

### PLANNING PROPOSAL REPORT

### Draft Amendment to Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012

### 654-666 Pacific Highway, 2A Oliver Road & 1 Freeman Road, Chatswood

Prepared for Daraki Holdings By INGHAM PLANNING Pty Ltd Job No. 12087

May 2014

Urban and Regional Planning, Environmental Planning and Statutory Planning Registered Office: Lyndhurst, Suite 19, 303 Pacific Highway, Lindfield N.S.W 2070 Telephone: (02) 9416 9111 Facsimile: (02) 9416 9799 email: admin@inghamplanning.com.au A.C.N. 106 713 768

### Contents

1.	INTR	ODUCTION	1					
2.	THE SITE, LOCALITY AND PLANNING CONTROLS							
	2.1 2.2	The Site and locality Planning Controls Willoughby LEP 2012	2 8					
3.	THE	PLANNING PROPOSAL	10					
	3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4	The Planning Proposal (Amendment to Willoughby LEP 2012 Proposed Future Mixed Use Development Intended Outcomes Site Context and Potential Future High Density Residential Development	10 10 10 11					
4.	JUST	IFICATION OF THE PLANNING PROPOSAL	18					
	4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5	Need for the Planning Proposal Relationship to strategic planning framework Environmental, Social and Economic Impact State and Commonwealth Interests Community Consultation	18 19 25 30 30					
5.	CON	CLUSION	31					

#### Appendices

Appendix A –	Site Survey Plan
Appendix B –	Design Concept Plans and Floor Space Schedule prepared by MGA Architects.
Appendix C –	Shadow Diagrams prepared by MGA Architects
Appendix D -	Traffic Impact Assessment dated May 2014 prepared by Transport and Traffic
	Planning Associates

- Appendix E SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code Compliance Table
- Appendix F Willoughby DCP Parts E and I.6 Compliance Table

NOTE: The Appendices are contained in a separately enclosed volume of Appendices.

### Introduction

This Planning Justification Report has been prepared to support a Planning Proposal for land at Chatswood described as Lot 1 DP 1068007 No. 654-656 Pacific Highway, Lot 1 DP 121830 No. 658-666 Pacific Highway, Lot 1 DP 839309 No. 1 Freeman Road and Lot 2 DP 839309 No. 2A Oliver Road, Chatswood. The property is a corner site of some 2,856m, with 3 road frontages and contains 2 commercial buildings (1 x single storey and 1 x part 1, part 2 storey) fronting the Pacific Highway and at the rear, 2 single storey dwellings, 1 fronting Oliver Road (No 2A) and 1 fronting Freeman Road (No. 1).

The site is predominantly zoned B5 Business Development under Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012 (WLEP 2012). A narrow corridor of land along the Pacific Highway frontage of the site is zoned SP2 Infrastructure for future road widening of the Pacific Highway. WLEP 2012 prescribes a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 2:1 and a maximum building height of 18 metres for that portion of the subject land zoned B5.

The Planning Proposal seeks amendment of WLEP 2012 to allow increased floor space ratio and building height, where land is consolidated into a development site of at least 2,000m2. It is proposed that an "incentives" clause encouraging site consolidation be inserted into WLEP 2012, with wording similar to the existing clause 6.13 of the LEP. Such a clause would allow an increase in height of buildings and floor space ratio of WLEP 2012 to enable the site to be redeveloped up to a maximum FSR of 3.0:1 and a building height up to RL 137.8 on the northern half of the site and RL 128.8 on the southern half of the site.

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure Guidelines for Preparing Planning Proposals. It considers the planning implications of a draft amendment to WLEP 2012. The report also outlines the form of building envelope drawings and how it is envisaged that the land, after gazettal of the Planning Proposal, will be developed for a part 7, part 8 storey mixed use building in a manner that maintains acceptable neighbor amenity and is consistent with the desired future character of the locality.

A concept plan for redevelopment of the site in the form of two residential towers (10 and 7 storeys) above a non-residential 1 to 2 storey podium, is enclosed separately in the Appendices. This concept plan is intended to illustrate how the site could be suitably developed at the proposed additional density and building height. In the event that the Planning Proposal proceeds, a separate development application would subsequently be submitted to Council

Council's support is sought for the Planning Proposal to proceed through the gateway process and subsequent public exhibition. Gazettal of the proposed increase in building height and FSR controls will enable economic use of the land and its development to an appropriate height and density, commensurate with its location adjoining the Chatswood CBD and proximate to the Chatswood Railway Station and transport interchange. Such an outcome is consistent with current planning policies which seek to increase development density in locations accessible to town centres with high quality frequent public transport services.

The Planning Proposal not only provides for a more viable development of the site, but also includes public benefits such as siting development clear of areas required for future road widening and payment of an affordable housing levy to Council, which would otherwise not be payable if the site is developed in accordance with the current planning controls.

1

### 2 The Site, Locality & Planning Controls

#### 2.1 The Site and Locality

The subject land comprises Lot 1 DP 1068007 No. 654-656 Pacific Highway, Lot 1 DP 121830 No. 658-666 Pacific Highway, Lot 1 DP 839309 No. 1 Freeman Road and Lot 2 DP 839309 No. 2A Oliver Road, Chatswood. The site has a total area of 2,856m2 and is located on the western side of the Pacific Highway, adjoining the Chatswood CBD, some 300m southwest of the main entry to Chatswood Railway Station (see **Figure 1 – Location**, below).



Figure 1 Location

The subject land is a corner site, with 3 road frontages and is proposed to be consolidated into a single development site. The site has a frontage (excluding splays) of 57.93 metres to the Pacific Highway, 35.745 metres to Oliver Road, 52.789 metres to Freeman Road and a 60.964 metre long rear western boundary. A site survey is attached at **Appendix A**.

The eastern portion of the site, fronting the Pacific Highway, contains commercial uses (see Photos 1 and 2). At the corner of Pacific Highway and Freeman Road is a single storey commercial building used for the sale of fireplaces. Further to the north, extending towards Oliver Road is a part one, part two storey commercial building used for display and sale of tiles. A car park for this business is located at the corner of Pacific Highway and Oliver Road.

The western rear portion of the site contains 2 single detached brick and tile dwellings and associated car ports (see Photos 3 and 4). The northern dwelling, fronts Oliver Road and the southern dwelling fronts Freeman Road.

Existing buildings have no heritage significance. There are a number of large trees scattered around the site, predominantly along the eastern side boundary of No. 2A Oliver Road and within the footpath reserves of Oliver Road and the Pacific Highway.

The front portion of the site has a generally gentle slope from the northeast corner to the south west corner. The rear residential portion of the site has more pronounced slope down from the Oliver Road frontage to the southwest corner. There are no watercourses on or near the site. A plan of the site is shown in **Figure 2**, below.



Figure 2 – Site Plan

An aerial view of the site and locality is shown in **Figure 3** below. Nearby Chatswood Railway station is shown in the top left hand corner of the aerial view.



#### Figure 3 Aerial Photo of Site and Locality

Photographs of existing development on the site are shown in **Photos 1** to **5**.



#### Photo 1

View to the site looking southwest from the Pacific Highway (corner Oliver Road), of the existing part one and part two storey commercial building fronting the Pacific Highway, in the northeast existing portion of the site. This building is used for display and sale of tiles.





#### Photo 2

View of the site, looking northwest from the Pacific Highway, (corner Freeman Road), of the existing single storey building fronting the Pacific Highway in the southeast portion of the site. This building is used for display and sale of fireplaces.

#### Photo 3

View of the site looking northeast from Freeman Road, showing the southern side elevation of the existing commercial building located at 654-656 Pacific Highway (corner Freeman Road). Vehicular access to this building is obtained from Freeman Road. The proposed development is to provide a vehicular access in a similar location.



#### Photo 4

View of the site, looking northwest, from Freeman Road showing the existing single storey dwelling and carport in the southwest corner of the site, at No. 1 Freeman Road. The Freeman Road frontage of the existing apartment building adjoining the western boundary of the site is shown at left.



#### Photo 5

View of the site looking south, from Oliver Road, showing the existing single storey dwelling and carport on the site, at No. 2A Oliver Road in the northwest corner of the site. The eastern elevation of the existing apartment building adjoining the western boundary of the site is shown at right.

The locality comprises medium and high density residential development to the east, west, northwest, southwest, south and southeast of the site. Low rise commercial development is located to the north and northeast of the site. The nature of existing development adjoining and near the site is shown in the following **Photos 6** to **10**.





#### Photo 6

View of existing development on the western side of the Pacific Highway, extending south from the site. The existing 7 storey apartment building shown in the photo is located at 640-650 Pacific Highway, on the southern side of Freeman Road, to the south of the site. Lower rise apartment buildings are located further to the south.

#### Photo 7

View of existing development fronting the Pacific Highway, north of the site. Commercial uses predominate in this view. Commercial development nearest the site is two storeys however, nearby further to the northeast there is a significant increase in building height to more than 15 storeys. The existing car dealership site (shown at left in the photo) can be redeveloped to a height of up to 18 metres (6 storeys).



#### Photo 8

View of existing development opposite the site on the eastern side of the Pacific Highway. The modern white and grey high rise apartment building is 9 storeys. This apartment building and the older style brick and tile 3 storey apartment building, shown at left, are located within an area where buildings up to 34 metres in height are permitted.



#### Photo 9

View of the existing 7 storey apartment building adjoining the western boundary of the site, as seen looking south from Oliver Road. This development extends south from Oliver Road to Freeman Road and its address is 3-5 Freeman Road. A maximum building height of 24m applies to this site and to residential land to the west and south.



#### Photo 10

View of existing medium and higher density residential development located on the southern side of Freeman Road, opposite the site. A 24m maximum height limit applies to these sites. Redevelopment of sites to this higher yield is unlikely on many sites where newer development of more than 3 storeys has been constructed over the last 20 to 25 years.

#### 2.2 Willoughby LEP 2012 Planning Controls

More than 90% (2,608.2m2) of site is zoned B5 Business Development under Willoughby LEP 2012 (WLEP 2012). A narrow corridor of land of some 247.8m2) along the Pacific Highway frontage of the site is zoned SP2 Infrastructure for future road widening of the Pacific Highway (see **Figure 5 – Zoning** on page). The boundaries of the B5 Zone generally correspond to sites currently used for "large floor area" commercial purposes such as car dealerships and bulky goods outlets, extending along the Pacific Highway near the CBD Core, which is zoned B3 Commercial Core.

The B5 Zone aims to provide for a mix of business and warehouse uses, bulky goods premises that require large floor area. The access needs and traffic generation of such uses should not interfere with the safety and efficiency of the road network. Other permitted uses include child care centres, garden and hardware supplies, neighbourhood shops, hotels, motels, restaurants and cafes, shop top housing and vehicles sales/hire.

Future development in the B5 Zone may be expected to be either wholly commercial in character or comprise mixed use developments with ground floor commercial uses and multi-level shop-top housing above. The Planning Proposal does not seek any change to existing zonings, nor is any change to the range of permitted uses proposed. The proposed development envisages construction of ground floor and lower ground floor commercial floor space and bulky goods retailing and/or neighbourhood shops, or car sales, with up to 6 storeys of shop-top housing above.



#### Figure 4 Zoning Willoughby LEP 2012

The Planning Proposal requests inclusion of an incentives clause to allow increased building height and FSR, subject to site consolidation forming a development parcel of at least 2,000m2. The existing building height and FSR controls for the subject land and adjoining land, as contained in WLEP 2012 are shown in **Figures 5 and 6**.





Figure 6 Maximum Floor Space Ratio Willoughby LEP 2012



### 3

### **The Planning Proposal**

3.1 The Planning Proposal seeks to amend WLEP 2012 to include redevelopment incentives for the subject land, designed to encourage site consolidation. Such an outcome facilitates creation of a larger development site more suitable to accommodating the higher density mixed use development envisaged in the B5 Zone.

The proposed incentives provide for increasing FSR from 2:1 to 3:1 and increased building height from the currently permitted maximum building height of 18m, where a development site of at least 2,000m2 is created by consolidation of existing allotments within the subject land, as envisaged in Part I.6 of the Willoughby DCP.

The Planning Proposal is proposed to be implemented by way of introduction of an additional subclause relating to maximum building height and FSR, where a minimum site area of 2,000m2 is achieved. A subclause 6.13A is proposed to be inserted into WLEP 2012 to allow a building height up to RL 137.8 (on the northern half of site) and RL 128.8 (on the southern half of site), and additional FSR up to 3.0:1 on the 2,608m2 B5 zoned portion of the site, where site area within the B5 Zone is at least 2,000m2.

#### 3.2 Planning Proposal Objectives

The objectives of the Planning Proposal are summarised as follows:

- (a) Provide a floor space and building height yield that provides a suitable transition between higher density development to the east and lower density development to the west and reinforces the role of the site as a gateway to the Chatswood CBD.
- (b) Provide an increased floor space and building height that improves viability of redevelopment and reflects enhanced site capability for accommodating higher density podium and tower form development, due to larger than average site area.
- (c) Encourage consolidation of existing allotments, 3 of which are relatively small in area, in terms of permitted higher density development, to facilitate enhanced urban design and tower form development outcomes on larger development parcels, more appropriate in area zoned for high density mixed use development.
- (d) Ensure that environmental and amenity impacts associated with increased development yield on a development parcel of more than 2,000m2 are not materially increased.
- (e) Enable more economic and efficient use of land and additional affordable housing adjoining a large Town Centre and major bus/rail interchange, generally compatible with the high density urban environment of the locality.

#### 3.3 Intended outcomes

The preparation of the Planning Proposal and a potential building envelope has been informed by a detailed analysis of the site's development constraints and opportunities. This analysis has included site context, topography, aspect, relationship to neighbouring development, traffic and access, road widening, viability and market expectations.

#### 3.4 Site Context and Potential Future High Density Residential Development

A DA for future high density mixed use development of the site will be separately prepared and lodged with Council, following exhibition of the Planning Proposal and its referral to the Minister for Planning for gazettal.

A building envelope and concept plans for a mixed use building with a part 1 part 2 storey podium and 2 residential towers (7 and 10 storeys) has been prepared. A comparison building envelope for a 6 storey mixed use building complying with the existing maximum 2:1 FSR and 18m building height development controls has also been prepared. These building envelopes enable testing of increased development yields on the site, based on its relatively large area. Larger sites are able to more efficiently accommodate new development and enhance able to accommodate more floor space per unit of area, compared to smaller sites.

The building envelope drawings are conceptual only and are not intended to represent the final form of development on the site. Building envelope drawings have been prepared for a "complying" scheme with an FSR of 2:1 and 18 metre maximum building height, as provided for in the existing WLEP 2012 and a "proposed" scheme, which complies with the 3:1 FSR and maximum RL's (137.8 and 128.8) contemplated in the Planning Proposal. A 24m height limit applies to the land adjoining the site to the west.

If the site is redeveloped in accordance with the existing development controls, generally along existing property boundaries, with some adjustment to provide more functional site configuration, without incentives to encourage site amalgamation, the likely outcome is two development sites, each of around 1,300m2.

After allowing for road widening, building setbacks to roads and property boundaries and building separation standards required under the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code, resulting development would comprise either a single street wall building form, or if developed as 2 sites, 2 relatively small medium rise towers on separate podiums. Developable area/floor space is significantly constrained due to the need to provide at least 18m separation between the 2 low rise towers.

In the scenario where site amalgamation occurs it is possible to construct a single long street wall building form on the site. However, such a building under the current development controls, limited to a maximum height of 18 metres and FSR of 2:1 would not optimize efficient redevelopment of the land. In other words, it would constitute an underdevelopment of a strategically located site. Such a building form would not provide a transition in building height from south to north towards the Chatswood CBD and would not acknowledge the gateway nature of the northern portion of the site.

Amalgamating all 4 existing allotments enables more floor space to be accommodated on the site, which more appropriately reflects the intrinsic development potential of this strategic site. Such a building would comprise a single storey podium (2 storeys at the rear due to the slope of the land), with 2 residential towers extending 7 and 10 storeys above the podium. Despite such a building being larger and taller than a "complying" building (18m high with an FSR of 2:1), overall bulk and scale remains compatible with site's existing context and of existing and future tower building forms to the northeast and east. Additional storeys on the towers are compatible with the site's gateway location and can be accommodated without significant visual or other amenity impact. This is illustrated in the two 3D building envelope drawings shown in **Figures 7** and **7A**.





Figure 7A: Planning Proposal Scheme with Increased Building Height and an FSR of 3:1



Figure 8: Planning Proposal Scheme 3D View looking north-west from Pacific Highway



The current planning controls for the site, under Willoughby LEP 2012 enable the subject land to be redeveloped for a mixed use development. Non-residential floor space such as commercial, neighbourhood shops or bulky goods are required at ground floor level and shop-top housing is permitted above this non-residential floor level. Due to the slope of the site a non-residential lower ground floor level in the rear portion of the site would also be included. On this basis a "complying" development on the B5 zoned land could achieve a non-residential GFA of 1,716m2 and a residential GFA of 3,500m2 (44 apartments).

The Planning Proposal seeks approval for an increase in allowable FSR from 2:1 to 3:1. The concept plan proposes 2,279m2 of non-residential GFA, and 5,665.45m2 of residential GFA (62 apartments, including a 94.4m2 communal meeting/recreation room). This residential floor space includes 3 affordable housing apartments with a total GFA of 234m2. Affordable housing floor space is not included in assessable GFA, therefore, total assessable residential GFA is 5,431.45m2. Total assessable GFA in the concept plan is some 7,710.45m2 equating to an FSR of 2.96:1. The proportion of non-residential to residential floor space is decreased from 32.9% to 28.7% to improve viability. However, the higher density option still retains the ground and lower ground floor in a non-residential use permitted under the B5 Zone.

A more intensive redevelopment of the site as envisaged in the Planning Proposal, particularly an increased apartment yield with taller residential towers, improves viability of redevelopment. This improved viability is achieved with minimal increase in environmental or amenity impacts. Perceived building bulk and scale is not materially changed, having regard to the context of the site, both as currently exists and as envisaged in the future under the WLEP 2012 development controls.

The additional floor space is primarily accommodated within additional tower floor levels (5 on Tower A and 2 on Tower B). The resulting higher density tower built form is a superior urban design outcome for this important CBD gateway site. The primary issue is the ability of the site to accommodate a taller building, between 2 and 5 storeys higher than permitted under the current planning controls. In this regard one must consider not only the height of existing buildings in the locality but also the heights of future buildings developed in accordance with the WLEP 2012 development controls.

Cross sections (east to west and south to north), as shown in **Figures 9** and **10** illustrate the height of the proposed development in relation to adjoining buildings and the currently permitted maximum building heights allowed on those sites.

Residential land opposite the site to the east is permitted to be developed up to a height of 34m. Adjoining residential land to the northwest, south and west is provided with a building height limit of 24m, while the subject land, which fronts onto the Pacific Highway, is provided with a modest height limit of 18 metres. The outcome of these controls is that development on the subject land constructed to an 18m height would be somewhat discordant with future development around the site. This is illustrated in **Figure 9** below.



Figure 9 - East to West Building Height Cross-Section

Allowing a building height of 27.8m for the southern tower (Tower B) is compatible with the prevailing 24m height limit on the western side of the Pacific Highway providing a more suitable transition in building heights from east to west. The taller 36.2m high northern tower (Tower A) is designed to recognise the CBD gateway location of the site and provide a building height that transitions to the tall existing and future towers to the east and northeast.

The tallest component of the proposed development is located in the northeast corner adjacent to the intersection of the Pacific Highway and Oliver Road. This strategy provides the building with a strong identity at this prominent location, emphasising the corner location, consistent with good urban design practice. Building height steps down 3 storeys for the southern tower, as shown in **Figure 10** below.



Figure 10 - North to South Building Height Cross-Section

Suitable setbacks have been provided to the tower buildings to ensure that there is minimal increase in shadows, compared to a complying scheme. The two tower building form also opens up a view corridor east-west through the centre of the site, which would otherwise be obstructed by a complying street wall building form.

Care has been taken in the design of the proposed development to ensure that the requested additional floor space and building height does not impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential buildings. A 6m wide deep soil zone is provided along the western boundary enabling planting of trees and shrubs that assist in maintaining privacy and an attractive outlook between apartments on the subject land and the adjoining land to the west.

