

RESPONSE DOCUMENT



Project:	DA2020/1756	Project #:	18057
Address:	351 & 353 Barrenjoey Road, Newport	Date of issue:	2021.07.13
to:	Northern Beaches Council	Issue number	02
Subject:	Response to Council letter dated 27th May	By:	PAUL GODSELL

Jordan, in response to councils letter dated 27th May 2021, and in addition to the drawings already provided, please find below an item by item response to all issues raised.

#	Council cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
1	<p>Site Amalgamation – In accordance with Clause D10.19 PDCP, the Newport Masterplan identifies that the subject land could be amalgamated with the sites to the north-west, 31 Foamcrest Avenue, owned by Australia Post. The Newport Masterplan encourages site amalgamation as per Figure 5.2 to achieve an outcome to ‘avoid a situation where lots are isolated and unable to be developed to their full potential’ and to ‘minimise driveway crossings and optimise access’.</p> <p>The application is not supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that amalgamation attempts with adjoining properties have been exhausted. In order for Council to be satisfied that amalgamation is not readily feasible and the north-eastern side of Robertson Road could not be developed as one concept, evidence of fair offers (in writing) and the decline of such offers (in writing) is to be provided to demonstrate this opportunity has been explored</p>	<p>First response – Letter provided by Prestige Properties, indicating that Steve Bell, the National Asset Manager of Australia post, had advised that Australia Post has no intention of selling their asset, being 31 Foamcrest Avenue.</p> <p>Second response – Provision of correspondence from Tony Westaway, Head of Asset Management for Australia Post, confirming they have no intension of disposing of the adjacent Foamcrest avenue site.</p> <p>Please note that although Australia post appear to wish to remain in operation from this site for the foreseeable future, item 2, provision of future link capability to both adjacent properties, will still form part of Crawford Architects amended documentation</p>	✓




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 and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
2	<p>Link through basement - Applicant to demonstrate the basement carpark is capable of providing a future link through to the northern property 355 Barrenjoey Road, as required by Figure 4.2 Newport Master Plan and clause D10.19 PDCP. Applicant shall provide details by a suitably qualified engineer and traffic engineer confirming the design is capable of accommodating this future link.</p>	<p>The future links to both adjacent properties are shown at both Basement level 1 and Basement level 2.</p>	
3	<p>Height of Buildings – Council does not support any height breach of 8.5m above the flood planning level for Area 3 as prescribed by Clause 4.3(2C). The building shall be designed to comply with the height limit for this area to allow solar access to the adjoining footpath area and the future pedestrian plaza area which is required to be provided within the development site on 349 Barrenjoey Road and as identified in the Newport Masterplan.</p>	<p>The following adjustments have been made</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 unit has been removed - The intrusion into the 8.5m height limit areas has been significantly reduced as shown on A110. - Through solar analysis, it was discovered that it was not the top floor structures (level 2) causing the shadowing of the adjoining footpath and future pedestrian plaza, but the envelope of the middle floor structures (level 1) that were impacting at 9:00am and 10:00am. - Therefore, not only was the level 2 significantly reduced, but level 1 was pulled away from the boundary, with its landscaped parapet wall pulled even further back (expressing a membraned concrete roof construction) to create the greatest possible reduction in building form to allow early morning sun pass over our structures to reach the footpath, and future plaza, on the other side of Robertson Road. 	
4	<p>Solar Access – The submitted solar access diagrams show that only 7 of 14 (50%) apartments (units 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10) receive sunlight for 2 Hours between 9am and 3pm on the winter solstice falling significantly short of the 70% minimum requirement in the ADG.</p> <p>The solar access diagrams show 4 of 14 (28%) apartments (units 1, 2, 8 and 9) do not receive any sun between 9:00 and 15:00 on the winter solstice, exceeding the 15% maximum requirement in the ADG. The applicant should increase the amount of solar</p>	<p>The following changes to the plans have allowed the hours for receipt of sunlight to increase;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the main design changes, was the removal of the external northern access from the northern façade, impacting on levels 1 and 2 northwest units. - The provision of a second residential lobby (B), with access provided internally and on the southern side, has removed all circulation from the norther side of these units, allowing the courtyard to be deeper, and 	





