

Urban Design Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2020/1597
Date:	14/05/2021
To:	Anne-Marie Young
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 25 DP 7002 , 67 Pacific Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

Officer comments

The applicant has submitted amended documents dated 29 April 2021. The proposal has not responded to all the issues identified in the Section 34 conference, Design and Sustainability Advisory Panel and Pre-Lodgment Meeting comments:

1. The proposed boarding house is a big increase in unit density and such, amenities to surrounding neighbours should be protected as if a residential flat building is going to be proposed.

Response: The latest amended proposal does not comply with all the built form controls and as such the amenities to the neighbouring residences and boarding rooms facing the west boundary are affected.

2. Proposal should comply fully with the front building setback of 6.5m and side setback of 4.5m, 2m at basement levels and building envelope of 5m at 45 degree. Amenities such as sunlight and privacy to neighbouring residences should not be compromised.

Response: The proposal has not complied with the side setbacks, side boundary envelope controls and basement setback. Amenities to neighbouring residences have been compromised.

3. No building sections are provided. Building height should comply with the 11m control but concern is raised with the deep excavation of the two basement carpark levels, two levels of communal rooms and three level of boarding units at the rear of the site. Basement carpark should not protrude above natural ground by more than one metre. Communal rooms proposed at the rear in subterranean conditions could be redesigned to face a central courtyard to be located in the middle of the building.

Response: The extent of the revised basement excavation is about 3 storeys for the car stacker area and is still a concern on a narrow site. Structure such as contiguous bore piles to the basement walls have not been indicated on drawings and will encroach into the 2m setback. The common areas are relocated to the roof area which should receive adequate solar access.

4. Middle units facing the west boundary have overlooking issues, a suggestion will be to re-orientate to the north by creating central courtyard to look into.

Response: Middle units are still facing the western boundary and not receiving adequate solar access.

5. Building articulations could be improved with bigger gaps to preserve existing trees and by creating a central courtyard for middle units to face into.

Response: These suggestions have not been explored.

6. Landscape requirement of 50% site should be provided for adequate landscape buffer to soften the impact of the increase in density of living units.

Response: Inadequate landscape (41.5%) has been proposed.

7. The roof terrace should address the street primarily and to be setback from building edges and have landscape planters to minimise overlooking and noise nuisance issues to next door neighbours.

Response: The proposed common open space terrace can be supported. The common room area proposed breaches the side boundary building envelope.

8. Generally, 30 units is an overdevelopment of the site with the side boundaries and building envelope breaches. The façade treatment consisting of mainly repetitive window boxes void of balconies could be softened with a more residential look with green walls and a variety of material finishes.

Response: The 26 rooms boarding house is still an over-development with excessive building control breaches. Facade articulations and finishes treatment could be improved and refine further.

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

Recommended Heritage Advisor Conditions:

Nil.