**Figure 11**, on Page 16 shows a comparison between the proposed minimum front and rear setbacks and the minimum front and rear setbacks required in the Willoughby DCP (WDCP), shown with a red line and those applying under the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC), shown with a green line. The provisions of the RFDC would prevail over the rear setback controls of the WDCP.

Proposed rear setbacks at the lower levels are significantly greater than required by the DCP and the RFDC, in order to provide a more generous landscaped deep soil area at ground level and space for tree canopy. Rear setbacks substantial comply with the building separation standards of the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC). Proposed setbacks to the road frontages are less than required in the DCP, but have been designed in accordance with consultations undertaken with Council aimed at facilitating Council's preferred tower building form, rather than a street wall building.

Figure 11 - Front & Rear Setback comparison with Willoughby DCP Setbacks



Levels 4 and 5 encroach slightly into the minimum rear setback for the southern half of the building, but fully comply with the building separation standards of the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code, apart from a minor encroachment for a limited portion of Level 3 in Tower B. Importantly the additional floor levels requested in the Planning Proposal comply fully with the rear setback controls of the RFDC, and apart from a minor encroachment on Level 7 of Tower A, comply fully with the WDCP.

The proposed mixed use building has been designed to substantially comply with the design rules of thumb recommended in the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code. There is full compliance with the primary design standards relating to solar access (70% of apartments), single aspect apartments (not more than 10% south facing), cross-ventilation (60% of apartments), naturally ventilated kitchens (25% of kitchens) and building separation. A SEPP 65 RFDC Compliance Table is enclosed separately in the volume of Appendices as **Appendix E**.

Building separation to neighbouring sites between habitable rooms up to and including the  $4^{th}$  storey at the rear are well in excess of the minimum 12m required by the Code. At the  $5^{th}$  storey and above building separation exceeds the minimum 18m/24m required by the Code.

Some flexibility is sought with respect to building separation between proposed Towers A and B, as privacy between habitable rooms is addressed by design (e.g. avoiding windows/balconies of habitable rooms facing each other). Building depth is substantially compliant with the 20m maximum building depth standard permitted under the WDCP, apartment from a minor encroachment in the southwest corner of Levels 1 to 7 of Tower A. A WDCP Compliance Table for the proposal is enclosed separately in the volume of Appendices as **Appendix F**.

#### 4.1 Need for the Planning Proposal

#### 4.1.1 Is the Planning Proposal a result of any Strategic Study or report?

No.

4

The Planning Proposal arises from an analysis of the site context, redevelopment advantages associated with larger sites consideration of existing planning controls and the objectives of those controls. The planning strategy underlying WLEP 2012 is to concentrate higher density development in and adjoining the Chatswood City Centre so that existing low density housing areas can be retained substantially as they currently exist. This approach is also consistent with the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and the Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy.

The Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy aims to increase densities in Centres, particularly in those centres near public transport and facilitate redevelopment of existing apartment sites that are capable of accommodating increased density. The Draft Strategy requires that the Willoughby LGA accommodate at least 6,800 additional dwellings by 2031.

WLEP 2012 allows building heights of up to 24m to the west and south of the site and 34 metres to the east of the site. There are no particular features of the site that would require a maximum building height lower than is the case with the adjoining land to the west and south. A sensitively designed and located 2 tower building form extending to a height of 36.2 metres in the site's northern portion and 27.8 metres in the southern portion provides a suitable transition in building height from the south and west where a height of 24m applies to adjoining land, to the north, where taller buildings of up to 34m permitted on land to the east and up to 60 metres on land to the northeast.

#### 4.1.2 <u>Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes,</u> or is there a better way?

Yes – there is no better way. The requested variation to maximum building height and FSR is greater than could reasonably be considered under the development standards variation clause in WLEP 2012.

#### 4.1.3 Is there a net community benefit?

Yes. The subject site is capable of providing additional housing opportunities in a convenient location adjacent to shops, services and high frequency public transport. Increased development yield will result in payment of additional Section 94 infrastructure levies to Council, assisting in the provision of new community facilities in the Willoughby LGA. The proposal also includes land dedication for local road widening.

The existing site is not designated as a site where affordable housing requirements apply. The provision of increased building height, FSR and apartment density will result in the site being included for levying of affordable housing contributions, or alternatively provision of affordable housing on the site (i.e. 3 apartments).

The requested increase in building height and density encourages redevelopment of the existing underdeveloped land, which contains buildings that do not contribute positively to the modern high density urban character of the adjacent Chatswood CBD. Encouraging redevelopment will enable removal of encroachments into areas of the site designated for future road widening, thus facilitating such road widening when it is required by Roads and Maritime Services and Council.

#### 4.2 Relationship to strategic planning framework

4.2.1 <u>Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions contained within the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Plan and exhibited draft strategies)?</u>

The Sydney Metropolitan Plan 2036 and the Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy provide direction for future planning and development in the Willoughby local government area. The vision for Sydney 2036 is a Sydney that will be a more compact, networked city with improved accessibility, capable of supporting more jobs, homes and lifestyle opportunities within the existing urban footprint.

Key Metro Strategy outcomes relevant to the Planning Proposal include improved housing choice and affordability, encourage employment and services to be located in centres accessible to public transport and locate at least 70% of new housing within existing urban areas.

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Sydney Metropolitan Plan 2036 by encouraging new housing within an established urban area in a location adjoining a large town centre and directly accessible to public transport and services, on a site capable of accommodating high density housing.

The Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy requires that Willoughby accommodate an additional 6,800 dwellings by 2031. These additional dwellings are to be primarily located within and adjoining the City Centre and in relatively limited areas within and adjoining existing suburban centres.

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy 2036 and the Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy.

### 4.2.2 Is the planning proposal consistent with the local council's Community Strategic Plan, or other local strategic plan?

Willoughby's Community Strategic Plan is the Draft Willoughby City Strategy, which identifies Willoughby as *"the vital hub of the region, where residential, cultural, economic and environmental interests are respected and balanced, and our communities enjoy a diversity of lifestyles."* The Strategy sets out key strategic directions for the next 15 years which are based on the principles of sustainability and social justice.

Strategic directions relate to community and cultural life, natural environment, homes, infrastructure, economic activity and governance. Strategic directions of particular relevance to the Planning Proposal are directions relating to homes, infrastructure and economic activity.

In relation to homes, the goal is to provide housing that is liveable and sustainable and enhances urban character. Emphasis is placed on affordability and housing choice to meet changing demographics. The form of mixed use development envisaged in the Planning Proposal has an emphasis on providing well designed apartment living with a focus on affordability and meeting the needs of smaller households such as singles and couples and the retired.

The emphasis on 1 and 2 bedroom apartments at modest prices addresses strong unmet market demand for such housing in the Chatswood area. A major proportion of new apartment developments in Chatswood have been targeted at the higher price range, whereas the proposal will incorporate apartments offered primarily at the lower middle and middle price range.

Due to the relatively modest returns currently available for commercial floor space fronting the Pacific Highway, the provision of a larger proportion of residential floor space enhances the viability of the project, facilitating development of commercial floor space at the ground and lower ground floor. Such an outcome is consistent with the objective of protecting employment areas and providing opportunities for local employment.

The siting of the building facilitates planned future widening of the Pacific Highway and Oliver Road and footpath widening in Freeman Road. This will assist in achieving the infrastructure objective of facilitating improvements to road infrastructure to reduce road congestion. The siting of the proposal within easy walking distance to the Chatswood Transport Interchange contributes to achieving the objective of reducing car dependency.

The proposal provides for more than 2,200m2 of affordable commercial floor space in a configuration that is ideally suited to small businesses seeking a location in Chatswood. The proposal constitutes a significant investment in the local economy and the Chatswood centre, a key objective of Council's strategic direction relating to Economic Activity.

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the vision and strategic directions of Draft Willoughby City Strategy and will assist in achieving the relevant objectives of the City Strategy.

#### 4.2.3 Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies?

#### State Environmental Planning Policies

The only State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) relevant to this planning proposal are SEPP 55, SEPP (BASIX) 2004 and SEPP 65:

SEPP	Consistency
SEPP 55 – Remediation of Contaminated Land This SEPP aims to promote the remediation of contaminated land for the purposes of reducing risk to human health and/or the environment.	

SEPP	Consistency
SEPP (BASIX) 2004	
Building Sustainability Index designed to encourage improved environmental performance and reduced energy consumption.	This SEPP will apply to future proposed dwellings/apartments and appropriate BASIX documentation will be submitted with any future DA for redeveloping the site.
SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	
This SEPP aims to improve the design quality of residential flat development including better built form and aesthetics and amenity and reduced energy consumption. The SEPP also aims to better satisfy housing demand and the needs of a wide range of people.	This SEPP will apply to the proposed residential component of the future mixed use building. The concept plan has been prepared having regard to the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC) and achieves general compliance with this Code and full compliance with the primary design standards. A SEPP 65 assessment is required to be submitted with any future DA for redeveloping the site. A SEPP 65 RFDC Compliance Table is enclosed at <b>Appendix E</b> .

#### Regional Environmental Plans

No Regional Environmental Plans (REP's) are applicable to the site.

### 4.2.4 <u>Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?</u>

This planning proposal has been assessed having regard for the Section 117 Directions [issued to Councils under s117(2) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act* 1979 (EP&A Act)], relevant to this planning proposal. The findings were as follows:

DIRECTION	CONSISTENCY					
	Yes/No or Not Applicable					
1. EMPLOYMENT AND RESOURCES						
<b>1.1 Business and Industrial Zones</b> The objectives of this direction are to encourage employment growth in suitable locations, protect employment land in business and industrial zones and support the viability of identified strategic centres.	YES – the proposal will not reduce the extent or business/commercial floor space permitted on the site under its B5 Business Development Zone. The B5 Zone will be retained but with increased residential density an outcome that supports the viability of the adjoining Chatswood City Centre.					
1.2 Rural Zones	Not Applicable					
1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	Not Applicable					
1.4 Oyster Aquaculture	Not Applicable					
1.5 Rural Lands	Not Applicable					
2. ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE						
<b>2.1 Environment Protection Zones</b> The objective of Direction 2.1 is to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas.	Not Applicable (The site and adjoining lands are not identified as environmentally sensitive).					

DIRECTION	CONSISTENCY Yes/No or Not Applicable							
2.2 Coastal Protection	Not Applicable							
<b>2.3 Heritage Conservation</b> The objective of Direction 2.3 is to conserve items, areas, objects and places of environmental heritage significance and indigenous heritage significance.	Not Applicable (The site and adjoining lands are not identified as containing any items, areas, objects or places of environmental heritage or indigenous heritage significance). There is substantial separation distance to the nearest heritage item (former Chatswood fire station).							
2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas	Not Applicable							
3. HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
<ul> <li>3.1 Residential Zones</li> <li>The objectives of Direction 3.1 are:</li> <li>To encourage a variety and choice of housing types to provide for existing and future housing needs;</li> <li>To make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services.</li> <li>To minimise the impact of residential development on the environment and resource lands.</li> </ul>	Not Applicable (the site is not within a Residential Zone)							
3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	Not Applicable							
<b>3.3 Home Occupations</b> The objective of this direction is to encourage the carrying out of low-impact small businesses in dwelling houses.	YES – home occupations will continue to be permissible development on the site. No changes are proposed to the Willoughby LEP 2012 B5 Zone land use table applicable to the site.							
3.4 Integrating Land Use & Transport								
The objective of Direction 3.4 is to ensure that urban structures, building forms, land use locations, development designs, subdivision and street layouts achieve the nominated planning objectives e.g. improving access to housing, jobs and services, reducing dependence on cars and supporting efficient public transport.	YES – the proposed increase in development density will improve access to housing in a location which adjoins a city centre offering employment and services, including high frequency public transport services offering excellent access to jobs and services in major employment centres such as the Sydney CBD and North Sydney CBD and other nearby employment centres such as Macquarie Park, St Leonards and the Artarmon Industrial Area.							
3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Not Applicable							
3.6 Shooting Ranges	Not Applicable							
4 HAZARD AND RISK								
4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	Not Applicable							
4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	Not Applicable							

DIRECTION	CONSISTENCY
	Yes/No or Not Applicable
4.3 Flood Prone Land	Not Applicable
4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	Not Applicable
5. REGIONAL PLANNING	
<b>5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies</b> The objective of this Direction is to ensure that draft LEPs are consistent with the nominated regional strategies.	YES
5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchment	Not Applicable
5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast	Not Applicable
5.4 Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	Not Applicable
5.5 Development in the vicinity of Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield (Cessnock LGA) (Revoked 18 June 2010)	Not Applicable
5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1	Not Applicable
5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1)	Not Applicable
5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek	Not Applicable
6. LOCAL PLAN MAKING	
<b>6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements</b> The objective of this Direction is to ensure that LEP provisions encourage the efficient and appropriate assessment of development.	YES- the proposal does not include requirements for the concurrence, consultation or referral of DA's to a Minister or Public Authority and does not identify any development as designated.
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes	Not Applicable (no land is proposed to be reserved for public purposes – the existing land reservation for Pacific Highway road widening is retained within an SP2 Infrastructure Zone)
<b>6.3 Site Specific Provisions</b> The objective of this Direction is to discourage unnecessarily restrictive site specific planning controls.	YES – the proposal does not seek to reduce the level of restriction of height and FSR controls. Indeed the opposite is the case, with increased development density proposed, primarily on the basis of providing a larger development site. The Planning Proposal does not include specific development/drawings of a development proposal. Concept building envelopes and indicative elevations and floor plans are included in order to objectively assess the implications of allowing increased building height and FSR.

DIRECTION	CONSISTENCY Yes/No or Not Applicable
7. METROPOLITAN PLANNING	
7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 The objective of this direction is to give legal effect to the vision, transport and land use strategy, policies, outcomes and actions contained in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036	YES – the proposal is consistent with the implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. The Proposal is also consistent with the Draft Metropolitan Strategy For Sydney 2031. Both Strategies identify Chatswood as an important Major Centre that forms part of the Global Economic Corridor.

#### Department of Planning's Criteria for Spot Rezonings

This planning proposal has been assessed having regard for the Department of Planning's *LEP Pro-forma Evaluation Criteria*-Category 1: Spot Rezoning *LEP*, which provides criteria for consideration for any draft LEP. This LEP Amendment request is assessed against these criteria in the table below.

Criteria	Consistency
Will the LEP facilitate a permanent employment generating activity or result in a loss of employment lands?	The proposal will facilitate permanent employment generating activity by providing ground level floor space for future commercial/retail activities. The proposal will not reduce employment potential on the site and will not result in a loss of employment lands.
Will the LEP be compatible with agreed State and regional strategic direction for development in the area (eg, land release, strategic corridors, development within 800m of a transit node)?	As noted in Section 4.2.1 of this Planning Proposal report, the requested re-zoning is compatible with the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy 2036 and the Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy. The subject land adjoins an important metropolitan regional city centre and public transport interchange (Chatswood) is located within Pacific Highway corridor. The proposal will not adversely impact on Chatswood City Centre or the Pacific Highway corridor. By facilitating future road widening, there is potential to reduce traffic congestion in the Pacific Highway corridor in this locality.
Will the LEP implement studies and strategic work consistent with State and regional policies and Ministerial (s.117) directions?	The Planning Proposal will support the objectives of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy 2036 and the Draft Inner North Subregion Strategy, with respect to the relevant objectives in those strategies. It is also consistent with the relevant s117 directions as noted above.
Is the LEP located in a global / regional city, strategic centre or corridor nominated within the metropolitan Strategy or other regional / sub-regional strategy?	No, the site adjoins the Chatswood CBD which is identified as a Major Centre and is in a location that is close to a transport hub/interchange in the Chatswood City Centre.
Will the LEP deal with a deferred matter in an existing LEP?	No.
Have the cumulative effects of other spot rezoning proposals in the locality been considered? What was the outcome of these considerations?	Yes. There are no other proposals in the locality that we are aware of that propose site specific increases in building height and density that are dependent on consolidating sites to form larger more efficient development parcels.

Criteria	Consistency					
Is the LEP likely to create a precedent, or create or change in the expectations of the landowner or other landowners?	No. The circumstances applying to this site are relatively unique within the locality in that there are few sites in the B5 Zone adjacent to the Chatswood CBD that can be readily amalgamated to provide development area of more than 2,000m2. The site is also surrounded on 3 sides by land that is					
Will the LEP be compatible /	provided with maximum building heights substantially higher than the maximum height permitted for the subject land. Yes. As detailed in the Planning Proposal Report, the site is					
complementary with surrounding land uses?	adjoined by high density residential and mixed use zones on all 4 sides. The interface to the medium density zone to the west will be "protected" by providing a generous deep soil area and stepping back upper levels of the building to provide a generous separation distance to minimise shadow, view and privacy impacts.					

#### 4.3 Environmental, Social and Economic Impact

# 4.3.1 <u>Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?</u>

The site and adjoining lands do not contain any areas of critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or habitats. Therefore the proposal will not adversely impact on any critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or habitats

### 4.3.2 <u>Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?</u>

Willoughby LEP 2012 has identified the site as being suitable for high rise mixed use development. The subject land is free of development hazards such as flooding, bush fire, land contamination, acid sulphate soils, land slip, mine subsidence and the like. A small number of trees within the site will be removed, with suitable replacement tree planting provided along the western boundary. Most of the more significant trees are located within the existing footpath reserve or within areas Council has proposed for road widening.

The site adjoins a busy Highway, but is not exposed to significant rail noise due to separation distance from the railway and the noise dampening effect of intervening buildings. Increased residential development yield will be located within the proposed additional two storeys and is hence less exposed to traffic noise compared to lower floor levels.

#### Acoustic Impacts

The subject land is located within a relatively noisy environment, primarily due to road traffic noise generated from the adjoining Pacific Highway. Noise attenuation measures will need to be incorporated into the design of future residential building above the podium, to reduce noise levels within apartments to not more than 30dBA. This will be necessary whether or not the Planning Proposal proceeds.

The proposed increase in density and building height does not exacerbate existing noise levels experienced or require additional noise attenuation measures compared to those that would be required for a development constructed in accordance with the WLEP 2012 FSR and building height controls.

Most of the additional development yield will be accommodated in the additional storeys proposed for the residential towers. Lower residential levels facing the Pacific Highway are provided with a deep area of terrace and potential for sliding noise screens across balconies. Windows facing the Highway can be provided with double glazing. An acoustic assessment would be provided with any future DA and recommended noise attenuation measures incorporated into construction plans.

Development of the site at the higher density proposed, will not result in adverse noise impacts on neighbouring residential development. The site is separated from neighbouring residential development on 3 sides by public roads. Generous separation distances are proposed to the apartment building located to the west of the site, to minimise acoustic impacts.

#### Traffic Impacts

The Planning Proposal is accompanied by a Traffic and Parking Assessment Report assessing the traffic and parking requirements and impacts arising from development of the site at an increased density, as envisaged in the Planning Proposal. A copy of this Report, prepared by Transport and Traffic Planning Associates is enclosed at **Appendix D**.

The Traffic and Parking Report compares 2 development scenarios, one based on the current controls in the WLEP (2:1 FSR) and one based on the controls envisaged in the Planning Proposal (3.2:1 FSR). The first scenario (2:1 FSR) provides for 44 apartments and 1,716m2 of commercial/retail floor space. The second scenario (3.05:1 FSR) provides for 62 apartments and 2,345m2 of commercial/retail floor space. Vehicular access in both scenarios is via two driveways extending north off Freeman Road.

The Traffic and Parking Report indicates that "the development outcome under the FSR 3.05:1 as compared to the FSR 2:1 will only result in some 5 vtph additional in the morning peak and 9 vtph in the afternoon peak." Such a minor traffic generation impact will have "no perceptible impact on the access road system and would not have any "measureable" impact on the operation of the intersections on the highway".

Figure 5 of the Traffic and Transport Report demonstrates that here are several route options for driving to and from the site, enabling vehicle trips to be distributed across several routes. Existing intersections with the Pacific Highway are at times congested, but generally operate at satisfactory levels. There is no requirement to upgrade roads or intersections as a consequence of the future development of the site either at the current density permitted or at the proposed increased density.

