

Development Application DA2019/0505

RESPONSE MATRIX to Council Withdrawal request letter dated 24th July, 2019

Rebecca: Thank you for extending the time frame for response through to the 28th of August 2019. In response to Councils above noted letter, please find following Crawford Architects responses, to be read in conjunction with revised documentation.

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
Footpath levels and flooding Clause 6.3 (Flood Planning) of WLEP 2011 Clause D18 (Accessibility) of WDCP 2011 Clause E11 (Flood Prone Land) of WDCP 2011		
Whilst the internal floor levels of the ground floor spaces comply with the nominated flood planning levels, compliance is only achieved by considerable ramping of the footpath, with gradients up to 22%. The proposed gradient of the footpath is inconsistent with Council's standard 3% gradient for footpaths across Dee Why Town Centre, and is inconsistent with accessibility gradients and relevant Australian Standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ramping of the footpath has been corrected – with 3% footpath gradient implemented.- Split level retailing has been introduced, with the lower level of each unit providing level accessible access to the space. The upper level of the shop, meeting the required flood levels, is accessed via individual short 1:14 ramps in each retail space.	✓

crawford architects pty ltd
suite 3.01, level 3, 80 mount street
north sydney, NSW 2060
t 02 9660 3644

Nominated Architects
Tony Gray 5303 Paul Godsell 6726

A quality endorsed company to ISO 9001
ABN 56 120 779 106

www.crawford.com.au

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
It is noted that upgrade works have occurred to the footpaths along both the Pittwater Road and Oaks Avenue frontages, including upgrades to stormwater infrastructure to reduce flooding in the locality. However, the effects of these upgrades have not been modelled by Council, and the as built upgrades have not been reflected in survey detail provided to support the application.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Survey Provided completed: now reflects upgrades as built. - Amended Stormwater plans provide connection to plan 	✓
It is highly likely that flood levels have reduced as a result of these works, which may mitigate some of the design challenges facing this application. However, the applicant would be responsible for modelling the effect of these upgrades and providing updated flood levels for the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Retailing spaces have been lowered to provide accessible access, but only the front portion to a maximum plan depth of 5m. The remaining ancillary floor area of each shop is above the flood level. - On this basis, a flood study has not been undertaken. 	<div>✓</div> <div>X</div>
Stormwater Management C4 (Stormwater) of WDCP 2011		
The proposed Stormwater Concept Plan is unsatisfactory. The proposed point of stormwater discharge is to Council's road drainage in Oaks Avenue. Stormwater infrastructure within Oaks Avenue has been constructed by Council, and is inconsistent with the provided information and proposed discharge point as shown on the Stormwater Concept Plan. The Applicant shall provide updated survey information of the stormwater infrastructure and an updated Stormwater Concept proposal as part of any future submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed point of discharge amended: - Updated survey and stormwater plans provided as requested. 	✓
Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate compliance with Council's OSD Technical Specification. The minimum information required to be submitted is detailed in Section 3.3, including the provision of DRAINS model. It shall be demonstrated that the permissible site discharge is restricted to the "state of nature" (0% impervious) condition for all storm durations for the 5-year, 20-year and 100-year ARI storm event. The long section of the proposed connection to Council's road drainage line shall be supported by a HGL analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRAINS model has been provided. - Long section is also now provided. - An HGL analysis for the connection has not been provided, since in the flood design event, the pipe is full. 	<div>✓</div> <div>X</div>

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
Communal open space & building height Clause 4.3 (Height of Buildings) of WLEP 2011 Objective 3D (Communal and Public Open Space) of the ADG		
With a maximum building height of 28.27m, the proposed development is reliant upon a variation to the 24m maximum building height development standard prescribed by clause 4.3 of WLEP 2011. Whilst it is appreciated that draft amendments to WLEP 2011 have been publically exhibited to provide for an increased height of 27m at the subject site, the amendments have been delayed by Parliamentary Counsel and are not imminent or certain at this stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With a repositioned and redesigned roof top communal open space, no part of the roof exceeds 27m in height as measured from natural ground. 	✓
The clause 4.6 submission provided to support the application states that the height exceedance is a result of the proposed incorporation of rooftop communal open space, which is of benefit to the entire future population of the development. The rooftop terrace is promoted as an area of high amenity that is equitably sited for use of all residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The roof top communal open space has been shifted to the lower eastern roof, with all permanent structures located beneath the 27m height limit. - New height blanket drawings have been provided to illustrate compliance has been achieved, albeit still located at the higher roof level, not one level down. 	✓
However, concern is raised in relation to the design of the rooftop communal area, noting that there is no direct accessible access for occupants on the eastern side of the building, nor any protection from the elements, including rain, direct sunlight and winds likely experienced at the height proposed. The amenity of the communal open space is considered to be paramount in relation to the proposed development noting that a significant portion of the proposed areas of private open space will receive little to no sunlight for the majority of the year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both the roof top and level 7 residential floor have been redesigned: - Full accessible access from any unit is now possible. - Level 7 redesign includes for a corridor that links the lift cores A and B, allowing any unit to arrive at level 7, then either use the stairs or open-air platform lift to access the roof. - The roof has been contained to just the eastern side of the development where it is 700mm lower than the western side. It has however a footprint that takes the full width of the eastern block, so the area provided remains similar. 	✓

