

## 4.4 DA2020/1597 – 67 Pacific Parade Dee Why

### PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### **General**

Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a part 3 / 4 storey 26 room boarding house with basement parking for 13 cars.

The site is rectangular in shape having a combined frontage of 15.3 metres, a depth of 45.8 metres and a total area of 695.6<sup>2</sup>.

***It should be noted both the applicant and architect declined to present this project due to legal advice. The applicate joined the meeting for the preliminary briefing however excused himself for the discussions and recommendations which followed.***

#### **Strategic context**

The site is zoned Medium Density Residential R3 under the provisions of Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 and the proposed development is permissible with consent.

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

Adjoining development is characterised by three and four storey Residential Flat Building (RFB) with older brick and tiled hipped roof RFBs interspersed with more recent cement rendered flat roof developments including the development to the immediate west at No. 65 Pacific Parade (DA2015/1164) and to the east at 1-5 The Crescent. With the exception of No. 65 Pacific Parade, the RFBs within the vicinity of the site are generally set back from the street in landscape settings.

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

The building does not comply with the required 4.5m setbacks. This creates significant amenity and privacy and sunlight issues with both the subject site and the adjoining RFB's. The long blank wall to the property at 1-5 The Crescent results in a very poor outcome for the residents of this building.

#### **Recommendations**

1. Provide compliant setbacks in addition to orienting the units to face into the site so they do not borrow the amenity from the adjoining sites;
2. Use these setbacks to provide deep soil planting which will provide a landscaped setting to the building and provide privacy and outlook to both the adjoining and subject sites.

#### **Landscape area and carparking**

The project is in a site which has the opportunity to provide a building with a good landscape setting. There is insufficient landscaping to the front of the building due to the façade treatment, services and car parking. This is a poor streetscape outcome.

### **Recommendations**

3. Re design the streetscape to provide significant landscaping to soften the proposal.
4. Provide sufficient landscaping to the side setbacks as mentioned previously;
5. The complicated car parking solution which require two ramps on the street should be redesigned to reduce the impact of the parking on the street. Alternatives such as car lifts could be incorporated to improve the streetscape of the building.

### ***Façade treatment***

The façade treatment to the street is very monotonous and does not relate to the context in any way.

### **Recommendation**

6. Consider redesigning the front façade to provide more visual interest and a contextually appropriate response to the site.

### ***Amenity***

Due to the siting of the building longitudinally into the site and the orientation of the units to the boundary the amenity of the west facing units are poor.

The double story common room to the rear of the site suffers from poor amenity and should be relocated.

### **Recommendation**

7. The west facing units should be designed out of the project with units facing either the street or into the site with adequate separation distances provided.

## **PANEL CONCLUSION**

**The Panel does not support the proposal in the current form and considers it to be an overdevelopment of the site. A reduction in boarding house rooms and scale of the project is recommended to improve the amenity within the site and reduce the impacts on the Adjoining RFB's. The project has a number of other adverse impacts such as the streetscape treatment and façade compositions and these aspects should be considerably improved with the redesign of the project.**