The Traffic and Parking Report confirms that adequate car parking (140 car spaces) and bicycle parking can be provided in the basement levels. The proposed layout of the basement levels can comply with the design requirements of AS 2890.1, particularly in relation to ramps, aisles, bays and manoeuvring areas. Provision is made for service vehicles and deliveries and vehicular circulation and the proposed access driveways from Freeman Road are satisfactory.

#### Shadow Impacts

Shadow diagrams have been prepared by MGA Architects, illustrating the shadow impact of a "complying" development envelope (FSR 2:1 and building height of 18m) with a development envelope at higher density as envisaged in the Planning Proposal (FSR 3:1 and building heights of up to 36.2m and 27.8m). These shadow diagrams also include shadows cast by existing buildings and are enclosed at **Appendix C**.

The shadow diagrams illustrate, in black on the diagrams, the increased extent of shadowing arising from the taller larger building envelopes capable of accommodating the requested increase in building height and FSR. The shadow diagrams also identify shadows cast by existing buildings in blue and shadows cast by a complying development in light grey.

The extent of increased mid-winter shadow cast beyond the site boundaries is relatively minor and predominantly confined to the period before 10am and after 2pm. The impacts of additional mid-winter shadowing, after allowing for shadows cast by existing buildings and a complying building of up to 18m on the subject land are summarised as follows.

- 9am No shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows confined to Freeman Road and a limited portion of the front yards of the apartment developments to the west and southwest.
- 10am No shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows confined to the deck above the car park entrance of the building to the west and a small portion of the front yard of that property and limited portions of the front yard of the 2 apartment developments to the southwest.
- 11am No shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows confined to limited portions of the front yards of the apartment building to the southwest and the apartment building to the south.
- 12pm No shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows similar to 11am above.
- 1pm Minimal shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows confined to a minor portion of the front yards of the apartment developments to the southwest and south. Some shadowing of north facing ground floor elevation of the apartment building to the south.
- 2pm Minor shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows confined to the north facing first floor and second floor elevations of the apartment building to the south.
- 3pm Modest shadowing of sensitive areas additional shadows confined to the Pacific Highway and the north facing 3rd and 4<sup>th</sup> floor levels of the apartment building to the south.

The proposed 2 to 5 additional floor levels do not cast any additional shadows to any of the apartments or their adjoining private open space located to the west at No. 3-5 Freeman Road. These apartments continue to receive at least 2 hours mid-winter solar access. This level of solar access is acceptable in a dense urban environment.

Apartments in the apartment building to the south that are impacted by additional shadowing from the additional 2 storeys to Tower B currently enjoy a high level of solar access throughout the day. They will continue to enjoy more than 3 hours mid-winter solar access, with no shadowing up until 12pm.

#### **Privacy Impacts**

Development of the site at the higher density proposed, will not result in adverse privacy impacts on neighbouring residential development. The site is separated from neighbouring residential development on 3 sides by public roads and will have no privacy impacts on apartment buildings located on the northern side of Oliver Road, the southern side of Freeman Road or the eastern side of the Pacific Highway.

Potential privacy impacts to the existing apartments to the west have been addressed by providing separation distances fully compliant with minimum separation distance recommended in the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code. The Code separation distances are designed to ensure satisfactory privacy outcomes. There is also an opportunity to install planter boxes to west facing balconies to further enhance privacy.

The Code prescribes a minimum separation distance of 12m for the first 4 storeys (that is up to a height of 12m) between habitable rooms/balconies of on the subject land and habitable rooms/balconies of the apartment in the building to the west. The proposal provides a separation distance of at least 15.7m and generally more than 18m to these apartments, up to a height of 12m. Above 12m, a minimum separation distance of 18m is required. The proposal provides a minimum separation distance of more than 18 metres, with greater separation distances provided in the northern portion of the building.

A 6m wide deep soil zone is provided along the western boundary to accommodate common area open space and screen planting comprising trees and large shrubs. At upper levels privacy is further enhanced by increased building setback to the western boundary. An adequate level of privacy is maintained commensurate with expectations of residential living in a high density urban environment.

Adequate privacy between proposed apartments in Tower A and Tower B is achieved by a combination of separation distance (12m to 15m) and privacy protection measures such as translucent glass, offset windows and balconies, raised sill heights, screens and minimising living room and bedroom windows of apartments facing each other.

#### View and Visual Impact

The proposed increase in density and building height does not adversely impact on any existing significant views or outlook. There are no important or iconic views available over the site. The proposed additional storeys will modestly reduce the extent of skyline views from surrounding properties.

The provision of a view corridor between the two proposed residential towers provides an improved visual outlook from properties to the west and east, compared to an 18m high street wall building that would be the likely outcome if the site is developed in accordance with the existing height and FSR controls.

A building constructed on the subject land to a height of 18 metres along the length of the site, as permitted by the current planning controls, would effectively preclude easterly views from all levels of the apartment building to the west. The additional storeys therefore have a minimal impact on future easterly views from 3-5 Freeman Road or northerly views from the apartment building to the south or from the high rise apartment building at the corner of Albert Street and the Pacific Highway.

Visual impact arising from the proposed increase in building height and density, within the tower building envelope proposed, is acceptable in the context of the site. Tower building forms predominate for new buildings and at street level exhibit reduced building bulk compared to street wall buildings. The 3D views shown in Figure 7 and 8 demonstrate that the additional height and density can be accommodated on the site without resulting in unreasonable bulk and scale.

#### Heritage Impact

There are no heritage items on or adjoining the site. The nearest heritage items are the Old Fire Station at 767 Pacific Highway and Chatswood primary School located at the corner of the pacific Highway and Centennial Avenue. The development of the site as envisaged at the increased height of between 27.8m and 36.2m would not materially impact on the visual catchment of Chatswood Primary School.

The proposal is visible from the existing Old Fire Station building, however, given the established high rise context and separation distance, the development of the subject land to an additional 2 storeys would have minimal if any impact on the heritage values of the Old Fire Station building.

#### 4.3.3 How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

#### Social Issues

The proposal will not result in any adverse social impacts. The provision of additional apartment living opportunities in a similar form to that envisaged in the existing WLEP 2012 planning controls will maintain the character and social fabric of the neighbourhood generally as envisaged in the planning controls for the locality.

The provision of 3 additional affordable apartments within easy walking distance of Chatswood Railway Station, bus interchange and Chatswood City Centre shops and services is considered to have a positive social impact in the locality. Increased pedestrian traffic associated with a modest increase in density will assist in creating more vitality and improving public safety along the western edge of the Chatswood CBD.

#### Economic Issues

An increase in building height and increased FSR to 3:1 on this large site, with an increased proportion of residential floor space facilitates redevelopment of the site. This is consistent with an important objective of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*, which is to promote the orderly and efficient development of land.

Increased population on a site adjoining the Chatswood CBD will increase use of existing public transport and increase spending within the CBD, contributing positively to the economic performance and viability of existing and future businesses in the CBD.

The proposal creates modern purpose designed commercial floor space suitable for both small and large businesses. Such an outcome enhances Chatswood as a location for business premises and promotes additional job creation in the Chatswood CBD. The proposal will result in improved efficiency of traffic movements in the locality as a result of the future widening of the Pacific Highway and Oliver Road.

#### 4.4 State and Commonwealth Interests

#### 4.4.1 Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

#### Services (Water, Sewer and Drainage)

The site is located within an existing developed area that is well catered for in terms of infrastructure. We understand that there is capacity within existing service systems for the proposal, subject to appropriate augmentation as necessary.

#### Roads, Traffic and Transport

Traffic generation has been considered in Section 4.3.2. The proposed increase in density will result in a modest and acceptable level of traffic generation on the local road network and on the Pacific Highway and associated intersections. The proposal locates all development clear of areas of the site required for future road widening of the Pacific Highway and Oliver Road.

The proposal includes dedication of land for local road widening to facilitate a 1m widening of the footpath in Freeman Road and provision of an additional traffic lane in Oliver Road.

### 4.4.2 What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?

Under the Gateway process the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities are not known until after the initial Gateway determination. This section of the planning proposal will be completed following consultation with those public authorities nominated by the Gateway Determination.

#### 4.5 Community Consultation

Under the Gateway process the level of community consultation is tailored for each planning proposal by the initial Gateway determination. The proposal has been designed to minimise environmental and amenity impacts on neighbouring properties. The concept plans have been prepared in consultation with Council's planners to provide an optimal urban design outcome. There will be an opportunity for further community consultation when a Development Application is lodged with Council.

## 5 Conclusion

This Planning Proposal seeks amendment of Willoughby LEP 2012 to introduce an incentives clause applicable to the subject land to encourage amalgamation of existing allotments by allowing for an increase in maximum FSR and building height, where a development site area of at least 2,000m2 is created. Where such a development site can be created, it is proposed that maximum FSR be increased from 2:1 to 3.0:1 and maximum building height increased to RL 137.8 for the northern half of the site and RL 128.8 for the southern half of the site, subject to this Planning Proposal.

This Planning Proposal Report has demonstrated that the subject land, if developed as a single parcel of more than 2,000m2, as envisaged in the WDCP, can be suitably developed within the B5 zoned land to a maximum FSR of 3.0:1 (excluding affordable housing) and maximum building height of between 27.8m and 36.2m (8 to 11 storeys).

Redevelopment of the subject land at the requested higher density does not materially impact on the amenity or character of the locality, to any greater extent than is envisaged in the existing planning controls applying to the site and locality, as contained within Willoughby LEP 2012.

Following adoption and implementation of the Planning proposal by Council, detailed design objectives and controls relating to building form, heights and setbacks for the site are proposed to be prepared by Council for insertion into Part I6 of the Willoughby DCP.

The Planning Proposal will facilitate the orderly and economic use of land that is strategically located adjacent to the Chatswood City Centre and transport interchange, in a locality that is appropriate for high rise mixed use development.

It is recommended that the Planning Proposal proceed through the Gateway determination process and be placed on public exhibition.



Date	Description
23 MAY 14	PLANNING PROPOSAL

### MIXED USED COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

### 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, CHATSWOOD







Client

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

Architecture Interiors roject Management ACN 149 287 972

DRAWING LIST					DRAWING LIST				DRAWING LIST					
SHEET NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SCALE IN A1	ISSUE DATE	REVISION	SHEET NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SCALE IN A1	ISSUE DATE	REVISION	SHEET NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SCALE IN A1	ISSUE DATE	REVISION
13710-01	LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN-GROUND FLOOR	1:100	21 MAY 14		A1.32	BASEMENT 2 PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.09	SHADOW DIAGRAM 3PM	1:500	21 MAY 14	
13710-02	LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN-LEVEL 1	1:100	21 MAY 14		A1.33	BASEMENT 3 PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A6.01	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 1	1:100	21 MAY 14	
13710-03	LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN-ROOFTOP	1:100	21 MAY 14		A1.34	BASEMENT 4 PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A6.02	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 2	1:100	21 MAY 14	
	LEVEL(S)				A2.01	ELEVATION 1	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.03	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 3	1:100	21 MAY 14	
13710-06	LANDSCAPE SECTIONS	1:100	21 MAY 14		A2.02	ELEVATION 2	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.04	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 4	1:100	21 MAY 14	
13710-07	LANDSCAPE SECTIONS	1:100	21 MAY 14		A2.03	ELEVATION 3	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.05	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 5	1:100	21 MAY 14	
A0.00	LOCALITY PLAN	NTS	21 MAY 14		A2.04	ELEVATION 4	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.06	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 6	1:100	21 MAY 14	
A0.01	COMPLIANCE CALCULATION	NTS	21 MAY 14		A2.05	ELEVATION 5	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.07	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 7	1:100	21 MAY 14	
A0.02	SURVEY PLAN	1:400	21 MAY 14		A2.06	ELEVATION 6	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.08	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 8	1:100	21 MAY 14	
A0.03	FSR CALCULATION	1:300	21 MAY 14		A3.01	SECTION A	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.09	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 9	1:100	21 MAY 14	
A0.04	UNITS AREA SCHEDULE	1:300	21 MAY 14		A3.02	SECTION B	1:150	21 MAY 14		A6.10	WINTER SUNLIGHT ACCESS LEVEL 10	1:100	21 MAY 14	
A0.05	CAR PARKING SCHEDULE	NTS	21 MAY 14		A3.03	SECTION C	1:150	21 MAY 14		Grand total: 66				
A0.06	LANDSCAPE AREA CALCULATION	NTS	21 MAY 14		A3.04	SECTION D	1:150	21 MAY 14						
A1.01	SITE ANALYSIS PLAN	1:250	21 MAY 14		A3.05	SECTION E	1:150	21 MAY 14						
A1.02	LOWER GROUND FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A3.13	BUILDING ENVELOPE	1:200	21 MAY 14						
A1.03	GROUND FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A3.14	BUILDING SEPARATION	1:200	21 MAY 14						
A1.04	LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A3.15	BUILDING DEPTH PLAN	1:200	21 MAY 14						
A1.05	LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A4.01	PHOTOMONTAGE VIEW 1	NTS	21 MAY 14						
A1.06	LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A4.02	PHOTOMONTAGE VIEW 2	NTS	21 MAY 14						
A1.07	LEVEL 4 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.00	SHADOW KEY PLAN	NTS	21 MAY 14						
A1.08	LEVEL 5 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.01	SHADOW DIAGRAM 9AM	1:500	21 MAY 14						
A1.09	LEVEL 6 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.02	SHADOW DIAGRAM 10AM	1:500	21 MAY 14						
A1.10	LEVEL 7 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.03	SHADOW DIAGRAM 10.30AM	1:500	21 MAY 14	-				NNING F	PROPOS
A1.11	LEVEL 8 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.04	SHADOW DIAGRAM 11AM	1:500	21 MAY 14	-					
A1.12	LEVEL 9 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.05	SHADOW DIAGRAM 12PM	1:500	21 MAY 14	+				APPLIC	ATION
A1.13	LEVEL 10 FLOOR PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.06	SHADOW DIAGRAM 12.30PM	1:500	21 MAY 14	+				04 NA AN	1 201 4
A1.14	ROOF PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.07	SHADOW DIAGRAM 1PM	1:500	21 MAY 14	+				21 MAY	/ <b>ZU14</b>
A1.31	BASEMENT 1 PLAN	1:100	21 MAY 14		A5.08	SHADOW DIAGRAM 2PM	1:500	21 MAY 14	+					

Date Description

21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL

Project PROPO DEVELO DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD

22/05/2014 6:07:06 PM

PLANNING PROPOSAL
APPLICATION
21 MAY 2014

		1		1	1
ct	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
POSED MIXED	LOCALITY PLAN	As @A1 indicated	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A0.00
		Do not scale off drawi	efore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrig! e written permission of the	nt and may not be	٥

#### FLOOR SPACE RATIO

SITE AREA =	2,856 sqm (EXISTING)
SITE AREA =	2,608.2 sqm (AFTER ROAD WIDENING)

UNIT MIX FSR TOWER A		] [	RB		
LEVEL	FSR AREA	NO. OF UNITS	LEVEL	FSR AREA	NO. OF UNITS
				1	
LEVEL 1	440.82 m <sup>2</sup>	5	LEVEL 1	402.63 m <sup>2</sup>	5
LEVEL 2	445.66 m <sup>2</sup>	5	LEVEL 2	402.41 m <sup>2</sup>	5
LEVEL 3	445.66 m <sup>2</sup>	5	LEVEL 3	402.41 m <sup>2</sup>	5
LEVEL 4	445.66 m <sup>2</sup>	5	LEVEL 4	366.36 m <sup>2</sup>	5
LEVEL 5	365.10 m <sup>2</sup>	4	LEVEL 5	197.22 m <sup>2</sup>	2
LEVEL 6	365.10 m <sup>2</sup>	4	LEVEL 6	141.24 m <sup>2</sup>	2
LEVEL 7	365.10 m <sup>2</sup>	4	LEVEL 7	114.90 m <sup>2</sup>	0
LEVEL 8	310.17 m <sup>2</sup>	4	Grand total	2027.17 m <sup>2</sup>	24
LEVEL 9	186.38 m <sup>2</sup>	1			
LEVEL 10	174.23 m <sup>2</sup>	1			
Grand total	3543.88 m <sup>2</sup>	38			
TOTAL UNITS					62
TOTAL RESIDEN	ITIAL FSR				5571.05
COMMUNAL RO	OM AT LOWER GROUNI	D FLOOR			94.40
COMMERCIAL F	SR				2279.00
TOTAL FSR ARE	A (INCLUDING AFFORD	ABLE HOUSING)		А	7944.45
AFFORDABLE H	OUSING REQUIRED (4%	OF TOTAL RESIDEN	ΓIAL)		222.84
AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROPOSED (COMPLY) B					234.00
TOTAL FSR AREA (EXCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING) A-B					7710.45
FLOOR SPACE RATIO WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING					3.05:1.0
FLOOR SPACE RATION WITHOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING					2.96:1.0

UNIT MIX SCHEDULE Tower A						UNIT MIX SCHEDULE Tower B					
LEVEL	STUDIO(N O.)	1BED (NO.)	2BED (NO.)	3BED (NO.)	TOTAL	LEVEL	STUDIO (NO.)	1 BED (NO.)	2 BED (NO.)	3 BED(NO.)	TOTAL UNITS (NO.)
LEVEL 1	1	0	4	0	5	LEVEL 1	1	0	4	0	5
LEVEL 2	1	0	4	0	5	LEVEL 2	1	0	4	0	5
LEVEL 3	1	0	4	0	5	LEVEL 3	1	0	4	0	5
LEVEL 4	1	0	4	0	5	LEVEL 4	1	2	2	0	5
LEVEL 5	0	1	3	0	4	LEVEL 5	0	0	2	0	2
LEVEL 6	0	1	3	0	4	LEVEL 6	0	1	0	1	2
LEVEL 7	0	1	3	0	4	LEVEL 7	0	0	0	0	0
LEVEL 8	2	0	2	0	4	Grand total	4	3	16	1	24
LEVEL 9	0	0	0	1	1	1					
LEVEL 10	0	0	0	1	1	1					
Grand total	6	3	27	2	38	_					

			UNIT MIX SEPP			
LEVEL	Total Units	Naturally cross ventilated units	Kitchens with Natrual ventilation	Single Aspect South Facing units	Dual Aspect Units	2Hr Mid-Winter sunlight to Living and POS
LEVEL 1	10	8	8	1	8	9
LEVEL 2	10	8	10	1	8	9
LEVEL 3	10	8	10	1	8	9
LEVEL 4	10	8	9	1	8	9
LEVEL 5	6	6	6	0	6	5
LEVEL 6	6	6	6	0	6	5
LEVEL 7	4	4	4	0	4	5
LEVEL 8	4	4	4	0	4	4
LEVEL 9	1	1	1	0	1	1
LEVEL 10	1	1	1	0	1	1
Grand total	62	54	59	4	54	57
		87.0% of Total Units	95.0% of Total Units	6.0% of Total Units	87.0% of Total Units	91.9% of Total Units

#### SEPP65/DCP COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

	SEPP/DCP CONTROL	PROPOSED	COMPLIA
Naturally cross ventilated units	60% (min) of total units	87.0%	YES
Kitchens with natural ventilation	25% (min) of total units	95.0%	YES
Single aspect south facing units	10% (max) of total units	6.0%	YES
2Hr mid-winter sunlight to Living and POS	70% (min) of total units	91.9%	YES

NOTE: For others controls and compliance, refer to SEPP65 compliance table and DCP Control compliance table in Planning report.