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
Continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The amenity provided includes several individual seating areas, a BBQ area (with sinks), and large format fixed umbrellas for shelter. - A full perimeter glazed wind barrier is provided, to height that sits below the 27m height limit. - The level 7 A-core lantern structure has been deleted. 	
As proposed, the design of the communal open space does not reflect consistency with the objectives and guidelines of Objective 3D of the ADG. As such, the application is not considered to demonstrate that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravention of the existing and proposed maximum building height development standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The redesigned communal open space is now not only fully accessible, but fully equitable as well. - The previous design required those in tower B to use several lift movements to get to and from the space. However, the redesign of Level 7 lift core B halves these movements, and places them on par with all residents whose units are served by lift core A. 	✓
In this respect, you are encouraged to delete the four x Level 7 units on the eastern side of the building, with the resultant floor area to be used for communal open space. This will facilitate direct lift access to the communal space from both lifts/sides of the building, and allow for the provision of protective wind barriers and roof forms below the maximum building height development standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The redesigned communal open space is now fully equitable and has been achieved without the need to reduce unit numbers. - The amended lift overruns also now height complete – being 3600 clear from level 7 to lifting eye, and a nominal 200mm waterproofed concrete lid structure - The level 7 A-core lantern structure has been deleted 	✓
Traffic, Driveway and Basement Design Clause C2 (Traffic, Access and Safety) of WDCP 2011 Clause C3 (Parking Facilities) of WDCP 2011		
Insufficient information has been provided with regard to the proposed access driveway. A long-section at both edges of the proposed access driveway, with relevant gradients, across the road reserve to the proposed carpark is required to demonstrate compliance with AS2890	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long sections now provided, illustrating compliance has been easily achieved. 	✓

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
The servicing of the site is proposed from a loading bay within the basement. No swept paths have been provided to demonstrate how large vehicles will enter and exit the site in a forward direction. Further, the applicant must demonstrate that Council's refuse vehicle can enter and exit the site in a forward direction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Swept paths for large vehicles have been provided with TTM report, showing 3 point turns within B1, - Report confirms large vehicles can both enter and leave the site in forward direction. - Rubbish removal from commercial refuse and recycling areas will not be undertaken by council, but private contractor, whom will operate from a small garbage truck. - Crawford Architects note the manoeuvring within the basement is provided with greater space than the previously approved DA for the L-shape site. 	✓
Bicycle parking at the rate of 1 bike rack per dwelling is required, in addition to 1 bike rack per 200m ² or retail floor space. Insufficient bicycle parking is proposed in the current application.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional Bike parking provided as requested. - Primarily located as a large single bank on B2, but includes the minor bike rank banks in locations throughout other basements as previously shown. 	✓
Whilst technically compliant with respect to the allocation of car parking, further refinement is required in relation to the location of parking spaces and access between the retail lift and retail bin store. It is considered that the retail lift should be designed to also access the upper level of Basement Level 1 (to connect straight to the loading zone and bin store) and for the retail and visitor spaces on Basement Level 2 to be reversed to be in closer proximity and on the same level as the relevant lift/s.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retail lift has been redesigned to also access the upper level of Basement Level 1 with a connection straight to the loading zone and bin store - A through-type lift has been introduced to assist with this circulation, but also allows retailers to enter and leave the lift in a forwards direction (preferable if they use small trolleys to transfer product/rubbish) - The retail and visitor spaces on Basement Level 2 have been reversed as requested - One parking space has been removed - The Access control vehicular roller shutter repositioned. - The lift threshold at street level has also been lifted to above the flood level, with a small ramp and flight of steps added to maintain full accessibility. 	✓

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
The traffic generation associated with the retail component of the development has been calculated based on the number of car spaces, as opposed to RMS Guidelines. As such, the peak traffic generation is considered to be underrepresented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request has been actioned: - TTPA response has been provided, adjusting and accessing amended peak traffic generation. 	✓
Inadequate / insufficient information Further detail is required to:		
a: Demonstrate the level of solar access to each individual living room and area of private open space in midwinter at minimum intervals of 30mins, consistent with the requirements of Objective 4A-1 of the ADG (ie: 1m ² of direct sunlight, measured 1m above ground).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full compliance with ADG, with respect to solar access, is always going to be difficult to achieve on this site, given the long south facing Oaks Avenue façade couple with several single aspect units per floor, and councils requirements for courtyard placement. <p><i>Living rooms and private open spaces of at least 70% of apartments in a building receive a minimum of 2 hours direct sunlight between 9 am and 3 pm at mid winter in the Sydney Metropolitan Area and in the Newcastle and Wollongong local government areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results of solar study provision at 30min intervals, as shown on architectural drawings A400 and A401, have been scheduled on the provided Solar Matrix – showing provision of 52% units 	X
b: Confirm that the FFL of the Retail Lobby on the ground floor is compliant with the FPL,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retail Lobby amended for FPL compliance: - A small switchback ramp and small flight of steps has been provided to obtain full accessibility. 	✓

