



92-96 Victoria Avenue, Chatswood

Prepared by: SJB Planning
Date prepared: 17 December 2020
SJB Reference: 8889

Item #	Council Comment	Comments
Key Issues for Consideration and officer comments		
1.	<p>Relationship to strategic planning framework</p> <p><i>The Planning Proposal will require justification with sufficient detail to demonstrate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ consistency with the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the North District Plan and;➤ consistency with local strategic planning documents - in particular the Local Strategy Planning Statement, Willoughby Local Centres Strategy to 2036 and the Willoughby Housing Strategy 2036 <p>Officer comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The strategic merit in exploring town house (missing middle) type development is recognised.• The site is located close to public transport being adjacent to North Willoughby Local Centre. (The reference in the Draft Local Centres Strategy to “East Chatswood” was changed following public consultation).• Rezoning to R3 would also permit residential flat building. An option of an additional permitted use in the R2 Low Density Residential zone was discussed as an alternative.• The possibility of the owner utilising the Seniors Housing SEPP as has been carried out next door was flagged as a possibility.• A pick up in the market for town house development type in the Willoughby LGA was acknowledged	<p>Refer to Part 4 Strategic Planning Context of the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal does not seek to rezone the site to facilitate multi-dwelling housing, rather it seeks to introduce this land use by way of an amendment to Schedule 1.</p>
2.	<p>Density and Height</p> <p><i>Proposal seeks an FSR of 1.32:1. Heights of 3 storeys with a 4th storey setback on the western section of the site transitioning down to 2 with a 3rd storey setback on the eastern section of the site.</i></p> <p>Officer comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council's existing FSR control for the R3 zone is a maximum of 0.9:1.• FSR of 1.32:1 is considered to be too high.• Reference was made to the low density scale of the neighbouring aged care home with a room in roof style• The setback 4th storey is of concern. Consideration should be given to 2 storeys with a 3rd storey setback to the western section of the site transition down to 2 storeys towards the eastern section of the site.• Privacy towards the aged care development needs to be considered	<p>An FSR of 1.32:1 I proposed and is supported by an Urban Design Report prepared by CM+ (refer to Attachment 1). The Urban Design Report demonstrates a built form across that site that is of a bulk and scale commensurate with surrounding built form.</p> <p>Building envelope modelling showing 12m building heights and corresponding storeys has been prepared to demonstrate consistency with building envelope modelling undertaken for East Chatswood Local Centre as part of the draft Local Centres Strategy.</p> <p>Refinement of building designs, including opportunities to establish more tailored height controls is available to Council through the preparation of site specific DCP controls. The proposed uplift in building heights proposed in the Planning Proposal is provided as a maximum, ensuring flexibility for an architectural response to the site, noting the proponents intent to design multi dwelling housing in a terrace form at 2.5 storeys and 3.5 storeys. Refer to the Urban Design Report prepared by CM+ at Attachment 1 for precedent images that demonstrate these design outcomes.</p> <p>The Urban Design Report details opportunities for deep soil planting along the eastern boundary to effectively screen and buffer the site from the adjacent aged care. Upper storey elements including windows and balconies would need to be properly designed and assessed at DA stage to comply with Council's controls for ensuring adequate privacy and amenity is amenity afforded to both the development site and surrounding properties. The indicative built form prescribed in the Urban Design Report is able to demonstrate a setback range of 3m-4.7m along the eastern boundary.</p>
3.	<p>Home business / occupation “Soho” design concept</p> <p><i>Given the proximity of the site to the North Willoughby Local Centre, an option of home business / occupation for the terraces facing the south section towards George Brain Lane could be explored as an option.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>



	Officers Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>This would not be considered as a rezoning (business zone) option. Home business / occupation are permissible uses in the Land Use Table.</i>	
4.	Shadowing <i>Winter solstice diagrams were presented and discussed</i> Officer comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Generally overshadowing implications does not appear to be an issue</i>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Shadow modelling of an indicative multi dwelling housing scheme is provided with the Urban Design Report prepared by CM+ at Attachment 1. The shadow analysis demonstrates overshadowing can be appropriately managed across the site and adjoining properties.</p>
5.	Parking / visitor parking <i>Access to underground parking is proposed from George Brain Lane. WDCP requirement of 2 metre setback from George Brain Lane has been included.</i> Officer comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Note that gradient ramp / transitions for the car park entrance is required to be located on the site and not within the 2 metre setback.</i><i>Consideration of lane widening along the western side of the site noting the townhouse style development fronting the laneway.</i>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The indicative design proposal prepared in support of the Planning Proposal provides demonstrates vehicular access to to/from the site with the gradient ramp/ transition for basement car park on the site and not within the required 2m setback along George Brain Lane.</p> <p>The widening of George Brain Lane to the west of the site is considered more appropriate to be undertaken as part of the redevelopment of East Chatswood Local Centre with opportunities for this to connect to the proposed through-site link and ground floor commercial land uses.</p>
6.	Landscaping provision <i>Deep soil landscaping and communal open space form part of the proposal.</i> Officer comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Acknowledged that existing WDCP controls for R3 are difficult to achieve as they relate more towards residential flat buildings. Council staff are reviewing this and this can be reviewed further with applicant. For townhouses, individual open space is more important, however, communal tree canopy is encouraged.</i>	<p>Noted.</p>
7.	Affordable Housing <i>Affordable housing was not discussed at the meeting.</i> Officer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Applicant to note that in areas “upzoned,” a minimum of 4% affordable housing should be provided by the development in accordance with Council’s existing LEP and DCP requirements.</i>	<p>The proposal does not seek to amend the existing R2 Low Density Housing zoning, but rather introduce multi dwelling housing as a specific land use to the site. Corresponding opportunities for uplifts in heights and FSR will be subject to the realisation of multi dwelling housing on the site.</p>
8.	Adaptable housing Officer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Applicant to note that 1 in 4 dwellings are required to be adaptable under the WDCP.</i>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Matters relating to adaptable housing will be addressed as part of any future DA.</p>
9.	Waste Management Officer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Whilst not an issue for the Planning Proposal, applicant may consider early stage discussions with Councils Resource Recovery Team Leader to consider options.</i>	<p>Noted.</p>
10.	Documentation required for Planning Proposal <i>Clarification of what is required to be submitted.</i> Officers Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Clear definition of WLEP 2012 changes</i><i>Traffic impact report. Issues to address include</i>	<p>Noted, refer to the Planning Proposal for details on WLEP 2012 changes and justifications.</p> <p>Refer also to the Traffic and Transport Study at Attachment 2.</p> <p>Given the land use history of the site and the presence and age of the existing residential built dwellings, it is considered that a Stage 1 contamination assessment is not required. This can be provided if requested as an outcome of the Gateway Determination.</p> <p>Refer to Tree Assessment at Attachment 3.</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none">- access arrangements along George Brain Lane- access of vehicles turning into George Brain Lane from Victoria Avenue (particularly via the western end of the lane) and the potential for delays to traffic flow at the intersection of Victoria Ave and Penshurst St (which is a classified road).- visitor parking arrangements- accessible parking spaces- bicycle parking- existing users of the laneway- applicant to note Council's draft Integrated Transport Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stage 1 contamination assessment• Justification for rezoning. <p><i>Note that Council's comprehensive LEP Planning Proposal is currently progressing. This includes the changes proposed for North Willoughby as adopted in the Local Centres Strategy with a target exhibition period in the first half of 2021.</i></p>	
---	--