Project PROPO DEVEL

IANCE

### PLANNING PROPOSAL APPLICATION 21 MAY 2014

			1	I	1
ct	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
POSED MIXED ELOPMENT	COMPLIANCE CALCULATION	NAs @A1 indicated	23 MAY 14	12-0024	A0.01
		Do not scale off drawing	refore commencing work, ng. This design is copyrigh e written permission of the	nt and may not be	0


Date	Description
23 MAY 14	PLANNING PROPOSAL



UNITS AREA SCHEDULE TO	DWER A	UNITS AREA SCHEDULE TOWER B			
LEVEL UNIT NO. BR AREA BALCONY	CROSS KITCHEN ACCESS VENTILATION VENTILATION (Hr)	JNIT NO. BR AREA BALCONY VENTILATION VENTILATION ACCESS			
LEVEL 1     A101     2BR     94 m²     40.5 m²     Y		101     2BR     76 m <sup>2</sup> 64.5 m <sup>2</sup> Y     N     3       102     2BR     85 m <sup>2</sup> 37.5 m <sup>2</sup> Y     Y     3			
LEVEL 1     A102     2BR     92 m²     56.5 m²     Y       LEVEL 1     A103     2BR     79 m²     39.5 m²     Y	Y Y 3 LEVEL 1 E	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			
LEVEL 1     A104     STUDIO     41 m²     23.0 m²     N       LEVEL 1     A105     2BR     84 m²     31.0 m²     Y	N Y 3 LEVEL 1 E	2BR     77 m²     40.5 m²     Y     N     3       201     2BR     88 m²     13.0 m²     Y     N     3	I	FUTURE 4M ROAD WIDENING	
LEVEL 2     A201     2BR     94 m²     10.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 2     A202     2BR     92 m²     20.0 m²     Y	Y Y 6 Y Y 3 LEVEL 2 E	202     2BR     85 m²     15.5 m²     Y     Y     3       203     STUDIO     40 m²     10.0 m²     N     Y     0	<b>H</b>	AS HATCHED	
LEVEL 2 A203 2BR 86 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 2 A204 STUDIO 41 m <sup>2</sup> 11.5 m <sup>2</sup> N	Y Y 2 N V 2	204     2BR     72 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y     Y     2       205     2BR     75 m <sup>2</sup> 10.3 m <sup>2</sup> Y     Y     2	Ψ 2	OSSIBLE NEW BOS	
LEVEL 2     A205     2BR     84 m²     13.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 3     A301     2BR     94 m²     10.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 3     A302     2BR     92 m²     20.0 m²     Y	Y Y 6 LEVEL 3 E	301     2BR     88 m <sup>2</sup> 13.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y     N     3       302     2BR     85 m <sup>2</sup> 15.5 m <sup>2</sup> Y     Y     3	UNIT MIX LEGEND		
LEVEL 3 A303 22R 86 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 3 A304 STUDIO 41 m <sup>2</sup> 11.5 m <sup>2</sup> N	Y Y 2 LEVEL 3 E LEVEL 3 E	303     STUDIO     40 m²     10.0 m²     N     Y     0       304     2BR     72 m²     10.0 m²     Y     Y     2	STUDIO		
LEVEL 3 A305 2BR 84 m <sup>2</sup> 13.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 4 A401 2BR 94 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	Y Y 6 V V 6	305     2BR     75 m²     10.3 m²     Y     Y     2       401     2BR     88 m²     13.0 m²     Y     N     3       402     2BR     85 m²     15.5 m²     Y     Y     3	1BR		
LEVEL 4     A402     2BR     92 m²     20.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 4     A403     2BR     86 m²     10.0 m²     Y		403 STUDIO 40 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> N Y 0	2BR		
LEVEL 4     A404     STUDIO     41 m²     11.5 m²     N       LEVEL 4     A405     2BR     84 m²     13.0 m²     Y	N Y 2 Y Y 6 LEVEL 4 E LEVEL 5 E	A05     1BR     57 m²     30.0 m²     Y     N     2       501     2BR     88 m²     130.0 m²     Y     Y     N     2	2BR+S		
LEVEL 5 A501 2BR 94 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 5 A502 2BR 83 m <sup>2</sup> 20.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	Y Y 6 Y Y 3 LEVEL 6 E	502     2BR     83 m <sup>2</sup> 62.5 m <sup>2</sup> Y     Y     1       601     3BR     59 m <sup>2</sup> 27.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y     Y     3	ЗBR		
LEVEL 5     A503     1BR     50 m²     41.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 5     A504     2BR+S     93 m²     50.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 6     A601     2BR     94 m²     10.0 m²     Y	Y Y 6 LEVEL 7 E	602     1BR     55 m²     32.0 m²     Y     Y     2       601     3BR     101 m²     120.5 m²     Y     Y     3	3BR+S		
LEVEL 6 A602 2BR 83 m <sup>2</sup> 20.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 6 A603 1BR 50 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	I     I     I     I     I     I     Grand total: 24     Grand total: 24		CORRIDOR		
LEVEL 6 A604 2BR+S 93 m <sup>2</sup> 13.5 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 7 A701 2BR 94 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	Y     Y     6       Y     Y     6	STUDIO 10 UNITS 16%		4000 TOWER-A	TOWER-B
LEVEL 7     A702     2BR     83 m <sup>2</sup> 20.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y       LEVEL 7     A703     1BR     50 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	Y Y 3 Y Y 2	1BEDROOM 6 UNITS 10%		LEVEL 1	S
LEVEL 7 A704 2BR+S 93 m <sup>2</sup> 13.5 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 8 A801 2BR 95 m <sup>2</sup> 10.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	Y Y 6 Y Y 6	2BEDROOM 43 UNITS 69%			
LEVEL 8     A802     2BR     83 m²     20.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 8     A803     STUDIO     41 m²     33.0 m²     Y       LEVEL 8     A804     STUDIO     48 m²     33.5 m²     Y	Y Y 3 Y Y 3 Y Y 3	3BEDROOM 3 UNITS 5%   TOTAL 62 UNITS			
LEVEL 9 A901 3BR+S 162 m <sup>2</sup> 106.9 m <sup>2</sup> Y LEVEL 10 A1001 3BR 148 m <sup>2</sup> 18.0 m <sup>2</sup> Y	Y Y 6				
Grand total: 38	Y Y 3 2BR SIBLE NEW BOUNDARY A 8 POSSIBLE NEW BOUNDARY	E DEN BOUNDARY			
b possible No.					
		-A TOWER-B		5 LEVEL 6 TOWER-A	
LEVEL 2 SETBACK 2 1:300 TOWER-A TO	<b>DWER-B</b> $4000$ $4000$ $3$ LEVEL 4 TOWER 1:300	-A I TOWER-B $4 \frac{127}{1:300}$ TOWER-A I	TOWER-B	000 4000 5 1:300 TOWER-A	TOWER-B
			}		Z
			l		
			1		
	LEVEL 8	LEVEL 9			
	NER-B	TOWER-B	TOWER-B	9 <u>LEVEL 10</u> TOWER-A	TOWER-B
Rev Date Description		Architect	Client F	Project DRAWING	Scale Date Project No. Drawing No.
23 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL			itecture	PROPOSED MIXED UNITS AREA SCHEDULE DEVELOPMENT	As @A1 23 MAY 14 12-0024 A0.04
		MGA Architects Pty Ltd. ACN 149 : 22/05/2014 3:21:05 PM Wganask/2011/12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Chatswood/Drawings/02-DAIDA-REVITI/Model/Chatswood residential.vt/	4 812 CHATSWOOD NSW		Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use found dimensions. Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect
			1	•	



### CAR PARKING REQUIREMENT

	DCP Requirement	Proposed Units/ Area	Required Spaces	Total
Residential Apartments	3			
(Railway Precinct)				
Studio -	0.5 space	10	5	
One-bedroom -	1 space	6	6	
Two-bedroom -	1 space	43	43	
Three-bedroom -	1.25 space	3	3.75	58
Visitors -	1 space per			
	4 apartments	62		16
Commercial/Office -	1 space per 110m2	797.65(35% of 2279.0m2)	7	
Neighbourhood Retail		1481.35(65%of 2279.0m2)		
Total Retail/Commercia	al 2279m2	85% retail area=1259.1m2	50	57
				131 spaces
Motorcycle Parking	1 space per			
	25 carspaces			
	Residential		2.3	
	Visitors		1	
	Commercial/Office		2.3	6 spaces
Bicycle Rail/Rack				
Residential	1 per 12 units		5	
Neighbourhood Retail	1 per 150m2		9	
Commercial/Office	1 per 250m2		3	17 racks
Bicycle Lockers				
Residential	1 per 10 units		6	
Neighbourhood Retail	1 per 450m2		3	
Commercial/Office	1 per 600m2		1	10 lockers

	(	CAI	R P	PARI	KING	s Su	MMAR	Y
--	---	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	---

DCP C	ONTROL	PROPOSED	COMPLIANCE
Residential	58	65	YES
Retial/Commercial	57	58	YES
Vlisitors	16	17	YES
Accessible		Residential 8 Retail 4 Visitor 0 Total 12	YES
Motor Cycle Parking	6	6	YES
Bicycle Rail/Rack			
Residential	5	6	YES
Retail/Commercial	13	18	YES
Bicycle Lockers			
Residential	6	7 (in units sto	rage) YES
Retail/Commercial	5	5	YES



LEVEL	RESIDENT	RETAIL/COMM ERCIAL	VISITOR	TOTAL CAR SPACES	ACCESSIBLE (INCLUDED)	LOADING BAY	MOTORCYCLE	BICYCLE LOCKERS/RACK
BASEMENT 4 LOWER	23	0	0	23	0	0		0
BASEMENT 4 UPPER	23	0	0	23	4	0		0
BASEMENT 3 LOWER	0	0	17	17	0	0	4	6
BASEMENT 3 UPPER	19	0	0	19	4	0		18
BASEMENT 2 LOWER	0	22	0	22	0	0	2	0
BASEMENT 2 UPPER	0	9	0	9	2	0		0
BASEMENT 1 LOWER	0	19	0	19	0	0		0
BASEMENT 1 UPPER	0	8	0	8	2	0		0
Grand total		1 1		1			1	
TOTAL	65	58	17	140 SPACES	12	3 -LOWE	RGF 6	24

Architect

MGA

Client

DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD

PLANNING PROPOSAL APPLICATION 21 MAY 2014

Pacific Highway

1		1	1	1	1
Project	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	CAR PARKING SCHEDULE	As @A1 indicated	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A0.05
		Do not scale off draw	efore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigit e written permission of the	nt and may not be	0

### LANDSCAPE AREA COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

	SEPP/DCP CONTROL	PROPOSED	COMPLIANCE
Deep soil zone	25%(min) of ground floor open space	49.5%	YES
Podium landscape area	20%(min) of total podium area	21.1%	YES
Roof landscape area	20%(min) of rooftop open space	23.6% and 31.9%	YES
Recreational area	50%(min) of site area	110%	YES
Communal open space	10m2(min) per unit	21.7m2	YES

NOTE: For others controls and compliance, refer to SEPP65 compliance table and DCP Control compliance table in Planning report.

LANDSCAPE SCHEDULE						
Level	GROUND FLOOR OPEN SPACE	DEEP SOIL ZONE	LANDSCAPE AREA	BALCONY AREA	COMMUNAL OPEN SPACE	RECREATION AREA
GROUND FLOOR	C11(A)	303	414.4			
	611(A)	303			(A)	
LEVEL 1 (PODIUM)			408	317 m <sup>2</sup>	514.5	
LEVEL 2				123 m <sup>2</sup>		
LEVEL 3				123 m <sup>2</sup>		
LEVEL 4				162 m <sup>2</sup>		
LEVEL 5				302 m <sup>2</sup>		
LEVEL 6				233 m <sup>2</sup>		
LEVEL 7				54 m²		
LEVEL 8				99 m²		
LEVEL 9				107 m <sup>2</sup>		
LEVEL 10 (ROOF)			88	18 m <sup>2</sup>	221.5	
	TOTAL		910.5m2	1,538.0m2 (D)	1,347.0m2 (C)	(C)+(D)=2,885.0m
		49.5.0% of GF OPEN SPACE			21.7m2 per unit	110% of SITE AREA

ROOF TOP OPEN SPACE:	328m2
TOTAL PODIUM AREA:	1,925.2m2
NO. OF UNITS:	62 UNITS
SITE AREA:	2608.2m2





### PLANNING PROPOSAL APPLICATION 21 MAY 2014

		1	1	1	1
ect	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
DPOSED MIXED /ELOPMENT	LANDSCAPE AREA CALCULATION	As @A1 indicated	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A0.06
		Do not scale off drawi	efore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigh e written permission of the	t and may not be	0



## **TOWER B**

295606882 F + 612 9560

Rev Date





**TOWER A** 

22/05/2014 4:17:54 PN





1295606882 F + 612 956

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW





Rev Date



Date Project No. Drawing No. A2.04 Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimen Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.



5 ELEVATION 5

Client

DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD

Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL Architect

MGA

Rev Date







**TOWER A** 





+ 61295606882 F + 612 9560 9884 -26 Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 2203

Architect Rev Date Client Description 12 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL MGA Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972 PROF DEVE DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW MGA Architects Pty.Ltd 22/05/2014 4:23:56 PM





POSED	MIXED
ELOPM	ENT

ELEVATION 6

Scale Date Project No. Drawing No. As @A1 12 MAY 14 12-0024 A2.06 Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.



Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972 MGA Architects Ptv I to 22/05/2014 5:25:29 PM VIT\Model\Envelope.rvt

MGA

DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

Project	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	BUILDING ENVELOPE	1 : 200@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A3.13
		Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimensions. Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.		0	



22/05/2014 4:26:59 PN

MGA Architects Ptv I to

Rev Date

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

# PLANNING PROPOSAL

			1		1
ject	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
	BUILDING SEPARATION	1 : 200@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A3.14
		Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimensions. Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.		0	





	Rev	Date	Description
1		21 MAY 14	PLANNING PROPOSAL

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

MGA Architects Ptv I to

Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimensi Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.





































## **OLIVER ROAD**









## **FREEMAN ROAD**





## **FREEMAN ROAD**

ANDERICATION PROJECT AND SCALE SCALE DRAMING TITL LANDS DRAMING TITL DRAMING TITL LANDS DRAMING TITL DRAMING TITL LANDS DRAMING TITL DRAMING TIT	FR SER
AGNETIC NORTH FROJECT NORTH FROJECT NORTH FROJECT NORTH FROJECT NORTH FOR COORDINATION PERMISSION 02/05/1- FREVISED PLANNING PERMISSION 02/05/1- FOR COORDINATION PERMISSION 02/05/1- FOR COORDINATION PERMISSION 02/05/1- FOR PLANNING PERMISSI	D BENCHMARK ON KERB R. L. 00.00 (AHD) PROPOSED SPOT LEVEL EXISTING TREE TO BE REMOVED (REFER ARBORIST REPORT) MASONRY WALLING (REFER ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS EXISTING BRICK PAVING (REFER ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS PROPOSED PAVING TYPE 1 (REFER ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS PROPOSED PAVING TYPE 2 (REFER ARCHITECTS DRAWINGS PROPOSED PAVING TYPE 2 (REFER PLANT SCHEDULE) ACCENT PLANTING (REFER PLANT SCHEDULE) SCREEN PLANT SCHEDULE) SCREEN PLANT SCHEDULE) EXISTING TURF AREA (TO BE RETAINED) LANDSCAPE LIGHTING



VD ADDRESS VD ADDRESS I and scape @ greenplan.net.au W: www.greenplan.net.au W: www.greenplan.net.au V: www.greenplan.net.au W: www.greenplan.net.au V: wyw.greenplan.net.au V: wyw.greenplan.gree		@ A1/1:200 @ A3 2013	DEVELC ACIFIC DD DE SECTIO	AKI HOLDING PTY I	PERMISSION 28/0 PERMISSION 06/0 02/0 DA B Scot NSW 2020 M: 0407 061 386	PROJECT
--	--	-------------------------	--	-------------------	---	---------

ADJACENT BALCONY PAVEMENT MEDIUM EVERGREEN TREE
WITH GROUNDCOVER
PLANTING BELOW
SMALL TREE PLANTING WITH HEDGE BELOW RAISED PLANTER BOX APARTMENT BELOW	SMALL TREE PLANTING WITH GROUNDCOVERS BELOW MAINTENANCE ACCESS AFETY BALUSTRADE BELOW TEL 177.45 TEL 107.45 TEL 177.45 TEL 107.45 TEL 107.45TEL 107.45 TEL 107.45TEL 107.45 TEL 107.45TEL 107.45 TEL 107.45TEL 107.45TEL 107.45 TEL 107.45TEL 107.45TE	FOCAL POINT (INDICATIVE RAISED PLANTER AFEFTY BALUSTRADE AND AFEFTY BALUSTRADE AND AFEF	RAISED PLANTER BOX PAVED AREA WITH GROUNDCOVER PLANTING BELOW FOCAL POINT FOCAL POINT FOCAL POINT FOCAL POINT FOCAL POINT FOCAL POINT FOCAL POINT FIL 19645 FIL 19655 FIL 19645 FIL 19655 FIL 196555 FIL 196555 FIL 1965555 FIL 19655555 FIL 196555555555555555555555555555555555555
SAFETY BALUSTRADE AND GATE FOR MAINTENANCE ACCESS	PAVED AREA RAISED PLANTER BOX	SMALL TREE PLANTING WITH GROUNDCOVER PLANTING BELOW MAINTENANCE ACCESS SAFETY BALUSTRADE	MAINTENANCE ACCESS

 $\ast$ X SYMB. 100mm DIA AGRICULTUAL DRAINAGE PIPE F E PLANT SCHEDULE UP ĭ FR RS AP TREES STRUCTURAL RETAINING WALL TO ARCHITECT AND ENGINEERS DETAIL WATERPROOF MEMBRANE AND DRAINAGE CELL TO ENGINEERS DETAIL \* HEIGHT AND SPAN INDICATIVE. SUBJECT TO ONSITE LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS. USE ONLY AS A GUIDE. NOTE: WATER USE IS MEASURED ONCE THE 12 MONTH PLANTING ESTABLISH PERIOD HAS BEEN REACHED. \*\* GROUNDCOVER AND ACCENT PLANTS SCREEN PLANTING 7 4 7  $\triangleright$ PLANTING TYPE 7 - TURF ON GRADE PLANTING TYPE 4 - ON GRADE FILLING DETAIL STRELITZIA JUNCEA MURRAYA PANICULATA CAMELLIA SASANQUA 'SOMETHING SPECIAL' PHORMIUM TENAX 'PURPUREUM' LIRIOPE 'EVERGREEN GIANT' LANTANA MONTEVIDENSIS DORYANTHES EXCELSA BOTANICAL NAME ULMUS PARVIFOLIA ROBINIA PSEUDOACACIA 'FRISIA MAGNOLIA GRANDIFLORA 'LITTLE GEM' LIVISTONA AUSTRALIS EUCALYPTUS MACULATA MACROZAMIA COMMUNIS ELAEOCARPUS RETICULATUS SYZYGIUM 'PATHFINDER' AGAPANTHUS PRAECOX ACER PALMATUM TRACHELOSPERMUM TRICOLOR VIOLA HEDERACEAE 75mm DEPTH MULCH TO FINISH 25mm BELOW TOP OF PLANTER 350mm DEPTH PLANTING MEDIA TYPE D CENTRALLY MOUNDED -- 150mm DEPTH IMPORTED TURF UNDERLAY SOIL CULTIVATED INTO SUBSOIL 100mm DEPTH RIPPED AND CULTIVATED SUBGRADE 450mm DEPTH PLANTING MEDIA TYPE B -200mm DEPTH RIP AND CULTIVATED SUBSOIL LIRIOPE VARIEGATED STAR JASMINE NATIVE VIOLET NZ FLAX CULTIVAR CHINESE ELM SPOTTED GUM **BIRD-OF-PARADISE** ORANGE JESSAMINE SASANQUA CAMELLIA BURRAWANG DWARF STERILE LANTANA COMMON NAME GOLDEN ROBINIA MAGNOLIA CABBAGE PALM **BLUE BERRY ASH** LILLYPILLY CULTIVAR GYMEA LILY LILY OF THE NILE JAPANESE MAPLE HARD PAVED AREA TO ARCHITECT AND ENGINEERS DETAIL PLANTING REFER TO PLANT SCHDULE TRIM SUBGRADE AS SHOWN TO MINIMISE SUBSIDENCE — **07** 8 **07** 5 PLANTING INSTALLATION - 150mm TO 451t PLANTING TYPE 5 - ON GRADE FILLING DETAIL SHOWN RANDOM RANDOM CENTRES SHOWN SHOWN 1800mm SHOWN 1000mm 1000mm 600mm 400mm SHOWN 1000mm 1000mm 5/m2 450mm 5/m2 5/m2 POT SZE 150mm 150mm MEDIA PLACED IN 100mm DEPTH LAYERS AND LIGHTLY COMPACTED 150lt 150lt 100lt 100lt 300lt 45lt 75lt 45lt 25lt 25lt 25lt 100mm 25lt 25lt 150mm 200mm 200mm AROUND THE BASE OF PLANTING 75mm DEPTH MULCH TO FINISH 25mm BELOW ADJACENT HARD PAVED AREA 200mm DEPTH RIPPED AND CULTIVATED SUBGRADE - 200mm DEPTH RIPPED AND CULTIVATED SUBGRADE 5 x 3m 8 x 5m 20 x 10m 6 x 3.5m 6 x 3.5m 8-12 x 8-10m 100 x 500mm 600 x 600mm 1200 x 1200mm HEIGHT/SPAN \* 6-8 x 4-5m 2000 x 1200mm 1500 x 1000mm 2500 x 1000mm 400 x 500mm VARIABLE 450 x 450mm 400 x 500mm 400 x 400mm 3000 x 1000mm ו DEPTH PLANTING MEDIA TYPE D TOTAL Nω 30 <sup>6</sup> 106 110 318 60 128 65 510 1015 305 200 18 17 47 16 JUTE WEBBING TIED AND STAPLED TO STAKE NOTE: CARE SHOULD B TAKEN AT ALL TIMES TO ENSURE NO ROOT DAM EXISTING TREES. REFE ARBORIST REPORT FOI SPECIFIC REQUIREMEN LOOSEN SOIL 100mm DEPTH TO SIDE OF HOLE HARDWOOD STAKE(S) DRIVEN INTO SOIL UNTIL FIRM PLANTING REFER TO PLANT SCHDULE NATIVE 07 6 **07**9 z z | z | z | ≺ | ≺ | z z z ≺ z z ≺z z ≺ Z  $\prec$ PLANTING SCALE: NTS PLANTIN SCALE: NTS WATE 



