluding habitable areas wholly located within a roof space).

2 Exceptions

This control may be varied on sites with slopes greater than 20% within the building footprint (measured at the base of the external walls), provided the building:

- *does not exceed the 8.5 metre height development standard;*
- *is designed and located to minimise bulk and scale; and*
- *has a minimal visual impact when viewed from the downslope sides of the land.*

RESPONSE

Non compliance with the wall height control of 7.2m is noted, along with the consideration of the nature of the sloping site. Measures to address minimisation of bulk and scale, visual impacts and sharing of views from adjoining properties should be demonstrated. A reduction in the increase of the upper level floor plates could address the increased bulk at the upper levels.

B7 – Front Boundary Setback

Requirements

- 1. Development is to maintain a minimum setback to road frontages.*
- 2. The front boundary setback area is to be landscaped and generally free of any structures, basements, carparking or site facilities other than driveways, letter boxes, garbage storage areas and fences.*

RESPONSE

Noting the alignment of the ground level with the existing street building lines the general arrangement and planning across the site is supported.

It is however noted that there are service doors that open outward onto the public pedestrian path and exceed the boundary line.

It is recommended the building line be pulled back so as doors open onto entirely within the boundary line. Citing the existing building lines/garages as the precedent it is noted that these are vertical roller doors and do not encroach on the public area.

B9 – Rear Boundary Setbacks

Objectives

- *To ensure opportunities for deep soil landscape areas are maintained.*

- *To create a sense of openness in rear yards.*
- *To preserve the amenity of adjacent land, particularly relating to privacy between buildings.*
- *To maintain the existing visual continuity and pattern of buildings, rear gardens and landscape elements.*
- *To provide opportunities to maintain privacy between dwellings.*

Requirements

1. *Development is to maintain a minimum setback to rear boundaries.*
2. *The rear setback area is to be landscaped and free of any above or below ground*

RESPONSE

In consideration of the rooftop apartment being removed in the proposed development the subsequent reduction in bulk as viewed from the northern part of the site with a reduced setback of 5.2m can be supported.

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.