

LANDSCAPE REFERRAL

To: Jonathan Goodwill
From: Tempe Beaven
Re: DA0110/11
Property: 6A- 8 Buckingham Road KILLARA NSW 2071
Proposal: Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of two residential flat buildings comprising 43 units, landscaping and associated works

Plans/reports sighted

Plan/document	Designer	Drawing No.	Date
Architectural	Aleksander Design Group	DA00-DA43	18/02/11
Survey	Usher and Co	1772-DET	22/10/04
Stormwater	ABC Consultants	C01.01 – C03.01 Rev A1	21/02/11
Landscape	Melissa Wilson	LS01-DA Sheet 1-3 Issue B	23/02/11
Deep Soil Landscape Compliance	Melissa Wilson	LS01-DA Sheet 4-5 Issue B	23/02/11
Basix Landscape Compliance	Melissa Wilson	LS01-DA Sheet 6-7 Issue B	23/02/11
Basix	Certificate no.	360906M	22/02/11
SOEE	Don Fox Planning		March 2011
Arborist's report	Urban Forestry		February 2011
Heritage Report	Archnex Designs		February 2011
Environment Site Management Plan	Alexsander Design Group		18/02/11

Recommendations

Not supported in current form for the following reasons:

1. Incorrect deep soil calculation[KPSO 25I (2)(c)]
2. Lack of clearly visible access to building from the street (DCP55 Section 4.6 C-4).
3. Lack of direct access between street frontage and building entrances (DCP55 Section 4.7 C-1(ii))
4. Inadequate communal open space in terms of a consolidated area of deep soil landscape area for tall tree planting that enhances biodiversity while providing

recognisable areas with reasonable space and facilities for recreation and social activities(Part 02, RFDC)

5. Insufficient information

Site Characteristics

The site (3792.2m²) falls steeply to the south-east approximately 17 metres. Killara Golf Course adjoins the sites southern boundary. The heritage listed property at No. 10 overlooks the upper section of the site from the west.

Deep Soil

Proposed - 54%

Agree with calculation? No

- Refer below

It is to be noted that the court approved development at 2-6 Buckingham Road Killara (DA1353/04) had a deep soil landscape area of 50% (Compliance Table, p12, SOEE, Dickson Rothschild, Jan 2006). Council's Landscape Officer disagreed with the deep soil landscape assessment as it omitted to exclude areas in accordance with the deep soil definition as per Clause 25D, Part IIIa, KPSO. A further S96 application including a basement connection was refused by Council with non-compliance with deep soil standard as a reason for refusal. This application relies on a basement extension on the adjoining development approval at 2-6 Buckingham Road which is considered unlikely to comply with the deep soil landscape standard.

Tree & Vegetation removal & impacts

An arborist report prepared by Urban Forestry, dated February 2011, has been submitted with the application. Tree numbers refer to this report.

Trees to be removed

20 trees on site are proposed to be removed.

Significant trees to be removed

Liriodendron tulipifera (Tulip Tree) Tree 15/12H/8S /420DBH, boundary between no. 6a and no. 8 Buckingham Road

Ginkgo biloba (Maiden-hair Tree) Tree 34/9H/5S /320DBH

The following trees are not considered significant due to size, location and condition. Their removal will not have an adverse environmental impact and is supported. Trees numbered: 5-14, 17, 19, 39, 45-48.

Existing screen planting (Trees 24-33) along the eastern boundary to the driveway consist of assorted species to approximately 4 metres in height including Oleander, Magnolia, Photinia, Cotoneaster, Crepe Myrtle. These plantings provide immediate amenity and could be retained in the short term in association with canopy tree planting.

Trees to be retained

Trees to be retained

Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda) Tree 23/12H, 10S, 400DBH, TPZ 4.8m, western boundary, adjoining property – proposed retaining wall 2.5m from tree

Jacaranda mimosifolia (Jacaranda) Tree 49/8H, 8S, 390DBH, western boundary, adjoining property – proposed retaining wall 2.0m and 3.5m from tree. Arborist recommends stepped retaining walls along the access path.

Melia azedarach 'Australasica' (White Cedar) Tree 50/9H, 12S, 450DBH, western boundary, rear yard – proposed retaining wall 2.0m and 3.5m from tree. Arborist recommends removal due to possible structural instability due to proximity on three sides of retaining walls. Landscape Plan shows tree to be retained.

Of the trees shown to be retained, 2 are recommended in the arborist report for removal and are exempt under Council's TPO (40,41) and one is an Urban Environmental Weed (Council's Weeds Management Policy)(51).

Trees 21, 22, 44 and 52 are less than 8m in height.

Street trees to be removed

Both of the existing street trees are proposed to be removed. Both trees are less than 5m high and display normal form and vigour. Replacement planting of three *Angophora floribunda* (Rough Barked Apple) is proposed.

Landscape Plan

Front setback

The proposed 9.8-11.0m front setback results in a reduced area for deep soil landscape for the establishment of tall trees. To provide for viable establishment of significant canopy trees, proposed tree planting of *Eucalyptus saligna* (Sydney Blue Gum) should be planted minimum 8m from the building. Views to heritage property at No. 10 Buckingham Road have been considered in tree layout.

Driveway

Proposed 7-14 metre width basement connection to 2-6 Buckingham Road is located within the eastern side setback of Building A. The location of such a large structure within the side setback restricts the provision of effective landscape treatment to eastern elevation of Building A and should be avoided.

(KPSO LEP194, Clause 25D(2)(c), DCP55 Section 5.1 C-7(v))

Building entrance/disabled access

The proposed entrance to the development is via the eastern side setback and includes a 3m high set of stairs. All disabled access from the street to the development is via the Building A entry and requires a 'wheelchair accessible platform lift' (PSE Access Consulting, 9/02/11). The proposed stair lift is within 3m of bedroom window of Apartment 4 (DCP55 Section 4.5.3 C-3). Disabled access to Building B continues via the lifts through the basement and an external path to Level 2 of Building B. The disabled access route through the basement is not clearly delineated.