TURF AS SPECIFIED TO FINISH FLUSH WITH ADJACENT SURFACES 400mm DEPTH PLANTING MEDIA TYPE C 50mm DEPTH COARSE SAND

	GG REFER TO SCHDULE COOD STAKE(S) INTO SOL INMTO SOL INTO	C REQUIREMENTS C REQUIREMENTS MATTER HAND CULTIVATED INTO EXISTING TOPSOL 200mm DEPTH ORGANIC CULTIVATED EXISTING TOPSOL INTO EXISTING TOPSOL EXISTING TOPSOL PLANTING TYPE 6 - EXISTING GARDEN BED SCALE NTS	PLANTING TYPE 3 - ON SLAB FILLING DETAIL SCALE NTS
c       REVISED PLANNING PERMISSION       28/05/14         B       REVISED PLANNING PERMISSION       06/05/14         ISSUE       DESCRIPTION       02/05/14         B       REVISED PLANNING PERMISSION       06/05/14         SSUE       DESCRIPTION       02/05/14         PE       1800 464 207       Miscoti NSW 2020         PE: 1800 464 207       MI: 0407 061 386       E: landscape@greenplan.net.au         ULINT       DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD         PROJECT AND ADDRESS       MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT         MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT       654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY         CHATSWOOD       DRANNG TITLE         LANDSCAPE SECTIONS       (SHEET 4 OF 4)         SCALE       1:100 @ A1/11:200 @ A3         DERIMER       1:6/07/2013         JOB NUMBER       1:3710         DRANING NUMBER       ISUE	MAGNETIC NORTH PROJECT NORTH		



EXISTING VIEW





Project DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

# PLANNING PROPOSAL APPLICATION 21 MAY 2014

#### PROPOSED VIEW

PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT

PHOTOMONTAGE VIEW 1

DRAWING

1NTS0@A1 21 MAY 14 12-0024 A4.01



Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.

Date



EXISTING VIEW





PLANNING PROPOSAL APPLICATION 21 MAY 2014

Rev Date Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL PROPOSED VIEW

MGA Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972 MGA Architects Ptv I t 22/05/2014 4:28:50 PM

Architect

Client

DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT

Project

PHOTOMONTAGE VIEW 2 1NTS0@A1 21 MAY 14 12-0024 A4.02

DRAWING

Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimensi Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.

Scale

Date Project No. Drawing No.





MGA MGA Architects Ptv I to 22/05/2014 5:13:04 PM

Rev Date

Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL

> 61 (0)414 964 812 + 61295606882 F + 612 9560 9884 % Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 2202 11\12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Cha

Architect

Client

DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972

	0m	3m	6m	9m	12m	15m ‡
	VISUAL S	CALE 1:1	50 @ A1	I	I	1
Project	DRAWING		Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	SECTION A		1:300@A3	21 MAY 14		A3.01
			Do not scale off drawi	efore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigh e written permission of the	it and may not be	



Architect Client Rev Date Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL MGA Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972 DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD MGA Architects Pty.Ltd 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW 22/05/2014 5:14:35 PM

+ 61295606882 F + 612 9560 988 26 Grove Street Dubaich Hill NSW 2202 1\12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Chat



	>	<u>LEVEL 7 ROOF</u> 127.32
	3200	127.32
EXISTING 24m MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT LINE	32	LEVEL 7 🛨
		124.12
	3000	
EXISTING BUILDING		
	ō	121.12
1	3000	
	د	$ \frac{\text{LEVEL 5}}{118.12} \bullet$
	3000	110.12
	, a	LEVEL 4
		115.12
	3000	
	د	
	3000	112.12
	30	LEVEL 2
<u> </u>	>	109.12
	3000	
		106.12
	4000	
	,	GROUND FLOOR
<mark>—</mark>	د	102.12
	5500	LOWER GROUND
		FLOOR V
	,	98.12 LOWER GROUND
		FLOOR LOWER
	3000	BASEME96.62
	3000	
	Ж.	BASEMENT 2 LOWER
		90.62
	3000	BASEMENT 3 LOWER
	>	87.62
	3000	BASEMENT 4 LOWER
		84.62

o t	m 3m	6m 9n	n 12n	n 15m	ו ו	1
Project	DRAWING		Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	SECTION B		Verify all dimensions Do not scale off draw	21 MAY 14 21 MAY 14 before commencing work. Ing. This design is copyrigit a written permission of the	Use figured dimensions.	A3.02

Proje





						1	1
Rev	Date	Description		Architect		Client	Projec
	21 MAY 14	PLANNING PROPOSAL	22/05/2014 5:08:28 PM \Mganas\Xi2011\12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Chatswood/Drawings\02-DA\DA-REVIT\Mode\Chatswood residential.rvt	MGA Architects Pty.Ltd. P+6129500682 F+612 9560 9884 6-28 Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 2203	Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972 M + 51 (0)414 964 812 E + a.auyeung@mga-arch.com.au	DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW	PROP DEVEI

t	0m	3m	6m		9m	12m	15m			
т	VISUAL S	' CALE 1:15	, 0 @ A	\1	1	1			I	
ect	DRA	WING			Scale	Date	Proj	ect No.	Drawing No.	
POSED MIXED ELOPMENT	SECT	TION C			1:300@/	A1 21 MAY A3 21 MAY Inside a commencial of drawing. This design is a hour the written permission	a work. Use figure	d dimensions.	A3.03	0



Rev Date Description

21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL

Client Architect MGA Architecture Interiors Project Management ACN 149 287 972 MGA Architects Pty.Ltd 654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

Proje DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD PRO DEVI



		1			1
ect	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
OPOSED MIXED VELOPMENT	SECTION D	As @A1 indicated	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A3.04
		Do not scale off drawi	efore commencing work. 1q. This design is copyright a written permission of the	t and may not be	0

PLANNING PROPOSAL **APPLICATION** 21 MAY 2014



VISUAL SCALE 1:150 @ A1

Rev Date Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL Client

Architect





		1 2	1	1	1
Project	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	SECTION E	As @A1 indicated	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A3.05
		Do not scale off drawing	efore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigt e written permission of the	nt and may not be	0





<sup>22/05/2014 4:43:54</sup> PM + 61295606882 F + 612 9560 9884 -26 Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 2203 2-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Cl

M + 51 (0)414 964 812

Verify all dimensions before commencing work: Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.









22/05/2014 4:44:52 PM + 61295606882 F + 612 9560 26 Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 024-654-666 Pacific Hwy C

Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.

8m

10n





+ 61295606882 F + 612 9560 9884 i-26 Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 2203 M + 51 (0)414 964 812 \12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Cha

Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.





12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Ch

+ 61295606882 F + 612 9560 9884 -26 Grove Street Dulwich Hill NSW 2203

M + 51 (0)414 964 812





# **EXISTING BUILDINGS**

DARAKI HOLDING PTY LTD

654-666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY CHATSWOOD NSW

Client

Architecture Interiors roject Management ACN 149 287 972

Architect

22/05/2014 4:32:42 PI

MGA

# **COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT** (CURRENT DCP)

Rev Date Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL

# **SHADOW COMPARISON** DIAGRAMS



PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT

SHADOW KEY PLAN

Drawing No. @A1 21 MAY 14 12-0024

A5.00

Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dime Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be mercelused without the writes commission of the percentation.





 Rev
 Date
 Description

 21 MAY 14
 PLANNING PROPOSAL

NORTH



SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)





	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
/IXED NT	SHADOW DIAGRAM 9AM	1 : 500@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A5.01
		Do not scale off drawing	tefore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigh e written permission of the	t and may not be	0





 Rev
 Date
 Description

 21 MAY 14
 PLANNING PROPOSAL

NORTH

MGA Architects Pty,Ltd. 22/05/2014 4:37:30 PM Wganask/2011/12-0024-654-666 Pacific Hwy Chatswood/Drawingsi02-DAIDA-REVITWodel/Chatswood residential.htt 6:0:0:wsetz Daukich HINSN/2230 E+a.awyeung@masatch.com



SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)

#### 22 JUNE 10AM



 $\langle \rangle$ 

	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
D MIXED MENT	SHADOW DIAGRAM 10AM	1 : 500@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A5.02
		Do not scale off drawi	refore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrig e written permission of the	nt and may not be	0







NORTH

#### LEGEND

SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



AND STATE 1. SALE T

SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)



0m 10m 20m 30m 40m 50m VISUAL SCALE 1:500 @ A1

un ∭ ∭

	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
) MIXED IENT	SHADOW DIAGRAM 10.30AM	1/1:500@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A5.03
		Do not scale off drawi	efore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigh e written permission of the	t and may not be	0



NORTH

Rev Date Description

21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL



964 812

PF DF

Project



SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



The state is a state in the state st

SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)





DRAWING

PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	SHADO

DW DIAGRAM 11AM 1:500@A1 21 MAY 14 12-0024 A5.04

Scale Date Project No. Drawing No.

Verify all dimensions before commencing work: Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.





Rev Date Description

21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL

NORTH



SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)





	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
) MIXED	SHADOW DIAGRAM 12PM	1 : 500@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A5.05
		Do not scale off drawi	refore commencing work. ng. This design is copyrigt e written permission of the	nt and may not be	٥





NORTH



SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)

### 22 JUNE 12:30PM

\_50m 0m 10m 20m 30 40m 30m VISUAL SCALE 1:500 @ A1

Project	DRAWING	Scale	Date	Project No.	Drawing No.
PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT	SHADOW DIAGRAM 12.30PM	<b>1</b> 1:500@A1	21 MAY 14	12-0024	A5.06
		Do not scale off drawing	efore commancing work. ng. This design is copyrigh a written permission of the	t and may not be	٥





NORTH



SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



And And I are and a start of the start of th

SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)





PROPOSED MIXED
DEVELOPMENT

SHADOW DIAGRAM 1PM

DRAWING

Scale Date Project No. Drawing No. 1:500@A1 21 MAY 14 12-0024 A5.07

Verify all dimensions before commencing work. Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.









Rev Date Description 21 MAY 14 PLANNING PROPOSAL

NORTH

#### LEGEND

SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



Sanda Sanda

SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)





15.6. 

POSED MIXED	
ELOPMENT	

SHADOW DIAGRAM 2PM

DRAWING

Scale Date Project No. Drawing No. 1:500@A1 21 MAY 14 12-0024 A5.08









 Rev
 Date
 Description

 21 MAY 14
 PLANNING PROPOSAL

NORTH

#### LEGEND

SHADOWS FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



SHADOWS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



SHADOWS FOR COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT (CURRENT DCP)





POSED MIXED
LOPMENT

SHADOW DIAGRAM 3PM

DRAWING

 Scale
 Date
 Project No.
 Drawing No.

 1 : 500@A1
 21 MAY 14
 12-0024
 A5.09

Verify all dimensions before commencing work: Use figured dimension Do not scale off drawing. This design is copyright and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the architect.

### PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

666 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, CHATSWOOD

Assessment of Traffic and Parking Implications

> May 2014 (Rev C)

Reference 13057

TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC PLANNING ASSOCIATES Transportation, Traffic and Design Consultants Suite 502, Level 5 282 Victoria Avenue CHATSWOOD 2067 Telephone (02) 9411 5660 Facsimile (02) 9904 6622 Email: info@ttpa.com.au

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.	INTRODUCTION 1			
2.	NNING PROPOSAL	2		
	2.1	Site, Context and Existing Use	2	
	2.2	Envisaged Development	2	
3.	ROA	D NETWORK AND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS	4	
	3.1	Road Network	4	
	3.2	Traffic Controls	5	
	3.3	Traffic Conditions	6	
	3.4	Public Transport Services	6	
4.	FUTU	JRE ROAD AND TRAFFIC CIRCUMSTANCES	8	
5.	TRA	FFIC	9	
6.	ACCESS, INTERNAL CIRCULATION AND SERVICING			
7.	PARI	KING 1	3	
8.	CON	CLUSION 1	5	

APPENDIX A TURNING PATH ASSESSMENT

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE 1	LOCATION
	LOOMION

- FIGURE 2SITEFIGURE 3ROAD NETWORKFIGURE 4TRAFFIC CONTROLSFIGURE 5APPROACH AND DEPARTURE ROUTES

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared to accompany revised plans for a Planning Proposal Application to Willoughby City Council for an amendment to Willoughby Local Environment Plan 2012 (WLEP2012) to permit an increased FSR for a mixed use development at 666 Pacific Highway, Chatswood (Figure 1).

Significant ongoing development is occurring in the Chatswood Centre reflecting the urban consolidation process and the excellent public transport, shopping, entertainment and employment facilities available. The provisions of WLEP enable development on the site with an FSR of 2:1 while the Planning Proposal seeks an FSR of 3:1. Affordable housing is not included in assessable gross floor area. If the floor area of the 3 proposed affordable housing units are included FSR increases to 3.05:1 for the purposes of assessing traffic impacts and parking requirements. The comparative development outcomes achievable under these circumstances are as follows:

	FSR 2:1	FSR 3.05:1
Apartments	44	62
Commercial	535 m <sup>2</sup>	797.65 m <sup>2</sup>
Neighbourhood Retail	1,181 m <sup>2</sup>	1,481.35 m <sup>2</sup>

The purpose of this report is to:

- À describe the Planning Proposal and the envisaged development scheme
- À describe the existing road network and traffic conditions as well as the future circumstances in the vicinity of the site
- assess the potential traffic implications of the increased floorspace under the proposal compared to that under the existing WLEP provisions
- À assess the adequacy of the envisaged parking provisions to serve the development
- A assess the envisaged vehicle access, internal circulation and servicing arrangements



## 2. PLANNING PROPOSAL

### 2.1 SITE, CONTEXT AND EXISTING USE

The site (Figure 2) is a consolidation of 4 lots occupying a total area of 2,856 m<sup>2</sup> with frontages to Pacific Highway, Oliver Road and Freeman Road. The site is located on the western side of the highway on the edge of the CBD where there is significant ongoing development for residential apartment buildings with ground level retail/commercial uses.

The central and eastern part of the site is currently occupied by commercial buildings comprising:

- a single level building on the corner of Freeman Road which is used for the sale of fireplaces
- a two level building on the corner of Oliver Road which is used for the display and sale of tiles

There are two residential dwellings on the western part of the site and there are existing access driveways on the three frontages. The site is adjoined by a home unit building to the west while there is a new mixed use building on the southern side of Freeman Road and there is a car dealership located on the northern side of Oliver Road.

### 2.2 ENVISAGED DEVELOPMENT

The envisaged development outcome under the Planning Proposal is as follows:



	FSR 2:1	FSR 3.05:1
Residential apartments		
Studio	6	10
1 Bed	6	6
2 Bed	29	43
3 Bed	3	3
Total:	44	62
Commercial	535 m <sup>2</sup>	797.65 m <sup>2</sup>
Retail	1,181 m <sup>2</sup>	1,481.35 m <sup>2</sup>

In respect of other aspects of the envisaged development (apart from height and carparking) the development outcomes would be similar with a total of 140 parking spaces is envisaged on 4 basement levels with:

- carpark access on the Freeman Road frontage
- service vehicle access on the Freeman Road frontage
- provision for road widening along the highway and Oliver Road frontages

Details of the envisaged development scheme (3.05:1) are shown on the plans prepared by MGA Architects which accompany the Planning Proposal and are reproduced in part overleaf.














### 3. ROAD NETWORK AND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

#### 3.1 ROAD NETWORK

The road network serving the development site (Figure 3) is dominated by:

- Pacific Highway a State Road and arterial route being the principal link between the City and Hornsby
- Delhi Road, Mowbray Road and Boundary Street State Roads and sub-arterial routes connecting and/or crossing the Highway
- Archer Street Regional Road and major collector road route connecting between Mowbray Road and Boundary Road
- Help Street Victoria Avenue a major collector road route through the town centre
- Albert Avenue a collector road connecting to the Highway and running parallel to Victoria Avenue
- Orchard Street and Anderson Street collector roads connecting to Albert Avenue.

Oliver Road and Freeman Road are local access roads which connect to Whitton Road but "dead end" at the boundary of the Chatswood High School site to the west.



#### **3.2 TRAFFIC CONTROLS**

The traffic controls which have been applied to the road system in the vicinity of the site (Figure 4) comprise:

- the traffic signals at the Albert Avenue/Pacific Highway intersection. Details are provided on the design plan reproduced overleaf and include:
  - tidal flow lane arrangement in the Highway
  - 3 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound in Albert Avenue
  - green arrow for the right turn into Oliver Street
  - signal controlled pedestrian crossings
- the traffic signals at the Pacific Highway/Centennial Avenue intersection which include the provision to turn right into Centennial Avenue
- the traffic signals at the Pacific Highway, Fullers Road and Help Street intersection including prohibited right turn movements into Fullers Road and out of Help Street
- the traffic control signals at the Pacific Highway/Victoria Avenue intersection which provides for right-turn movements into Victoria Road
- the ONE WAY westerly restriction on Oliver Road between the Pacific Highway and Whitton Road
- the 50 kmph speed restrictions except for the 40 kmph restriction in the CBD core area and 60 kmph on the Highway
- the NO STOPPING restrictions along the Pacific Highway and Albert Avenue (western part)
- the central median island in Pacific Highway across the Freeman Road intersection





#### 3.3 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

An indication of the prevailing traffic conditions on the road system serving the site is provided by traffic surveys undertaken during the morning and afternoon peak periods which are summarised in the following:

		AM	PM
Pacific Highway	Northbound	1,607	1,826
	Right-turn	200	191
	Left-turn	11	12
	Southbound	2,625	1,670
	Right-turn	18	56
	Left-turn	195	189
Albert Avenue	Westbound	33	63
	Right-turn	135	392
	Left-turn	38	158

The operational performance of the Albert Avenue intersection during the morning and afternoon peak periods is relatively satisfactory although traffic flows in reality are at times disrupted by the congestion along the Highway (in peak traffic periods) dictated by the critical Fullers Road and Mowbray Road intersections.

#### 3.4 PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES

Chatswood CBD has excellent access for public transport services including:

#### Railway Services

The North Shore and Western Lines operate through Chatswood Railway Station which is located just to the north of the site. These lines provide 13 trains per hour in the morning and afternoon peak periods and there are currently some 32,000 passengers passing through the station each day.

#### **Bus Services**

There are services provided by 3 operators accessing Chatswood as well as 2 interstate operators with some 460 scheduled services operating each day out of the rail interchange and 220 per day operating out of Railway Street.

There is also excellent provisions for pedestrian access and circulation within the CBD (eg Victoria Mall) as well as provisions for bicycle access.