#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	<p>access, especially for the top floor units 11, 12, 13 and 14 to demonstrate adequate solar access is achieved.</p>	<p>reducing overhangs to allow more glazing (living rooms) with direct winter sunlight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A deeper courtyard also provides a degree of future proofing from any development to the northeast, given our glazing is now further from the boundary on both levels 1 and 2 (also resulting in units that are not as deep) <p>With the above noted configuration changes, in conjunction with reduced unit numbers, (1 less unit, 13, in lieu of 14) the amended design allows 85% of units to receive direct sunlight, exceeding the 70% ADG minimum requirements. However, 2 units receive no direct sunlight – equating to 15% of units, which remains within the constraints of the ADG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit 01 – no direct sunlight - Unit 02 – no direct sunlight - Unit 03 – solar access compliant - Unit 04 – solar access compliant - Unit 05 – solar access compliant - Unit 06 – solar access compliant - Unit 07 – solar access compliant - Unit 08 – solar access compliant - Unit 09 – solar access compliant (large roof window) - Unit 10 – solar access compliant - Unit 11 – solar access compliant - Unit 12 – solar access compliant - Unit 13 – solar access compliant 	
5	<p>Communal Open Space – The communal open space provided is only 5% of the site area and well short of the required 25% of site area required by the ADG and 15% required by control D10.28 PDCP. A reduction can be considered for the 25% ADG requirement given the site location, however the DCP should be complied with at a minimum</p>	<p>The Communal open space is now significantly larger, with more direct lift access, and with a greater number of separated seating areas, with increased landscape, whilst still be located with a northwest aspect within the 8.5m height restricted area. Most of this additional space has resulted from the removal of unit 14 (now only 13 units) and the large reduction of intrusion into the 8.5m height restricted areas (refer A110). In addition to this, unit numbers 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, and 08</p>	