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
c: Define and promote the entrance of the Retail Lobby as the primary entrance to the basement carpark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The entrance to the Retail lobby is now larger, containing both steps and a ramp. - However, the 7 storey pronounced slot between the 2 parts of the western façade on Pittwater Road remains unchanged, as does the lobbies' full width skylight to bath the lobby lift recess in natural light. - It is quite well defined for a carpark entrance. 	✓
d: Confirm that the fire stairs to the basement accessed from Pittwater Road are consistent with BCA requirements (that the landing be 500mm above the FPL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are 2x fire stairs on the Pittwater Road Frontage. - The northern stair comes up from the basement, to a point 500 above the FPL, the drops back down to the street, implementing a stepped weir arrangement – apologies, the arrows on the stairs were missing from the original DA documentation. - The southern stair comes from above, with the FPL requirements met by default of a rising stair. 	✓
e: Demonstrate the intended glazing treatment of windows on the western façade to minimise heat loading and satisfy the provisions of s101 of SEPP (Infrastructure) with respect to acoustics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The western façade (which has northwest aspect) is not entirely glass: A large proportion is either precast concrete or insulated aluminium timber-look panel. - The glazing to windows flush with the façade shall be detailed as double glazed units, with V-lam-hush used as one of the layers. This arrangement will control both acoustics and thermal performance. - Furthermore, the balconies are predominately setback, with the balcony providing additional sun control heat loading sound baffling. 	✓

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
f: Demonstrate an acceptable design/treatment for the proposed ventilation openings above the front doors presenting to the naturally ventilated lobby, certified as being consistent with necessary BCA fire separation requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crawford Architects have approached both TTM (acoustic engineers) and MEINHARDT (mechanical engineers) to provide us with their professional opinions on the proposed corridor arrangements. Both indicated that nothing new or out of the ordinary was being proposed, and have therefore provided corresponding letters describing the physical requirements of the louvres acoustic performance, and corresponding anticipated natural air flow characteristics. - Furthermore, Crawford Architects also reconfirmed the fire separation requirements, given the louvres will be placed into a SOU (Sole Occupancy Unit) wall. This was deemed a non-issue – with several solutions possible, one being the proposed corridor ceiling mounted small-format fire shutter, as shown on sections. 	✓
g: Demonstrate, by virtue of an acoustic report, that noise levels within the open/naturally ventilated lobby and between apartments will be acceptable if all openings are open.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report provided: - Prepared by TTM. 	✓
Design and amenity Apartment Design Guide The layout of the proposed residential units is inconsistent with a number of design criteria and guidance of the ADG. In particular, concern is raised with regard to:		
a: The width of Apartments 102A, 202A, 302A, 107A, 207A and 307A is less than the 3.6m minimum for one bedroom apartments, as prescribed by Objective 4D-1 of the ADG. These apartments are also non-compliance with the 8m maximum depth prescribed by Objective 4D-2 of the ADG. The combination of these non-compliances is unacceptable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding units 102A, 202A and 302A: The bathroom and kitchen of these units have been rearranged. - The (visitable) bathroom has been pushed back to the rear of the unit, with the Kitchen now located centrally. This not only widens the unit as requested, but brings the kitchen out of the rear corner, and allows it to be part of the living space. 	✓

Council Comment	Architectural Response	OK ?
Continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding units 107A, 207A and 307A: - The balcony has been increased by reducing bedroom width, and changing the access. - The minimum bedroom dimensions have been maintained by taking a little out of the cupboards in the unit directly to the west of each one. - This removes one non-compliance – however the depth remains marginally outside the ADG minimums. 	<div>✓</div> <div>✗</div>
b: Without confirmation of the design intent of the openings above front doors presenting to the naturally ventilated lobby, and resolution of consequential acoustic and general amenity impacts, consistency with the 60% minimum requirement for natural cross ventilation prescribed by Objective 4B-3 of the ADG is not achieved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The detail has been confirmed to be workable, with the >60% cross ventilation numbers achieved 	<div>✓</div>
c: The studies in Apartments 103A, 203A and 303A do not receive any natural light or ventilation, inconsistent with Objective 4D-1 of the ADG.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed studies have been removed. A Walk-in-linen/store has been introduced with corresponding door 	<div>✓</div>
Notification Sign Clause A.7 (Exhibition, Advertisement and Notification of Applications) of WDCP 2011		
In accordance with email correspondence (dated 18 July 2019), date stamped photographic evidence of the notification sign on site at the beginning and end of the notification period is required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completed by Client: and already provided to council on the 28th June 2018 	<div>✓</div>

Regards



Paul Adrian Godsell
 Director – Crawford Architects
 B.Arch Registration No.6726