## 4. FUTURE ROAD AND TRAFFIC CIRCUMSTANCES

#### LANDUSE

Chatswood is a developing Regional Centre with excellent public transport services and there are numerous recent, current, approved and proposed landuse developments in the centre. These developments include:

- **\*** Chatswood Interchange Complex
- \* Student Accommodation on Albert Avenue
- \* Albert Avenue/Archer Street site
- \* Archer Street Carpark site
- \* Albert Avenue Carpark site

#### **ROAD NETWORK AND TRAFFIC**

Council engaged the consultant GHD to prepare a traffic model reflecting the future traffic circumstances consequential to the identified landuse development and a range of road and traffic management works.

The road and traffic management works which were resolved in Council's study include:

- widening of Albert Avenue between the Pacific Highway east of Albert Lane (1 additional westbound lane)
- introduction of a one-way northbound flow in Thomas Lane between Fleet Lane and Thomas Street
- \* prohibition of the right turn movements into and out of Albert Lane at Albert Street

## 5. TRAFFIC

The existing development on the site is assessed to have a traffic generation during the morning and afternoon peak periods as follows:

Total:	10 vtph (say)
Northern Commercial	6 vtph
Southern Commercial	2 vtph
2 dwellings @ 0.85 vtph	1.7 vtph

The RMS Development Guideline Supplement (TDT 2013-04) specifies a peak traffic generation for high density residential apartments of 0.19vtph in the morning peak and 0.15vtph in the afternoon peak.

Similarly because the parking provision for commercial floorspace is "constrained" in the Railway precinct the traffic generation is lower than that indicated by the RMS Guidelines for this use. Extensive surveys undertaken by TTPA of existing parking for commercial uses in the precinct indicate a generation rate of 0.25 vtph/space in the morning and 0.32 vtph/space in the afternoon.

Isolated small retail units of the type proposed do not generate high parking turn over characterists like other retail uses and these uses will be somewhat ancillary (ie. café, convenience store etc). The assessed generation of the retail use is 0.2 vtph/space in the morning and 0.5 vtph/space in the afternoon.

Application of these factors to the FSR 2:1 and envisaged FSR 3.05:1 development scenarios indicates the following traffic generation outcomes:

#### TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC PLANNING ASSOCIATES

							3.05:1
	4.4				60		PM
	44	9	1		02	12	9
772 m <sup>2</sup>	7 spaces	2	3	797.65m <sup>2</sup>	7 spaces	2	3
944m <sup>2</sup>	38 spaces	8	19	1,481.35m <sup>2</sup>	50 spaces	10	26
802m <sup>2</sup> @8	85%			1,259.1m <sup>2</sup> @8	35%		
		19	29			24	38
		10	10			10	10
xisting		9	19			14	28
	944m <sup>2</sup>	944m <sup>2</sup> 38 spaces 802m <sup>2</sup> @85%	AM       44     9       772 m²     7 spaces     2       944m²     38 spaces     8       802m² @85%     19       10	44     9     7       772 m²     7 spaces     2     3       944m²     38 spaces     8     19       802m² @85%     19     29       10     10	AM       PM         44       9       7         772 m²       7 spaces       2       3       797.65m²         944m²       38 spaces       8       19       1,481.35m²         802m² @ 85%       1,259.1m² @ 8       1,259.1m² @ 8         10       10       10	AM       PM         44       9       7         772 m²       7 spaces       2       3       797.65m²       7 spaces         944m²       38 spaces       8       19       1,481.35m²       50 spaces         802m² @ 85%       1       12       1,259.1m²       85%         10       10       10       10       10	AMPMAM4497777777944m238388919 $1,481.35m^2$ 50 $1,259.1m^2$ 5010101010

Thus it is apparent that the development outcome under the FSR 3.05:1 as compared to the FSR 2:1 will only result in some 5 vtph additional (ie to 2:1) in the morning peak and 9 in the afternoon.

The envisaged vehicle access for the development will be located on the Freeman Road frontage and there will be very flexible approach and departure routes (despite the central median island in the highway across Freeman Road) as indicated in Figure 6. These available routes will enable access to/from the north, south, east and west resulting in a relatively even distribution of generated traffic movements whilst service vehicles will essentially be limited to ingress/egress to/from the highway.

The flexibility will be such that the projected total movements for the FSR 3.05:1 outcome, will spread as follows:

		AM	F	PM
-	IN	OUT	IN	OUT
TOTAL:	12	12	19	19
North 25%	3	3	4.75	4.75
South 40%	4.8	4.8	7.6	7.6
East 20%	2.4	2.4	3.8	3.8
West 20%	2.4	2.4	3.8	2.8



Vehicle movements of such a small magnitude will have no perceptible impact on the access road system and would not have any "measurable" impact on the operation of the intersections on the highway (which have an existing peak period throughput of some 4,500 to 5,000 vph). Accordingly there will be no requirement for upgrade roadworks particularly when the scheme provides the dedication of land for future road widening on the Highway and Oliver Road.

### 6. ACCESS, INTERNAL CIRCULATION AND SERVICING

#### **ACCESS**

Vehicle accesses for the envisaged development would be located on the Freeman Road frontage with an appropriate separation from the highway intersection. The proposed accesses will comply with the requirements of AS2890.1 and there will be suitable sight distances available.

#### **INTERNAL CIRCULATION**

The internal circulation arrangements will adopt a flexible two-way system with the residents carparking segregated on the lower basement levels. The layout of the basement areas will comply with the design requirements of AS 2890.1 particularly in relation to ramps, aisles, bays and manoeuvring areas.

#### **Servicing**

Provision will be made on the lower ground floor for 3 service vehicles and this will be adequate for the residential, commercial and retail needs particularly given the nature of the small units for each use. The generous manoeuvring of service vehicles will ensure that these vehicles can enter and depart in a forward direction.

### 7. PARKING

Willoughby City Council's DCP specifies a parking provision relevant to the proposed development scheme as follows:

Resid	Residential Apartments (Railway Precinct)					
	Studio	-	0.5 spaces			
	One-bedroom	-	1 space			
	Two-bedroom	-	1 space			
	Three-bedroom	-	1.25 spaces			
	Visitors	-	1 space per 4 apartments			
	Commercial	-	1 space per 110m <sup>2</sup>			
	Neighbourhood Retail	-	1 space per 25m <sup>2</sup> of 85% of NFA			

\* If not whole number rounded down.

Application of this criteria to the envisaged FSR 3.05:1 development scheme would indicate the following requirements:

The final end use of the 2,279m<sup>2</sup> of Commercial and Neighbourhood Retail floorspace has not been determined. Accordingly for the purpose of traffic and parking generation an assumption has been made that 35% of this floorspace will be Commercial and 65% neighbourhood Retail.

Residential Apartments		
10 x studio	-	5 spaces
6 x one-bedroom	-	6 spaces
43 x two-bedroom	-	43 spaces
3 x three-bedroom	-	3.75 spaces
Total:		57.75 spaces (58)
Visitors	-	16 spaces

<u>Commercial</u>		
797.65 m <sup>2</sup>	-	7 spaces
		·
Neighbourhood Retail		
1,481.35 m² (@ 85% 1,259.1m²)	-	50 spaces
Total:	-	131 spaces

It is envisaged that a total of some 140 parking spaces will be provided including suitable "disabled" and "accessible" spaces allocated as follows:

Residents	65 spaces
Visitors	17 spaces
Neighbourhood Retail/Commercial	58 spaces

The DCP specifies bicycle parking provisions as follows:

	Lockers	Racks
Residential	1 per 10 apts	1 per 12 apts
Commercial	1 per 600 m <sup>2</sup>	1 per 2,500 m <sup>2</sup>
Neighbourhood Retail	1 per 450 m <sup>2</sup>	1 per 150 m <sup>2</sup>

The provision of bicycle parking will be compliant with this criteria.

The DCP also specifies the provision of motor cycle parking at the rate of 1 space per 25 car spaces indicating a requirement for 6 motor cycle spaces.

### 8. CONCLUSION

The Planning Proposal involves a consolidated site and an amendment to WLEP2012 to permit development with an FSR of 3.05:1.

Assessment of the envisaged development scheme, which comprises commercial, retail and residential apartment elements, has concluded that:

- **\*** there will be no adverse traffic implications
- **\*** the parking can be provided to comply with Council's DCP criteria
- the proposed vehicle access, circulation and servicing arrangements will be suitable and appropriate

# APPENDIX A

# **TURNING PATH ASSESSMENT**

\_









### Prepared by Ingham Planning Pty Ltd

Provision	Requirements	Proposal	Compliance
Building Envelope	Building envelope should be at least 20-25% greater than their achievable floor area to allow for building articulation. Total floor area includes assessable GFA and non-assessable GFA (for the purposes of calculating FSR). In denser urban areas 80% of the total maximum building envelope is acceptable.	The maximum permissible building envelop (at an average maximum height of 32m and with streetfront setbacks, as agreed with Council and rear setback complying with the SEPP 65 RFDC) is 57,997.4m3. The proposal has a total volume (excluding the volume of balconies) of only 31,772.8m3, because of unbuilt volume between the 2 towers. Proposed volume equates equates to 54.8% of maximum envelope.	YES
		The building envelope standard is designed to encourage articulation of apartment buildings. The proposed balconies form an important part of the building's articulation. If balconies are included in the proposed building envelope, it increases to 33,658.4m3, equating to 58% of the maximum achievable building envelope volume. This complies with the maximum 80% permitted in a dense urban area that is the case within and adjoining the Chatswood CBD.	
Building Height	Compliance with building height controls or permissible number of storey.	A maximum building height of 18m above ground level applies to the site. The Planning Proposal seeks to increase maximum building height to 36.5m (north portion) and 28m (south portion). These heights are compatible with nearby development to the northeast and south. The proposal has a maximum height of 36.5m (north tower) & 28m (south tower) and therefore complies with the requested height controls for the northern & southern portions of the site.	YES (Subject to the Planning Proposal proceeding with an increase in maximum building height to 36.5m & 28m (including parapets and lift overruns).

\_1

2 Provision Poquiromento Proposal Compliano				
Provision	Kequirements	Proposal	Compliance	
Provision         Building Depth	RequirementsResolve building depth controls in plan, section and elevation. In general, an apartment building 	ProposalThere is no maximum number of storeys specified. Proposed south tower building height of 8 storeys to the Highway is consistent with the 24m (8 storey) height limit applying to the adjoining land to the west and south. The taller north tower height of 11 storeys to the Highway is compatible with the building height controls applicable to the eastern side of the Highway and assists in emphasizing the gateway nature of the northern portion of the site as the southwest gateway to the Chatswood CBD.Council's DCP allows a maximum building depth of 20m. The proposal substantially complies with Council's DCP standard for building depth, apart from a limited area of the southwest corner of Tower A (Levels 1 to 7) (see drawings showing the DCP 20m building depth lines).The great majority of the building also complies with the RFD Code standard of 18m as measured from the facades facing public roads.The site has 3 road frontages and for the most part has a building depth that does not exceed 18m to these road frontages.Some flexibility in building depth is envisaged where "the builk of development is in scale with the existing and future contact" and pravided	Compliance	
	-	-		

Provision	Requirements	Proposal	<sup>3</sup> Compliance
		Eliminating the minor breach of the 18m/20m maximum building depth control in the southwest corner of Tower A would offer no material visual bulk, aesthetic or amenity benefit.	
		The 2 tower form is consistent with Council's preferred building form for the site and locality. Notwithstanding the minor additional building depth in the southwest corner of Tower A, the proposal readily achieves compliance with respect to daylighting and natural ventilation. Building separation to neighbouring sites complies and for the most part exceeds standards specified in the RFDC, as demonstrated below.	
Building Separation	Design and test buildings separation controls in plan and section. Test building separation controls for daylight access to buildings and open spaces. Building separation required as follows: Up to 4 storeys/12m 12m between habitable rooms/ balconies; 9m between habitable rooms/balconies & non- habitable; 6m between non-habitable rooms; 5 to 8 storeys/up to 25m 18m between habitable rooms/ balconies; 13m between habitable rooms/balconies & non- habitable; 9m between non-habitable rooms/balconies & non- habitable; 9m between non-habitable rooms/balconies & non- habitable; 9m between non-habitable rooms;	Residential floor levels up to a height of 12m (4 storeys) above ground level provide in excess of 12m building separation between habitable rooms/balconies of the proposed building and neighbouring residential buildings & at least 12m between Towers A & B. Building separation (up to a building height of 12m) to the closest residential building (3-5 Freeman Road) ranges from 13.91m up to 16.41m Residential floor levels above 12m up to a height of 25m (8 storeys) above ground level provide in excess of 18m building separation between habitable rooms/balconies and neighbouring residential buildings.	Compliance with respect to building separation to buildings on adjoining & adjacent sites. Modest variation sought with respect to building separation for 4 uppermost levels of proposed Tower B, in relation to Tower A.

ProvisionRequirementsProposalCompliance9 storeys & above/over 25m9 storeys & above/over 25mMinimum building separation of well in excess of the 18m standard recommended in the RFDC is provided to buildings on neighbouring sites to the north, east and south.10m between habitable rooms;Building separation control may be varied in respond to site and context constrains, subject to the objectives of the building separation standard being met. These objectives are:Building separation to ensure that new development is scaled to support the desired character with appropriate massing and spaces between buildings.Ninimum building separation to 12m (from 18m) is sought for Level 4 of Tower B, as this level is effectively the 4th storey of the residential tower above the podium. The Tower A and B elevations facing each other have been carefully designed to optimize privacy between apartments in these two towers.•To allow the provision of open space.•A reduction in building separation to 15m (from 18m) is sought for Levels 5 to 7 of rowers, to 7 of 7 overshadowing of caceparatis.•A reduction in building separation to 15m (from 18m) is sought for Levels 5 to 7 of rowers, to 7 of 7 overs by of the tevels 5 to 7 of romers, back of the upper levels of Tower B to the sought for Levels of Tower B to the southern Freeman Road frontage to minimize shadow impacts on existing buildings on the southern side of Freeman Road Indig separation and sufficient view corridor east-west between the 2 tower
<ul> <li>25m</li> <li>24m between habitable rooms/ balconies;</li> <li>18m between nahaitable rooms;</li> <li>Building separation control may be varied in respond to site and context constrains, subject to the objectives of the building separation standard being met. These objectives are:</li> <li>To ensure that new development is scaled to support the desired character with appropriate massing and spaces between buildings.</li> <li>To ro ensure that new development is scaled to building separation to 12m (from 18m) is sought for Level 4 of Tower B, at this level is effectively the 4<sup>th</sup> storey of the residential tower and partners in these two towers.</li> <li>A reduction in building separation to 12m (from 18m) is sought for Level 4 of Tower B, at this level is effectively the 4<sup>th</sup> storey of the residential tower and B elevations facing each other have been carefully designed to optimize privacy between apartments in these two towers.</li> <li>To allow the provision of pape space with appropriate size and proportion for eccreational activities for building occupants.</li> <li>To provide deep soil zones for stornwater management and tree planting, where conditions allow.</li> </ul>
and B elevations facing each other have been carefully

#### Provision **Requirements** Proposal Compliance Tower B does not extend to more than 8 storeys above the Highway frontage, therefore separation distance to Tower A, above 8 storeys is not an issue. It is acknowledged that Level 7. being the 8<sup>th</sup> storey of Tower B, extends above a height of 24m due to the higher ceiling height clearance required for the ground level commercial floor. Given the relatively narrow width of Level 7 of Tower B, a separation distance of 15m to Tower A is considered reasonable in the circumstances, particularly as only 1 floor level is affected. The objectives of the building separation standards are achieved. Street Setbacks The building podium provides a Identify streetscape Variation zero setback to the Pacific character, common sought to Highway & the eastern end of Council's DCP setback in street, planting and height of buildings Oliver Road (with road streetfront and daylight access widening in place), a 1m to 4m setback controls. Relate to area's setback to Freeman Road and a requirements hierarchy. Identify garden 4m setback to Oliver Road (with to facilitate a and landscape areas and road widening in place). tower building street sections. And test form preferred control for impact on the The residential towers above by Council. scale, proportion and podium provide a minimum shape of building façade. building setback of 2m to the (Variation is Pacific Highway (with road relatively widening in place). Building minor if setback of the towers to the measured to Highway is variable, ranging existing street from ???m to ????m for Tower A boundaries, and ???m to ??m for Tower B. in rather than consultations with Council future regarding preferred building proposed form, reduced setbacks to the street Highway were support to boundaries) encourage a taller tower The street building form, rather than a setback lower, but more bulky street objectives of wall building, which would the SEPP 65

**RFDC** are

achieved.

have been permitted with lesser

Highway setbacks.
#### Provision **Requirements** Proposal Compliance Building setback to the Highway is compatible with the residential tower to the south (No. 640-650 Pacific Highway). Front setbacks to the Pacific Highway are appropriate for a mixed use building. Side and Rear Relate side setbacks to Freeman Road and Oliver Road SIDE SETBACKS Setbacks existing streetscape are secondary street frontages, patterns. Test side and rather than side boundaries. NOT APPLICABLE rear setbacks with The residential tower provides a controls for building minimum setback of 1m to 4m separation, open space to Freeman Road and a 4m and deep soil zones and setback to Oliver Road (with overshadowing controls road widening in place). (see building separation Typically reduced setback is standards in this reasonable to secondary street Compliance Table). frontages. Increased setbacks are provided for upper levels fronting Oliver Road and Freeman Roads. As noted above, the site has 3 REAR road frontages, which means BOUNDARY there are no side boundaries. SETBACK The primary frontage of the COMPLIES proposed building is the Pacific Highway. Therefore the western boundary of the site is effectively a rear boundary. Rear setback to 3-5 Freeman Road significantly exceeds the 3m minimum required for the lower ground and ground floor levels. The proposal substantially complies with the minimum rear setback for all levels of the building (apart

from some minor encroachment by parts of balconies). Setbacks are considered in detail in the DCP Compliance Table.

Deep soil zone to the rear boundary is more than double the minimum width required.

			7
Provision	Requirements	Proposal	Compliance
Floor Space Ratio	Determine FSR by calculating at 80% of the building envelope in denser urban areas and at 75% in suburban areas. Test desired built form outcome against proposed FSR to ensure consistency with building height, building footprint, the three dimensional building envelope and open space requirement. Test typical lot sizes and shapes in the area.	The current FSR controls provide for a maximum FSR of 2:1. The Planning Proposal seeks to increase this to a maximum of 3.0:1. The building envelope accommodates an FSR of just over 3:1, as affordable housing is not included in assessable GFA. The proposed total floor space is accommodated in a building which equates to not more than 58% of the maximum total volume achievable in the maximum permissible building envelope for the site at 3:1. The site is located within a denser urban area (being adjacent to the Chatswood Town Centre), therefore 58% is readily compliant with the 80% building envelope in dense urban areas.	YES
Deep Soil Zones	Minimum of 25% of open space area should be a deep soil zone.	The proposal provides for a deep soil zone of 300m2 approximating 25% of the total area of communal open space of some 1,347m2. The deep soil zone at the rear of the site is capable of accommodating large trees.	YES
Communal Open Space	Area of communal open space required should generally be at least between 25% and 30% of the site area. Where developments are unable to achieve the recommended communal open space, such as those in dense urban areas, they must demonstrate that residential amenity is provided in the form of increased private open space and/or a contribution to public open space.	The rear deep soil panting area of some 300m2 is available for use as communal open space for residents. Additional communal open space is located along the Freeman Road and Oliver Road frontages of the site. At podium & roof level, communal open space area of 735.5m2 including a substantial area of landscaping is provided. Total communal open space of 1,347m2 equates to 51% of site area (within the B5 zone) and exceeds the 25% to 30% of site area requirement.	YES

Provision	Requirements	Proposal	Compliance
Safety	Carry out a formal crime risk assessment for all residential developments of more than 20 dwellings. The safety objectives are: • To ensure residential flat developments are safe and secure for residents and visitors. • To contribute to the safety of the public domain.	There is a clear definition of the public and private domain and suitable fencing and access controls provided. Residential and commercial entrance lobbies are separated. The design provides for passive surveillance of the public domain. The Development Application will be accompanied by a "Safety by Design" assessment.	YES
Visual Privacy	public domain.Locate and orientate newdevelopment to maximizevisual privacy betweenbuildings on site andadjacent buildings.Design building layouts tominimize directoverlooking of rooms andprivate open spaceadjacent to apartments.Use detailed site andbuilding design elementsto increase privacywithout compromisingaccess to light and air.In relation to visualprivacy the Code adoptsthe building separationminimum standards as theprimary 'rule of thumb"for maintaining adequate	High levels of visual privacy are provided for apartments within the proposed development. Measures include privacy walls to balconies, off-setting of external windows and use of translucent glass in windows, where necessary. Substantial building separation distance to neighbouring buildings, in excess of the minimum requirements of the Code ensures adequate visual privacy to neighbouring residential units. Privacy to the units to the west is further enhanced by proposed planting of large trees and shrubs along the western boundary of the site.	YES
Parking and Vehicular and Pedestrian Access	neighbor privacy. Determine appropriate parking requirements depending on building type and proximity of public transport.	Off-street parking is provided in accordance with the Council's DCP requirements.	YES
	Provide vehicular access in accordance with Australian Standards.	Vehicular access is designed in accordance with Australian Standards. Driveway access does not exceed 6m in width.	