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
		<p>all have increased external landscaped POS space, resulting from the removal of external unit access, and the widening of the courtyard (reduction in depth of units). Furthermore, it is noted that units 09, 10, 11 and 12 still benefit from quite large terrace areas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Area: 1313 m2 - Level 2 – Communal Area: 183 m2 - Level 2 – POS Terrace Areas: 233 m2 - Level 1 – POS Landscaped Areas: 179 m2 - Unit 14 roof – Roof planting Matrix: 64 m2 	
6	<p>Front Setback – Control D10.9 provides the required setbacks for the development to Barrenjoey Road, including Figure 2. The proposal is partially non-compliant with the control as the balconies off proposed level 1 are within the 3.5m front setback which is contrary to the setbacks shown in Figure 2. At present, there is no justification for this non-compliance and the proposal is inconsistent with the intent of the Newport masterplan with regards to the treatment of Barrenjoey Road.</p>	<p>Drawings amended: Non-compliant planter detail relocated to respect 3.5m setback</p>	✓
7	<p>Rear Setback – Control D10.9 PDCP requires a 6m rear setback to be provided which is considered to be the western boundary of the site. At present, the ground floor and first floor is setback at a nil setback. Whilst this is considered reasonable for the ground floor (to provide a continued retail frontage along Robertson Road) Council must consider the implications of this setback upon any future development of the site 31 Foamcrest Avenue. For Council to support the configuration as proposed, details shall be given of how a nil setback will not unreasonably constrain development of the site 31 Foamcrest Avenue.</p>	<p>First – the nil setback at northwest boundary, ground floor and level 1, will not unreasonably constrain development of 31 Foamcrest Avenue, as it would be logical to assume that a similar pattern of cross-through ventilation units would continue up Robertson Road. The solid wall becomes an easy element to build from, specifically with respect to fire separation.</p> <p>Second – the nil setback on both the northwest boundary and northeast boundaries, apart from being a logical response to continue the grain of buildings along these frontages, council recognised in early discussions that these were indeed side boundaries, not rear boundaries, given the importance of both street frontages, and instructed Crawford Architects to provide the nil setbacks as documented.</p>	✓
8	<p>Acoustic Attenuation to units - Consideration shall be given to acoustically attenuating the units within the development that</p>	<p>It is the professional opinion of our acoustic engineers that there is sufficient scope within the proposed building design to satisfy</p>	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	could be impacted by night-time activities along Robertson Road, to ensure amenity can be maintained for units within the development whilst allowing community night time activities to occur along Robertson Road (such as outdoor dining, music, night markets etc). Details should be provided by an appropriately qualified acoustic consultant demonstrating how this has been addressed.	Item 8 raised by Council. The possible solution may include double-glazed window systems with mechanical ventilation to introduce fresh air.	
9	Unit Depth – As raised by the DSAP panel, the overall unit depths are of concern and in excess of the ADG requirements, along with the living room depths which many are in excess of 2.5 x the ceiling height (majority of cross through units are non-compliant). Unit depth and planning to be reviewed in this regard to achieve optimal amenity for the development and in line with the ADG. This is also in the context of non-compliant solar access for the top floor units which will lead to long/dark spaces.	Unit depths have been reduced due to the following design changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in rear private courtyard width - Change of Robertson Road façade, splaying away from the boundary to increase sunlight hours to footpath and future pedestrian plaza on the other side of the road - Introduction of second residential lobby (B) – requiring units to be further reduced in length. 	✓
10	Mechanical Plant – The applicant is to advise of how mechanical plant can be dealt with for future uses such as cafés/restaurants and where the mechanical plant and exhaust for these uses could be incorporated into the design, to avoid further modification of the development to include mechanical plant upon the roof.	Carpark exhaust – Located adjacent Lift A; Position reflected on the roof plan kitchen exhaust – 2x vertical runs provided which have been evenly distributed within the development: with positions reflected on the roof plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large KE riser located adjacent Stair B. This is well placed to serve the larger retail premises 07 and 08 - Smaller riser located adjacent unit 02 and unit 09. This is centrally positioned to serve any of the RETAIL spaces along Barrenjoey road – with a straight shaft and bends only on the ground floor. Condenser farm – Located and protected on the boundary pile cap in the well ventilate, and well accessible 2-way driveway	✓
11	Bicycle Parking – The DCP requires bicycle parking to be provided at a rate of 1 rack per 3 units. This is to be demonstrated on the plans.	With 13 units, 5 bicycles parking racks are required, equating to secure parking for 10 bicycles.	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In B1, 4 bicycle racks are provided, equating to 8 bicycle spaces. - In B2, a further 4 racks are provided – equating to another 8 bicycle spaces. - The resultant design is 3 racks more than the DCP minimum, being 6 bicycle spaces in excess of the minimum requirements. 	
12	<p>The application was referred to the DSAP and a number of recommendations have come from that meeting which are outlined in the minutes attached to this letter. The aim of the DSAP is to enable and encourage a high quality of development that achieves excellence for the development and for the community. The applicant is to review the comments provided and incorporate the recommendations into the proposal, or alternatively where the recommendations are not incorporated demonstrate to Council how the recommendations have been explored and a genuine attempt made to incorporate the recommendations into the design</p>	Refer DSAP specific responses below in this document	
13.a	<p>Geotechnical Hazards – The proposal involves excavation for two levels of basement. Certified Forms 1 & 1A are required to be submitted with the geotechnical report in accordance with Geotechnical Risk Management Policy for Pittwater – 2009.</p>	Forms have been requested, but have yet to be supplied Formal provision for forms via Asset Geo will form part of an amended respond document to be issued shortly	 
13.b	<p>Stormwater Management – The proposal to discharge site stormwater to the kerb in Robertson Road and Barrenjoey Road in four locations is not supported. It is recommended that the site discharge be connected to the existing Council pit in Robertson Road adjacent to the site.</p>	<p><u>The discharge to the four locations shown on the drawings was discussed and agreed with Council's engineers at the time the design was prepared. It appears Council have now changed their mind or forgotten the previous agreements. If necessary the design can be amended to discharge to this pit.</u></p>	 
14	<p>Council's Environmental Health team have reviewed the proposal and required the following items to be addressed: Of major concern with developments such as the one proposed, is the generation of noise and how it may affect the amenity of both external and internal receivers. A report (Acoustical Report - DA Stage dated 20 January 2021 by Koikas Acoustics) has been</p>	It is the professional opinion of our acoustic engineers that there is sufficient scope within the proposed building design to satisfy Item 14 as raised by Council. The possible solution may include double-glazed window systems with mechanical ventilation to introduce fresh air.	 