As this is the main pedestrian access to both blocks of units and to provide a more legible building entry, it is recommended that the building be entered via disabled ramps from a central position in the front setback rather than via a side access with a stair-lift.

Common Open Space

The proposal provides communal open spaces to the front, central and rear setback.

Communal open space – front setback

The front setback has adequate solar access however provides no useable area.

Communal open space – between Building A and B

The central open space area is a small terrace with disabled access via Building A. The area has poor solar access, outlook, privacy or amenity.

Communal open space – along southern boundary

The rear setback includes a linear communal open space. To meet the objectives of SEPP65 and NSW Residential Flat Design Code requirement for useable open space, it is recommended that private open space areas be modified to enable further amenity to be provided in the form of a concentrated area that will provide generous tall tree planting and useable residential amenity, particularly at the southwest corner.

Additional communal open space is provided as a roof terrace on Building B. The terrace overlooks the Killara Golf Course and incorporates a BBQ.

Private courtyards

To provide effective landscaping screening, all private courtyards should allow for generous planting areas within site setbacks.

Proposed 1.65 to 3.09m excavation for Apartment 4, 2m from the building, in association with fencing and screen planting will provide poor solar amenity.

On-slab planting

Proposed 800mm depth over the basement connection to the basement of No. 2-6 Buckingham Road (refer Section B, DA22, Alexsander Design Group, 18/02/11) including subsurface drainage, is suitable for shrubs only and is considered insufficient for tall tree planting (RFDC Planting on Structures). This would mean that a section of approximately 8m of Building A side setback will have insufficient deep soil for effective planting in scale with the building. Proposed planting of *Eucalyptus paniculata* (Grey Ironbark) and *Alphitonia excelsa* (Red Ash) would not be viable.

Proposed planting over basement directly to the north of Building B, conflicts with the proposed architectural sections that show no soil depth (refer Section A, Part 2 DA21, Alexsander Design Group, 18/02/11).

Screen Planting

Building A

Eastern boundary – *Polyscias sambucifolia* (Elderberry Panax) 1.5m

Western boundary – *Kunzea ambigua* (Tick Bush) 1.5m

Building B

Eastern boundary – *Polyscias sambucifolia* (Elderberry Panax) 1.5m, *Melaleuca decora* (White Feather Honey Myrtle) 5m, *Backhousia myrtifolia* (Grey Myrtle) 6m

Western boundary – *Melaleuca decora* (White Feather Honey Myrtle) 5m, *Ceratopetalum gummiiferum* (NSW Christmas Bush) 4m

Southern boundary – *Ceratopetalum gummiiferum* (NSW Christmas Bush) 4m

The screen planting species are adequate in height and depth in relation to the proposed development.

Tree replenishment

DCP55 requires for a site of this size one tall tree per 300sqm of the site area or part. With a site area of 3792sqm DCP55 requires a minimum of thirteen (13) tall trees to be planted on site. A total of 24 have been proposed.

Basix

Common area landscape nominated for indigenous or low water use species – 1041m².
No indigenous/low water use planting nominated in private open space areas.

Stormwater Plan

The stormwater plan is inconsistent with architectural and landscape plans in regards to location of retaining walls, paths and pits. To preserve existing trees along eastern boundary the proposed stormwater line should be relocated as close to building as possible.

Details of the proposed new interallotment drainage easement are to be provided.
Details of the proposed pipe to be located within existing easement are to be provided.

Other issues and comments

Front Fence

No proposed front fence.

CONCLUSION

Not supported in the current form for the following reasons,

1. Incorrect deep soil calculation (KPSO 25I (2)(c))

Areas to be excluded,

- Stair lift and path of travel
- Screening to windows
- Proposed new interallotment drainage easement along rear eastern boundary
- Area of deep soil landscape area less than 2m width

- Retaining walls where soil gradients greater than 1:3 including the following; to runs of steps over 1m in height, between proposed entry path and eastern side boundary, between Tree 23 and proposed retaining wall.
- 2. Lack of clearly visible access to building from the street (DCP55 Section 4.6 C-4).
- 3. Lack of direct access between street frontage and building entrances (DCP55 Section 4.7 C-1(ii))
- 4. Inadequate communal open space in terms of a consolidated area of deep soil landscape area for tall tree planting that enhances biodiversity while providing recognisable areas with reasonable space and facilities for recreation and social activities(Part 02, RFDC)
- 5. Insufficient information
 - a. Stormwater plan to be provided at 1:100
Details of the proposed new interallotment drainage easement is to be provided. Details of the proposed pipe to be located within existing easement is to be provided.
 - b. Landscape Plan is unsatisfactory for the following reasons,
 - Proposed interallotment drainage easement to be shown
 - Arrow identifying plant species to symbol should be heavier
 - Top of wall heights to all proposed retaining walls to be shown.
 - Spot levels at the base of all trees to be retained to be shown.
 - To provide viable planting areas, soil gradients greater than 1:3 are not supported including the following; to runs of steps over 1m in height, between proposed entry path and eastern side boundary, between Tree 23 and proposed retaining wall.
 - Landscape plan to address recommendations in arborist report in regards to location of retaining walls in vicinity of Tree 49, and removal of Tree 50.

Drawing inconsistencies

Retaining walls between Building A and B on Landscape Plan and architectural plans are inconsistent. Stormwater plan is inconsistent with the Landscape Plan.

Tempe Beaven
Landscape Development Officer

Ian Francis
Team Leader Landscape
Services