Provision	Requirements	Proposal	9 Compliance
FIOVISION	requirements	гторозат	Compliance
	Limit driveways to a maximum width of 6m and locate vehicle entries away from pedestrian entries.	Vehicular access is located in Freeman Road, separated from pedestrian access off Oliver Road & Pacific Highway.	
Private Open Space	The minimum recommended area of private open space for each apartment at Ground Floor is 25sqm with 4m in one dimension.	There are no ground floor apartments.	YES
	Provide primary balconies for all apartments with a minimum depth of 2m.	All apartments are provided with balconies with a minimum depth of at least 2m and minimum area of at least 10m2.	
Apartment Sizes	Minimum 38.5m2 for studio units, 50 m2 for 1 bedroom units; 70m2 for 2 bedroom apartments and 95m2 for 3 bedroom apartments.	The floor areas of all units are equal to, or exceed the minimum recommended apartment sizes (38.5m2 for studio units, 50 m2 for one bedroom units, 70m2 for 2 bedroom units and 95m2 for 3 bedroom units).	YES
Residential flat building Floor to Ceiling height	2.7m minimum for all habitable rooms on all floors, 2.4m is the preferred for non- habitable rooms although 2.25m is permitted.	A floor to ceiling height of at least 2.7m is achieved for all habitable rooms. In the case of non-habitable rooms a minimum height of 2.4m is achieved.	YES
Ground floor Apartments	Optimize number of ground floor apartments with separate entries. Provide ground floor apartments with access to private open space, preferably as a terrace or garden.	There are no ground level apartments.	N/A
Internal Circulation	Where units are arranged off a double loaded corridor, the number of units accessible from a single core corridor should be limited to 8.	The proposal provides for corridors of short length extending from the centrally located lift cores within each residential tower. The maximum number of units accessed from the corridors on each level does not exceed 8 (generally 5 or less).	YES

Provision	Requirements	Proposal	10 Compliance
Storages	Minimum 6m3 for 1 bedroom apartments, 8m3 for 3 bedroom apartments and 10m3 for 3 bedroom apartments (excluding kitchen cupboards or wardrobes) is to be provided.	The basement car park includes an average storage capacity of 7.5m3 of residential storage for the proposed apartments. Minimum capacity complies with the requirements of SEPP 65 (6m3 for 1 bedroom units, 8m3 for 2 bedroom units and 10m3 for 3 bedroom units). Additional storage is provided within apartments, equivalent to at least 40% of the basement storage for each apartment. Total storage capacity per unit	YES
Daylight Access	Living room and private open spaces for at least 70% of apartment should receive minimum of 3 hours direct sunlight between 9am- 3pm in mid-winter. In dense urban areas a minimum of 2 hours may be acceptable. Limit the number of single-aspect apartments with a southerly aspect (SW-SE) to a maximum of 10%	<ul> <li>Total storage capacity per unit exceeds the minimum required.</li> <li>The site is located within a dense urban area, hence a minimum mid-winter solar access of 2 hours applies.</li> <li>The proposal provides that 57 units out of a total of 62 units receive in excess of 2 hours sunlight on the winter solstice.</li> <li>This equates to 91.9% of units (10 units more than the minimum number required) that achieve at least 2 hours mid- winter solar access. This is an acceptable outcome in a dense urban environment on a site that is orientated north to south.</li> <li>The proposal provides 4 single- aspect south facing apartments. This equates to 6.5% of the total</li> </ul>	YES
Natural Ventilation	Building depths which support natural ventilation typically range in depth from 10-18m. (ie. Building depths should generally not exceed 18m in order to optimize access to natural ventilation).	number of apartments. Proposed units do not exceed a depth of 18m and have good access to natural ventilation. No apartments have a depth of more than 18m.	YES

	omphance rable for 054-000 racine righway. Chatswood		
Provision	Requirements	Proposal	Compliance
		The RFD Code guideline with respect to apartment depth is intended to discourage apartments of significant depth, where the rear portions of those apartments may be difficult to naturally ventilate from windows. Single aspect units have a modest depth of 6.6m to 10.83m, ensuring good access to natural ventilation.	
	60% of residential units should be naturally cross ventilated.	54 apartments (i.e. 87% of a total of 62 units) are naturally cross ventilated, well in excess of the 60% standard.	
	25% of kitchens should have access to natural ventilation.	95% of apartment kitchens (59 out of a total of 62) have direct access to natural ventilation.	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
E1.1 <u>Frontages</u> Ensure sufficient frontages to achieve a good relationship to adjoining development &	Where development exceeds 11m in height or vehicular access is only obtainable from the primary street frontage, a minimum width of the site at the front alignment is 27m.	The site frontages to the Pacific Highway, Freeman Road and Oliver Road all exceed 27m.	Yes.
provide adequate landscaping & be compatible with the general pattern of	Vehicular access is to be from the secondary street frontage.	Vehicular access is to the secondary street frontage (Freeman Road).	Yes.
spacing of buildings. Avoid "isolating" allotments by development. Minimize impact of traffic & vehicular access, including	Entry portal for driveway not to exceed 5m in width, with max 3.6m head clearance, if car park entry is also an entry to a loading dock.	6m width provided to ensure adequate clearance for two way truck movements.	Substantial compliance.
adequate separation between driveways and provide adequate separation	Car parking must be provided at and/or below ground level.	All car parking is located below ground level.	Yes.
between the different uses within the site.	Vehicular movements for loading/unloading and customer car parking should be separated where possible.	Loading and unloading facilities are separately located from customer/visitor parking.	Yes.
	Residential apartments entries to be separated from commercial entries. Ground level frontages shall be "transparent".	The residential entries/lobbies are separate from the commercial entries/lobbies.	Yes.
	Any security shutters, mesh, gates or similar must be located a minimum of 1m behind the façade.	No security shutters, mesh gates or the like are proposed within 1m of the front facades.	Yes.

#### Prepared by Ingham Planning Pty Ltd

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
E1.2 <u>Density, Use and</u> <u>Height</u> Maintenance & improvement of existing or planned scale and character of the street & maintenance of solar access to public places & footpaths. Buildings are appropriate to their setting & provide a well integrated backdrop to the streetscape and maintain the amenity of any adjoining residential land in terms of building bulk and solar access.	Compliance with building height and floor space controls in Willoughby LEP 2012. A maximum building height of 18m and maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 2:1 applies. The Planning Proposal envisages an increase in maximum building height to 36.2m & 27.8m and an increase in maximum FSR to 3:1 (excluding affordable housing). The height of a building must ensure that: - • Solar access to adjoining properties and key areas of the public domain is maintained. • Views from neighbouring dwellings are not unduly compromised. • The building height does not overwhelm the public street & is compatible with the existing or planned scale of the surrounding environment. Development should incorporate retail, business or office use on the ground floor to provide a continuous commercial character of business zones & maintain activity & passive surveillance at street level.	The Planning Proposal seeks a variation to the current maximum building height of 18m and maximum FSR of 2.0:1, to provide increased height and density. The proposal maintains at least 2 hours solar access & in most cases at least 3 hours solar access to adjoining properties. No key areas of the public domain are overshadowed. Views from neighbouring dwellings are not materially compromised, having regard to the high density context and the existing allowable building height of up to 18m. The additional building height proposed for the 2 towers does not obstruct any significant views. The proposal does not "overwhelm" the Pacific Highway is a major road of significant width. The residential towers provide setbacks to the Highway consistent with the 7 storey apartment building to the south & the 9 storey apartment building to the east. Upper levels of Tower B are stepped back from Freeman Road and building form is relatively narrow and modest in scale, fronting Oliver Road. The ground and lower ground floors comprise non- residential uses permitted in the B4 Zone and would be subject to separate DA.	Compliance subject to increased height (36.2m & 27.8m) and FSR (3:1 excluding affordable housing) proposed in the Planning Proposal being supported.

Provision Controls Proposal Compliance Non-residential uses that could be considered include neighbourhood shops, bulky goods retail, offices & car showrooms. The ground and lower ground floors include glazing to street frontages for passive surveillance. Yes. E1.3 Façade Treatment: Colours, vertical and horizontal elements, balconies and blade walls Design and Streetscape Design provide for an attractive Qualities façade with visual interest. Achieve attractive Contemporary tower on **Building Form:** Yes. podium building form is streetscapes that add proposed, consistent with visual interest & amenity to new development in the pedestrian areas, locality. Clearly defined reflect the function of commercial podium. Vertical the street, create high elements in residential quality urban forms towers moderate the horizontal line of the podium & enhance the character of the on the longer eastern and western elevations. existing retail/commercial Street Frontage Heights: Existing street frontage Yes. areas. heights in the locality are highly variable. Overall building height is consistent with nearby buildings to the south and northeast. Prominent Corner Sites: The taller Tower A in the Yes. northeast corner defines the intersection of Oliver Road and Pacific Highway, a gateway intersection of visual prominence at the southeast entry to the Chatswood CBD. Ground Level Activities & The ground floor frontage to Yes. the Pacific Highway includes Interest: display windows and avoids large areas of blank wall and provide for active uses such as neighbourhood shops and bulky goods retailing

3

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Building to Street Alignment:	The commercial podium (single storey to Highway) is built to the future street alignment of the Pacific Highway. Some landscaped setback is provided to the commercial podium along the Oliver and Freeman Road frontages, as these streets are primarily residential in character with buildings setback from the street.	Yes.
	Façade Modulation;	Building form is modulated with openings and changes to façade treatment to provide a suitable balance of horizontal and vertical lines and achieve suitable proportions. A design with 2 towers, rather than a street wall building, further modulates building facades.	Yes.
	Solid to Void Ratio:	A suitable balance of solid to void is achieved. There are no above awning shop frontages proposed. The first floor level is a residential floor level and includes an acceptable proportion of windows and solid wall.	Yes.
	Window Proportion:	The proportion of windows and openings to wall areas above awning level are consistent with other residential buildings in the locality.	Yes.
	Colour & Finishes:	A suitable range of coordinated colours is proposed, with strong colours avoided. Driveway entry walls are to be painted the same colour as the adjoining external facade.	Yes.

#### Willoughby DCP – Part E and I6 Specific Controls for Commercial and Shop Top Housing Development \_\_\_\_

Compliance Table for 654-666 Pacific Highway Chatswood

5
9

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Materials:	Design is contemporary in style, with a painted smooth rendered masonry finish. Large unbroken expanses of masonry wall surface area avoided and the facades are suitably modulated.	Yes.
	Rear Façade: Building massing & bulk:	No access to apartments is proposed at the rear, above podium level. Stairs are integrated into the design of the building. Lifts and stairs to apartments are within the buildings rather than at the rear elevation. Garbage and storage rooms are located within the basement. Clothes drying areas are screened from view.	Yes.
	Buildings over 11m should have a defined podium & tower element & the podium element defined as a transition element to reflect the height and form of neighbouring buildings.	The building presents a clearly defined commercial podium, with 2 residential towers above defined as a separate element of residential character by way of façade treatment, balconies and setback.	Yes.
	Signage	No signage, other than directional signage is required for the residential component. Signage for the commercial floor levels will be limited shop front and under awning signs as detailed on the future development application.	Yes.
	Public Art	There is potential for provision of an item of public art in the northeast corner of the site. While the site is a gateway to the CBD, modest volumes of pedestrian traffic would not justify providing public art.	Yes.

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
E1.4	Front/street setback	Residential floor levels up to	Variation to
		a height of 12m (4 storeys)	minimum
<u>Set backs</u>	Consistent front setback	above ground level provide	street setbacks
	with adjoining	in excess of 12m building	sought due to
Positioning of	development, though not	separation between habitable	site
buildings to provide	necessarily identical. Vehicular entrances or	rooms/balconies of the	circumstances
adequate separation between buildings	open parking areas must	proposed building and neighbouring residential	(3 street frontages and
for the amenity of the	not diminish the	buildings.	road
development and	attractiveness of the	bunungs.	widening).
adjoining properties	streetscape or visually	Minimum building	Proposed
& to provide	dominate.	separation of 13.91m is	street setbacks
adequate space for	dominater	provided up to a building	have been
landscaping,	To achieve visual interest	height of 12m. Building	formulated in
equitable access to	in front facades, buildings	separation (up to a building	consultation
sunlight& minimize	can be designed with	height of 12m) to the closest	with Council
overshadowing of	variations in the facade	residential building (3-5	to encourage
adjoining properties.	alignment at upper levels.	Freeman Road) ranges from	a tower
	Where appropriate,	13.91m up to 16.4m	building form,
Provide setbacks that	parapet structures should		rather than a
spatially define the	be used above the ground	Residential floor levels above	street wall
street, ensure	or first floor level to	12m up to a height of 25m (8	building form.
adequate visibility	emphasise the	storeys) above ground level	
for pedestrians and	commercial streetscape character consistent with	provide in excess of 18m	
cars, complement the streetscape &	adjoining buildings.	building separation between habitable rooms/balconies	
allow for landscaping	aujoining bundings.	and neighbouring residential	
& open space.	Where existing	buildings.	
a open space.	streetscape is	bunungs.	
Ensure the	characterized by ribbon	Minimum building	
positioning of new	development immediately	separation of between 17.9m	
buildings contribute	on the boundary to the	and 20.4m are provided	
to the existing and	street frontage, the ground	above a building height of	
proposed streetscape	floor (and where existing	12m, up to the maximum	
character.	2 storey building facades	building heights of 27.8m &	
	prevail, the first floor) of	36.2m	
	the development should		
	maintain the existing	Building separation (building	
	streetscape character by	height 12m to 25m) to the	
	incorporating a zero front	closest residential building	
	setback.	(3-5 Freeman Road) ranges from 17.91m to 20.4m	
	First & second floor levels		
	should be setback a	Streetfront setbacks at upper	
	minimum of an additional	levels are less than required	
	2m from the street	in the DCP in order to	
	frontage (from that of the	facilitate a tower building	
	ground level below).	form, rather than a long	
		street wall building form.	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Balconies, other than the use of the podium level, shall not encroach into this setback.	The residential tower at and below 3 storeys achieves a minimum 2m front setback to all street frontages.	
	Third floor and above: 5m for the 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor, with an increase of 1.2m for each storey of the building above the 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor (e.g. a 6 storey building would have the top 3 floors setback 7.4m from the front boundary and an 8 storey building would have the top 5 floors setback 11m from the front boundary Balconies are not to encroach into the	Due to the site having 3 street frontages a variation of front setback controls for the residential towers above 3 storeys is considered reasonable, particularly as nearby contemporary development over 3 storeys does not provide for a significant increase in front setback above 3 storeys. Above the commercial podium a variable setback is provided to the Pacific Highway. For Levels 1 to 4	
	encroach into the required setback of the level below.	Highway. For Levels 1 to 4 this setback is 2m to 4m. From Level 5 building setbacks range from 2m to 14m to the Highway, 6m to 8m to Oliver Road and 4m to 8m for Freeman Road. Given the narrow tower profiles to Freeman and Oliver Roads and the spacing between the 2 towers to the Highway, proposed building setbacks above 3 storeys are considered reasonable.	
	Development with a frontage to the Pacific Highway is to provide a minimum 4 metres landscaped setback at ground level and a 4m setback below ground level.	As the ground floor is proposed for commercial use a zero front setback is considered more appropriate and consistent with Council's expectations as illustrated in the street front setback diagrams on Page E1-18 of the DCP.	
	Splay corners are to be provide to all street corners at street level.	Splayed corners are provided to the 2 street corners.	

# Willoughby DCP – Part E and I6 Specific Controls for Commercial and Shop Top Housing Development \_\_\_\_8

|--|

		1
	•	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Side Setbacks Minimum setback from side boundaries:	The "side" boundaries of the site are to the street frontages of Freeman Road and Oliver	Side setbacks N/A. Side boundaries
	Ground floor: Zero setback; First & Second Floor; Zero setback for maximum of 50% of the length of the side boundary located within the front half of the	Road. Accordingly there are effectively no side boundaries. On this basis the proposal's building setback to Freeman Road and Oliver Road have been assessed against the controls for street front setbacks. As these are secondary street frontages,	are to secondary street frontages.
	site, subject to further stepping back in the rear half of the site.	some flexibility in setback to these streets is warranted. The commercial podium is	
	Third floor and above: 3m for the 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor with an increase of 1.2m for each storey above the 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor (applied to all floors from the 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor).	located close to the Freeman Road frontage. Above the commercial podium a minimum setback of 4m is provided to Freeman Road. This increases to 8m for Level 5 and above.	
	Rear Setbacks		
	Ground floor adjoining a residential boundary: Minimum of 3m. Upper floors (all floors above ground level); a minimum of 3m from the line of the ground floor rear wall below the first floor, with an increase of 1.2m for each storey of the building above first floor level.	The lower ground floor and ground floor levels are setback 6m from the rear boundary, double the minimum required, to provide for a wide deep soil landscaped area along the boundary. The west facing wall of Levels 1 to 4 are setback a minimum of 9m from the rear boundary. The minimum rear setback required for these levels is	Substantial Compliance (substantial additional setback provided at lower floor levels compensates for minor variations at 2 upper levels)
	Balconies & Verandahs	9m). The west facing wall of Levels 5 and 6 are stepped	
	Balconies and verandahs, other than rear balconies, may encroach upon the prescribed side and rear setbacks provided that the encroachment produces no adverse effect on the amenity of the adjoining	further back, providing a 12m minimum rear setback. Sufficient setback is provided to the rear boundary to achieve full compliance with the building separation requirements of the RFDC.	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	properties, is not enclosed (except by balustrades or a dividing wall) and does not encroach upon the required side setback so as to be closer than 2m to the side boundary. Rear balconies or planter boxes may not project beyond the line of the required setback of the level below. <i>Variations to side &amp; rear</i> <i>setback</i> Variations to side and rear setback may be permitted where Council is satisfied the encroachment produces no adverse effect on the amenity (privacy, solar access etc.) of the adjoining properties and the area between the building wall and the boundary is to be landscaped to Council's	Balconies encroach marginally into the southern side setback to Freeman Road, but have no amenity impact in this location. Balconies on Levels 1 to 4 encroach into the rear setback on Level 1 but are provided with planter boxes to maintain neighbor privacy. Above Level 1 balcony encroachments into the rear setback are very minor and result in no material impact on neighbor amenity. Rear balconies and planter boxes do not project beyond the setback of the floor below. The proposal seeks some modest variations to the side and rear setback controls on the grounds that the side boundaries are to public roads and landscaping to the rear boundary is twice the width of the minimum landscaping required under the DCP. Accordingly there is no adverse amenity impact to neighbouring residential properties.	Substantial compliance. Variations sought on the basis that the site has 3 street frontages and Council's preference for a tower building form rather than a lower but longer street
E1.5	satisfaction.		wall building.
Building Depth			
Ensure that the bulk of the development is in scale with the desired future context and provide adequate amenity for building occupants in terms of sun access and natural ventilation.	Development should have a maximum depth of 20m. Developments that propose buildings with a depth of greater than 20m must demonstrate how satisfactory natural lighting and ventilation are to be achieved.	Building depth for the most part does not exceed 20m as measured from any street frontage. A minor variation is sought for Levels 1 to 7 of Tower A (southwest corner) for optimum floor layouts. The affected units are corner units and a wider building form at the southwest corner	Substantial compliance (minor variation sought for southwest corner of Tower A at Levels 1 to 3.

