



30 January 2014,

Attention: May Li, Assessing officer,  
Lane Cove Council  
PO Box 20 Lane Cove  
NSW 1595

Your ref: DA # 176/2013

Dear Ms May Li,

**RE: comments on amendments to approved DA 7-15 Centennial Avenue Lane Cove**

I refer to your request for comment on this application 6<sup>th</sup> November. I refer also to the previous reports I have made on this development.

The applicant has acquired the property at number 15 Centennial Avenue and is therefore entitled to more floor space proportional to the size of the land added to the site.

The applicant's strategy for additional floorspace is to add a level to blocks B and C of the approved DA. In addition to planning in block A, 32 units are added to the development.

The additional levels raise 2 issues, namely, setbacks and solar access.

The documents provided state that the top level of blocks B and C of the new application are approved because they replicate plan of the previous application. These levels are now 3 m higher and are therefore not the same levels and cannot be considered to be approved.

**Setbacks**

The additional levels exacerbate what was, in my opinion, an already marginal application of the setback principles of SEPP 65. The additional floors increase the heights of blocks B and C by one floor. This results in insufficient building separation between blocks B and C and C and A. Buildings more than 4 storeys in height need an 18 m separation between balconies or habitable rooms. This application has 12 m separations.

The additional floor also has an impact on the side boundary setbacks. The northern boundary to block B should have the balcony edges and habitable rooms for levels above four storeys set back 9 m from the boundary. This issue is made more acute due to the way in which the buildings have been excavated into the site, effectively creating units below ground level.

Block B is a six-storey building. Block C is a six-storey building on the northern side and a seven-storey building on the southern side.



### **Solar access**

My previous reports question the degree to which the previous application achieved the minimum solar access requirements. This application was approved.

The additional floors, especially the addition to block B will negatively impact on the solar access to block C. Judging from the 'views from the sun' provided by the applicant, and comparing them to the views provided for the previous application, I estimate that 6 to 8 apartments in Block C will no longer receive the required amount of direct sunlight.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed amendments to this development do not result in a higher or equal level of amenity to the approved DA. Building separation and side setbacks are not sufficient and the solar access to block C is compromised.

In my opinion, the amendments do not meet the objectives of the following principles of good design. Built form and Amenity.

Tim Williams  
Architect AIA