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	<p>supplied with the proposal documentation. It is standard practice in such reports to undertake unattended noise monitoring surveys to establish levels of ambient noise. It is noted that section "3.0 AMBIENT NOSIE SURVEY" of the above report references unattended noise monitoring surveys which were conducted from Friday 29th July to Thursday 4th August 2011 for seven consecutive days. Environmental Health considers that as almost 10 years has passed since these surveys were undertaken, that there may be changes to the area in terms of built form development, traffic and other noise generating activities which may cause the data in this report to be somewhat dated, and not representative of current ambient conditions that relate to the proposed development. Accordingly, at this time Environmental Health recommends refusal based on the current information supplied.</p>	<p>The acoustical report can be amended with detailed recommendations once the COVID-19 lock-down restrictions are lifted so that representative noise logging surveys can be conducted and utilised for further analysis/calculations.</p>	
15	<p>Council's Urban Design officer has reviewed the proposal and provides the following items to be addressed:</p>	<p>Refer as follows</p>	<p>✓</p>
15.1	<p>Breach of the 8.5m building height by the top floor units 13 & 14 will affect sun access to the public plaza to the south between 9 to 11 am which could be outdoor seating area for cafe serving breakfast. The proposal should submit a complying scheme and demonstrate that the additional building bulk will not cast any additional shadow. The DSAP has made the following suggestion: "The impact could be almost entirely be eliminated by setting the upper-floor apartments back further from the Robertson Road street alignment".</p>	<p>The following changes have been adopted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit 14 – deleted - Units on the western side changed to reflect the adoption of a new residential lobby (B) - Building envelop reduced, both in in height and footprint - Robertson Road façade kicked in, creating a splay, to provide greater sunlight crossing the site to reach the footpath opposite, and the future pedestrian plaza 	<p>✓</p>
15.2	<p>Address and provide a response to all DSAP issues and recommendations with rationale whether they have been adopted or not.</p>	<p>Refer DSAP responses below</p>	<p>✓</p>
16	<p>Council's water management officer has reviewed the proposed development and provides the following items to be addressed: This development application has not addressed the requirements of the Water Management for Development Policy.</p>	<p>Refer responses below</p>	<p>-</p>

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
16.1	There is no stormwater treatment to remove pollutants apart from a gross pollutant trap. Targets for sediment, phosphorus and nitrogen removal have not been met.	<u>The requirements Council refer to for storm water treatment are based on a document that came into effect in August 2020. Our drawings were prepared in April 2020 before this document was in force. At the time we had discussions with Council engineers who agreed that only a GPT was required. If Council are now changing their advice, additional water quality treatment can be added.</u>	
16.2	A 10,000 litre tank is proposed, however it appears to be simply functioning as an OSD and is not connected to any facilities for the purpose of irrigation or reuse.	<u>There is no water tank. This is a basement pump out storage. Rainwater re-use was not required by the BASIX report. Council's policies do not supersede BASIX.</u>	
16.3	It is not clear how the quantity of stormwater runoff is being reduced although the proposed rooftop garden would assist with this somewhat, however is of limited size, with significant remaining roof space.	<u>This appears that Council is implying we should have on-site detention. This is incorrect. The pre-DA advice recorded in Section B5.10 and Section D(Engineering) of the PLM notes dated 13 June 2019 clearly states that on-site detention was not required for this site.</u>	
16.4	The development will intercept groundwater from 1.1m depth and the geotechnical report identifies significant risks to surrounding developments and the stability and water quality of the groundwater aquifer as a result of this development. The report identifies that the constraints may be too significant to support this development. A groundwater management plan from an appropriately qualified and registered engineer will be required to get a dewatering permit from Council that must be provided along with an application to WaterNSW for approval to intercept an aquifer and dewater. Continuous drawdown of the groundwater aquifer through pumping/dewatering of basements will not be allowed by Council or by WaterNSW. Dewatering of aquifers connected to seawater increased seawater intrusion and can impact the health of nearby brackish water systems. *Note – General Terms of Approval have been received from WaterNSW.	<u>This type of issue is not unusual. The basement can be constructed as a tanked basement so that there is no dewatering of the aquifer. This requirement is normally conditioned as part of the DA, not an impediment to the DA.</u>	

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	Summary:		
16.a	The applicant must address the objectives and requirements of the Water Management for Development Policy	<u>As noted above this policy came into effect 4 months after the drawings were submitted. The drawings address the requirements advised by Council's engineers at the time of submission.</u>	☹️
16.b	They must provide a MUSIC model file (.sqz), updated stormwater plans and a water management report that demonstrates how they have complied	<u>As advised by Council's engineer at the time this was not required.</u>	☹️

Jordan, in response to corresponding DSAP LETTER - to be read in conjunction with drawings already provided, please find below an item by item response to all issues raised.