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
		simplifies the tower form of Tower A, which is the taller of the 2 towers.	
		Notwithstanding a limited corner portion of Tower A extending to a depth of 2 to 3 metres more than 20m, the proposal achieves solar access and natural ventilation to a greater number of units than is required under the RFDC.	
		Eliminating the minor breach of the 20m maximum building depth control in the southwest corner would offer no material visual bulk, aesthetic or amenity benefit. Cutting out the southwest corner of Levels 1 to 7 would unnecessarily complicate the streamlined tower form proposed.	
E1.6			
Landscaping Requirements	Landscaping to rear		
Provide a high quality & attractive landscaping which enhances the setting of the buildings in	A 3m wide landscaped setback area is to be provided along a rear boundary adjoining residentially zoned land.	A 6m wide landscaped area is provided along the rear boundary and provides a total of 300m2 of landscaped open space at the rear.	Yes
the streetscape and enhances the amenity of a development by allowing for adequate open space, sunlight & shade.	Landscaping to podium & roof A minimum of 20% of podium and a minimum of 20% of rooftop open space is to be provided as vegetated area (turf, gardens & planters).	The podium is utilized for private terraces for Level 1 apartments and common open space (514m2). Some 400m2 (21.1%) of the podium level (1,425.2m2) (terraces and common area open space) is provided with landscaping.	Yes
Provide landscaping as a means of maintaining the amenity of surrounding		Some 88m2 (26.8%) of the rooftop common open space area (328m2) on Towers A and B will comprise landscaping.	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
development and provide absorptive areas for on-site infiltration of stormwater.	Location of site landscaping Landscaping should be provided within rear and side boundary setbacks, where a driveway is provided along a side boundary & in the area between recreational structures & the site boundary.	Landscaping is provided along the rear boundary as outlined above. The site's "side" boundaries are effectively secondary street frontages to Freeman Road and Oliver Road. Landscaping is provided along these frontages.	Yes.
E1.7 <u>Open Space</u> <u>Requirements for</u> <u>Shop Top Housing</u> <u>Developments</u>	Recreational Area For buildings comprising an 8 & 11 storeys of residential, provide an	The site has an area of 2,608.2m2 (after road widening). 60% of this area equates to 1,617m2.	Yes.
Provide a range of usable, attractive and accessible landscaped outdoor spaces and recreational areas for the use of occupants of shop-top housing. For sites providing open space at the ground level, to assist with stormwater management and on	area of recreational open space equivalent in area to at least 62% and 68% of site area. Using average Height 65% would apply. <i>Private Open Space</i> Balconies/terraces with a minimum dimension of 2m shall be provided for each unit, as follows:	1,347m2 of communal recreation space is provided (611m2 at ground level, 514m2 at podium level and 221.5m2 at roof level). In addition private recreation space of 1,538m2 (balconies and terraces) is provided for each unit. Total recreational/open space area (2,887m2) equates to more than 100% of site area (after road widening).	Yes
management and on- site drainage control.	<ul> <li>Studio &amp; 1 bedroom unit</li> <li>Minimum 10m2</li> <li>bedroom unit – Minimum 10m2</li> <li>3+ bedroom unit Minimum 15m2</li> </ul>	All balconies have a minimum depth of at least 2m for a length of at least 4m and all units have balconies areas at or larger than the minimum required.	Yes
	Communal areas 10m2 of communal area per dwelling, subject to such area having a dimension of not less than 5m and a minimum area of not less than 30m2.	Communal open space totaling 1,347m2 (611m2 at ground level, 514.5m2 at podium level & 221.5m2 at roof level) is provided. This equates to 21.7m2 of communal open space per dwelling.	Yes.

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
		Communal open space of more than 20m2 per dwelling is therefore provided where such space has a minimum dimension of 5m and area of 30m2.In addition a large community meeting/recreation room is provided at lower ground floor level.	
E1.8	Acoustic Privacy		
<u>Privacy</u> <u>Acoustic privacy</u> Ensure the provision of maximum acoustic privacy, both within the development itself & between the development &	Include effective sound insulation against road & traffic noise. Use noise resistant construction techniques/materials (e.g. mass of materials, thicker or double glazing to windows, insulation of	Suitable noise attenuation measures, such as double glazing of windows will be incorporated in units fronting the Pacific Highway. Mechanical equipment does not adjoin noise sensitive areas. If required, an acoustic report can be submitted with the development application.	Yes.
adjoining properties.	cracks and gaps). Mechanical equipment should be designed and located to minimize noise nuisance. Council may require a noise assessment report to be submitted by a qualified acoustic consultant.	The proposal will not have any unacceptable acoustic impacts on neighbouring properties, due to separation distance. Potential uses of the commercial floor space would not be significant noise generators. There are no proposed windows or balconies that	Yes Yes.
Visual Privacy	Visual Privacy	are located within 12m of windows or balconies located on adjoining land.	
Minimise overlooking of living spaces in dwellings and private open space. Balance the need for shop-top housing development with the achievement of a reasonable level of privacy between dwellings.	Limit windows & balconies that face directly onto windows, balconies or private open spaces of adjoining dwellings. Avoid windows being opposite and in close proximity to each other and splay location of windows to minimize direct views.	Where windows or balconies of units within the site are located within 12m of windows or balconies of other units on the site, suitable privacy measures such as screen walls, offsets, raised sills or translucent glass are provided.	Yes

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Use level changes, planter boxes and other techniques to minimize direct views.		
	Use screening such as landscape treatment, screening devices or translucent glass, where direct viewing is unavoidable.		
	Where windows or balconies are within 12m of windows or balconies of dwellings, some form of screen planting, offset of window locations, higher window sills or other appropriate measures must be used.		
E1.9			
<u>Views and Vistas</u> Siting and form of development must have regard to the creation, retention and enhancement of significant views and vistas from public places, into, out of and within the public domain and adjacent properties.	Existing views & vistas from & to commercial/residential precincts should be maintained. The sense of entry into a commercial precinct should be heightened by development which maintains and enhances the views and vistas from vehicular and pedestrian approaches.	There is a clear definition of the public and private domain and suitable fencing and access controls provided. Residential and commercial entrance lobbies are separated. The design provides for passive surveillance of the public domain. The DA will be accompanied by a "safety by Design" assessment.	Yes.
View sharing is encouraged, whilst not restricting reasonable development potential of a site.	Where possible, dwelling units should be designed with living areas facing views. However, windows should be positioned to avoid overlooking of adjoining property to gain views. Care should be taken to protect the views of existing buildings and	Development surrounding the site currently enjoys views over the existing low rise one and two storey buildings on the site. Given existing development controls provide for a 6 storey building on the site, current views over the site do not recognize the reasonable development potential of the site.	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	potential views from adjoining future buildings. Proposed development should be designed to maintain significant views where possible or achieve a degree of view sharing between properties. Where it is not possible for existing view levels to be maintained, any potential disruption to the primary view lines of adjoining developments should be minimized. The Site and Context Analysis prior to the preparation of a proposal must identify any significant views from the site and adjoining properties, including the public domain.	The additional building height sought under the Planning Proposal does not result in any material loss of views compared to a building constructed at the current maximum building height of 24m. This arises from the fact that neighbouring buildings to the west and south do not extend above a height of 18m and hence would have no views over a building of 18m height on the site. The only exception is the upper 2 floor levels of the apartment building at the southeast corner of Albert St. and the Highway. There will be a minor reduction in the arc of view for the west facing upper level apartments in this building, however compared to a street wall building, view impacts are less because a view corridor is created between the two proposed residential towers.	
E1.10 <u>Solar Access and</u> <u>Overshadowing</u> Development should be designed for adequate solar access in winter and summer and avoid potential for significant overshadowing of neighbouring dwellings, private open spaces, recreation areas and public areas, used by	Minimise overshadowing of adjacent buildings or open space by using measures such as variation to wall setbacks, roof form and building height and significant public areas. Control the desired amount of solar access to habitable rooms and recreational open space by considering building siting and orientation, height, placement of	91.7% of proposed units will achieve solar access of at least 2 hours in mid-winter between 9am and 3pm. Solar access is acceptable and complies with the requirements of SEPP 65. Shadow diagrams have been provided which demonstrate that there is no unacceptable overshadowing of neighbouring residential development.	Yes.

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
pedestrians such as malls, parks and the footpaths of commercial areas.	windows including the height of window sills, use of sun shading devices and location and species of planting. Shadow diagrams must be submitted to illustrate compliance with the controls. The north facing windows of living areas and the principal portion of the recreational open space of adjoining residential buildings should have at least 3 hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm on June 22. Where existing overshadowing by buildings and fences is greater than this, sunlight should not be reduced by more than 20%.	All neighbouring residential properties will continue to receive at least 2 hours solar access in mid-winter between the hours 9am and 3pm. This is the applicable solar access control in dense urban environments. The additional FSR and building height has been accommodated in a manner that results in a minimal increase in overshadowing compared to a complying building constructed in accordance with the current 18m maximum building height control. Existing residential properties receiving less than 3 hours mid-winter solar access reduced by more than 20%.	
E1.11 Service Facilities and <u>Amenities</u>		Off-street parking is provided in accordance with the Council's DCP requirements.	Yes
Adequate provision is to be made for service facilities and such facilities should be integrated with the design of the development and suitably sited for the convenience of occupants of the development.	<i>Electrical requirements</i> Substations to Energy Australia requirements and screened if able to be viewed from the street.	Vehicular access is designed in accordance with Australian Standards. Driveway access does not exceed 6m in width. Vehicular access is located in Freeman Road, separated from pedestrian access in Oliver Road & Pacific Highway.	Yes.
	Substations should preferably be located below ground level. Existing and new power and telecommunications are to be placed underground.	A substation location is provided at ground level in the southwest corner of the site screened by landscaping.	Yes

# Willoughby DCP – Part E and I6 Specific Controls for Commercial and Shop Top Housing Development \_\_\_\_16

Compliance	Table for	654-666	Pacific	Highway	Chatswood

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Plant & Equipment		
	All plant & equipment shall be acoustically treated to ensure that noise generation does not exceed 5dBA above the background noise level at the boundary of the site, at all times.	All plant and equipment will be located and designed to meet the prescribed noise emission standard. Site services facilities have been designed in accordance with the requirements of the DCP.	Yes.
	Site services and facilities (such as letterboxes & drying yards) should be designed to enable safe and convenient access by residents, be aesthetically designed and have regard to the amenity of adjoining developments and streetscape, require minimal maintenance and be visually integrated with the development.		
	Facilities such as laundries and storage areas should meet the needs of the users, be convenient and secure in terms of access and have adequate lighting. <i>Utility Services</i>		
	Utility services should be provided to meet the needs of the users, be considered at the design stage, be visually harmonious with the development and the streetscape and be separated from entry lobby and foyer areas (where applicable).	The basement and plant rooms and service ducts provide utility services to the residential and commercial components of the development. Detailed design of utility services will be in accordance with the requirements of the service authorities.	Yes.

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	The design, location and construction of utility services must meet the requirements of both the relevant servicing authority and Council.		
	Letterboxes		
	Letter boxes must be provided in accordance with Australia Post's Requirements for the Positioning and Dimensions of Mail Boxes in new Commercial and Residential Developments. There should be a separately identifiable residential address and entry in shop- top housing development.	Letter boxes are to be provided adjacent to the residential and commercial foyer entries.	Yes.
	Laundry facilities & drying yards		
	Laundry facilities should be incorporated into each dwelling unit. Drying yards and balconies are not to be located forward of the building line or within the setback to any street frontage and should not be visible from any public areas by the use of screens or landscaping.	Residential apartments are provided with internal laundry facilities, including space for a dryer. A suitably located and screened outdoor drying facilities are provided on the podium level and on the rooftop level.	Yes.
	Storage areas		
	Allow a space of 3m2 per dwelling exclusively for storage. This excludes wardrobe and cupboard areas incorporated into dwelling units. Storage space may form part of a garage.	Storage areas in excess of 3m2 are provided for all units.	Yes.

# Willoughby DCP – Part E and I6 Specific Controls for Commercial and Shop Top Housing Development

Compliance Table for 654-666 Pacific Highway Chatswood

1	8
•	~

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Public/common toilet		
	A building containing more than 10 dwelling units shall provide a toilet and washbasin in a convenient and accessible location at or near ground level for use by all who visit or reside on the premises.	A separate toilet and wash basin is provided in the lower ground floor car park.	Yes.
	TV antennae & satellite dishes		
	A master TV antenna or satellite dish is to be provided for each building. Individual antennae or dishes may not be placed on balconies or verandahs. Satellite dishes should not exceed 600mm diameter.	A master TV antenna will be provided on the roof of the building.	Yes.
	Plumbing		
	All plumbing pipes and installations must be concealed in internal ducts and not exposed on the external walls of the building and must be adequately soundproofed.	All plumbing pipes and installations are concealed.	Yes.
E1.12			
Reflectivity & Wind			
Development is to be designed and sited to avoid hazardous or undesirable glare to pedestrians,	Building materials and finishes which minimize adverse reflectivity are to be used. The use of glass of more than 20% reflectivity or other highly	The reflectivity requirements of the DCP will be achieved. Glass in the display glazing provided to the commercial podium will not have a mirrored finish.	Yes.
motorists, people using commercial areas and those in other buildings.	reflective external materials and finish are not permitted. Mirrored glass is not to be used on building exteriors.	A narrow depth awning is provided to more than 60% of the glazed area facing east towards the Highway.	Yes

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
Ensure that development is designed to avoid uncomfortable winds at pedestrian level in public areas.	Shade, angle or treat glass areas with horizontal, vertical or diagonal shading devices to reduce reflected solar radiation.	Future street trees will provide shade to the north facing podium glazing. Landscaping will shade west facing glazing to the podium. Most apartment glazing (other than south facing) includes shading (awnings, pergolas, roof of units above etc)	Yes
E1.13 <u>Awnings, Tree</u> <u>Planting and Paving</u> Provision of awnings over the commercial/retail component of development to aid climate control and shelter from rain and sun.	Provision of protection from rain and sun is to be provided in locations of high pedestrian activity, by way of awnings and colonnades. Entrances to large frontage development can incorporate raised or arched canopy elements to highlight entrances and break up the length of awnings. These should be appropriately scaled and be compatible with prevailing street awning character. Awnings are to be designed to permit street planting, provided at regular intervals. New awnings should maintain the continuity of the alignment of existing awnings. Awnings should be of opaque materials with glass inserts to allow light penetration and be continuous for the whole length of the building and setback 600mm from the footpath edge and include recesses for street trees.	An awning is provided along approximately 50% of the Highway frontage. Other street frontages have low pedestrian traffic. Weather protection is provided at the Oliver Road and Freeman Road pedestrian entries to the building. The western side of the Pacific Highway fronting the site and to the north and south, does not contain any existing awnings. Accordingly there is no prevailing awning character or form. The awning to the Highway is of relatively narrow depth, so that there is ample light penetration to the commercial tenancies, fronting the Highway and allows ample space for future street trees. The face of the awning is well setback from the kerb and gutter line and has a height above footpath of between 3m and 4.2m.	Yes.

2	0	

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Awnings should have a height of between 3m and 4.2m above footpath level and where the footpath is sloping, maintain the horizontal alignment by stepping down at regular intervals to follow the topography.		
	Footpath paving shall be provided in accordance with the Paving Policy.	Footpath paving will be provided in accordance with Council's Paving Policy.	Yes
E1.14			
<u>Sustainable</u> Development	Commercial/Retail Component		
The commercial component must comply with the provisions of Part E1.14 of the DCP. The residential component of shop top development must comply with the provisions of Part D2.14 of the DCP.	The commercial component must be designed to achieve an overall score of at least 24, while the retail component must achieve an overall score of at least 14 under the National Australian Built Environment Rating Scheme (NABERS). Proponents shall sign a NABERS Energy Commitment Agreement to achieve a minimum 4 star rating for the commercial/retail component.	The building will be designed to achieve the required NABERS rating when a development application is submitted.	Yes.
	A BASIX certificate pursuant to SEPP (BASIX) 2004 required for the residential component. In addition a Sustainability Scorecard (Attachment 1 to DCP – Sustainability Scorecard C2 – Multi Unit Residential) must be submitted demonstrating an overall score of 12 for high density residential.	A BASIX Certificate and Sustainability Scorecard achieving the required standards will be submitted with the development application.	Yes

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
E2 & E3			
Characteristics of Business Areas Chatswood CBD & Chatswood City Centre	The site adjoins the western boundary of Chatswood CBD/City Centre, which extends east from the Pacific Highway. The Chatswood CBD between the Pacific Highway and the North Shore Rail Line is the commercial office precinct of Chatswood, characterized by multi- storey office buildings intermingled with some older low scale office development and service retailing. Around the edges of the office precinct is some multi- storey mixed use development.	Development of the site for a mixed-use building in the form proposed will contribute positively to the Chatswood CBD/City Centre and maintain a mixed-use edge to the western precinct of the Chatswood CBD/City Centre.	Yes.
<ul> <li>1.6</li> <li><u>Locality 'J' West</u> <u>Chatswood</u></li> <li>Part I of the Willoughby DCP sets out controls for specific sites/areas.</li> <li>The subject land is located within Locality 'J' West Chatswood.</li> <li>Controls relevant to the subject land are identified in Column 2.</li> </ul>	Dwelling Types Multi-unit residential developments should provide for a mix of dwellings sizes, generally comprising 15% one bedroom units, 35% two bedroom units and 50% three bedroom units. Minimum floor areas are 75m2, 100m2 and 120m2 respectively.	The proposal is for a mixed use development in a CBD location and the controls in relation to apartment mix and sizes should therefore be applied more flexibly. The location of the site, fronting the Pacific Highway and adjoining the Chatswood CBD is more suitably developed for more affordable housing comprising studio, 1 and 2 bedroom units of more modest floor area. Unit mix proposed is as follows: 10x Studio units (16.13%) 6x1 bedroom units (9.67%) 43x2 bedroom units (69.4%) 3 x3 bedroom units (4.84%).	Variation to unit mix sought due to CBD location. (reduced provision of 3 bedroom units and increased provision of 2 bedroom units).

# Willoughby DCP – Part E and I6 Specific Controls for Commercial and Shop Top Housing Development

Compliance Table for 654-666 Pacific Highway Chatswood

2	2
2	2

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Allotment Size & lot Consolidation Objectives	The proposal complies with the minimum floor areas prescribed in the SEPP 65 Residential Flat Design Code.	
	Development in the area is to generally conform with the Lot Consolidation Plan and as a guide, should provide a minimum site area of 2,000m2 should be available as a consequence of a lot consolidation.	The site boundaries and lot area accord with the lot Consolidation Plan. The site has an area in excess of 2,000m2 and does not result in any residual allotments of less than 2,000m2.	Yes.
	Site Coverage For buildings of 6 or more storeys, a maximum site coverage of 24% of site area applies. Variations to the maximum site coverage requirements can be considered as long as the recreational open space and the natural landscape requirements, privacy, solar access and overshadowing considerations are complied with.	The proposal is for a mixed- use building rather than a residential building only. The podium of mixed-use buildings is intended to extend substantially across the site, apart from a minimum 3m rear setback, hence a 24% maximum site coverage is not appropriate. It should be noted that the proposal achieves adequate recreational and natural landscape area in the context of a mixed-use development and does not result in adverse privacy, solar access and overshadowing impacts on neighbouring properties.	Variation is sought as proposal is for a mixed use building in a mixed use zone.
	Significant trees indicated on the "retention of Significant Trees" map are to be retained with any development of the sites or to be replaced with advanced indigenous trees able to achieve similar height and maturity.	There are no trees on the site that are identified as significant trees for retention on the Retention of Significant Trees map. There is a significant tree identified on this Map as being located adjoining the site, in the northeast corner of No. 4 Freeman Road, fronting Oliver Road.	Yes.

Provision	Controls	Proposal	Compliance
	Trees to the Street	The proposed development, including any basement car parking and excavation, is located more than 12m from this tree. A number of existing trees on the site are to be removed and replaced with new tree planting along the rear boundary. A landscaping plan is enclosed separately.	
	Additional street tree planting is required for new development, as nominated by Council.	Street trees will be provided to the site frontages as required by Council.	Yes.