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
1	In Panel comments to the applicant and Council in relation to a pre DA scheme it was suggested that car parking number could be reduced in this relatively accessible location, and that curbside loading and waste collection in specific hours be considered, as is common practice in other parts of Sydney and in Manly Town centre.	<p>Whilst parking has not been reduced, the new design introduces kerb side waste collection in Barrenjoey Road. This removes all this developments garbage truck movements out of Robertson Road.</p> <p>Both the sloping site and the flood freeboard requirements have been respected and met, including councils 6.5m dimension for residential garbage collection, all provided on ramped surfaces (no steps for bins). The northeast boundary has lent itself nicely to accommodating this ramping, with separated garbage rooms peeling off this spine, with internal access for all residential units, and for larger retail units no Robertson Road. For the smaller Barrenjoey mums & dads type retail units, refuse and recycling access is via the this corridor on Barrenjoey road. The solution is balanced and responds to all needs.</p>	✅

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
1.a	The building massing is discussed in more detail below, but with the re-planning that the Panel considers necessary it is likely that there will be a reduction in the number of units. The deletion of unit 14 and the section of unit 13 that exceed the 8.5m height control will reduce the number of cars. (refer to Height section)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit 14 deleted - Results in less vehicle traffic, and reduction of envelope exceeding the 8.5m height limit 	✓
1.b	Given the valid concerns expressed in many submissions that the ambience of Robertson Road will be degraded by vehicle movements, the Panel suggests that Council consider whether there should be no requirement for on-site retail parking and a relaxation of the car parking rates for residential.	<p>If this is seen as a benefit to the amenity of Robertson Road, the removal of a basement is agreeable, noting that this will still provide at least 1 parking space for each unit (13), at least one parking space for each retail unit (7 for shop owners), a couple of visitor spaces, retention of the loading area, and provision of a turning bay. Crawford Architects confirm our client is happy to take direction here.</p> <p>Crawford Architects are in agreeance, that eliminating the need for an entire basement level (approximate 34 spaces) could be accommodated, noting the revised garbage collection planning in conjunction with street side loading would have the following benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced embodied carbon in the construction, - reduced operating energy consumption - reduced construction time and disruption to the centre - Reduced difficulties of constructing both below the water table and below sea level 	✓
1.c	It is not clear how the loading area or onsite parking would work in the current scheme; assuming that the parking is for the exclusive use of patrons it is not clear how the public would be aware of whether there are spaces available and whether they would be required to be patrons.	On street Loading is preferred for retailing spaces, eliminating the need to have all large commercial vehicles using Robertson road, with a majority using kerb side delivery on Barrenjoey Road. However, off street loading for all residential units is provided.	✓
1.d	Residential waste store requires residents to take garbage out through lobby, this is not acceptable.	New planning provides for internal access to garbage areas for all residents.	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
1.e	There is no direct access for retail to the 'commercial refuse' area	The new larger retail spaces 07 and 08 have direct internal access to a separated street-level garage room – to be collected kerb side at Barrenjoey road. The smaller mums & dads retailing spaces 01 through to 06 have access directly via Barrenjoey road to the same retail garbage room.	✓
1.f	<p>The Panel notes requirements of the DCP that may be difficult to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an expectation that adjoining sites (355 Barrenjoey Rd) and sites further to the north east will gain access to underground parking by established rights of way through the subject site (the proposal does not take this into account) - an expectation that car parking for the retail component will be accommodated on site at rates specified in the DCP even though the current provision is a total of 4 onsite spaces for both existing retail and shop-top housing - second basement level is well below water table and sea level 	<p>Reponses as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Underground connectivity to adjacent sites achievable and shown on the new planning. - Parking provision provided at the DCP rates, however, as noted above, Crawford Architects have no issue with the removal of 1 level or parking to both reduce parking numbers, provide environmental benefit, and move away from basement construction that is below both the water table and sea level. From a purely construction point of view – this would be preferred 	✓
2	<p>In order to minimize the disruption to the street, in consultation with council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - investigate the removal of the requirement for on-site loading and explore the possibility of kerb side loading during restricted hours - investigate the possibility of reducing car parking rates for retail - The Panel suggests that further reduction in car parking could be considered given the accessible location 	<p>Reponses as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kerbside loading during restricted hours – preferred and agreeable, given the constraints on this site, and the relatively small shop footprints - Reduce parking numbers would be support, being the removal of one basement, noting that this would still provide access to both adjacent sites for underground connections. 	✓
3	Improve the accessibility of the waste storage area for the units.	New planning provides for internal access to garbage areas for all residents.	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
4	Include toilets for retail patrons on the ground level	New planning provides accessible retail and retail patron toilet on the ground floor level	✓
5	Introduce an internal service corridor to provide internal access from shops to waste and storage	The new larger retail spaces 07 and 08 have direct internal access to a separated street-level garage room – to be collected kerb side at Barrenjoey road. The smaller mums & dads retailing spaces 01 through to 06 have access directly via Barrenjoey road to the same retail garbage room.	✓ ✗
5.a	Height, building massing and impacts on south side of Robertson Road – The overall building massing is appropriate for the context, however the Panel notes that the building exceeds the 8.5m maximum height limit in the rear third of the site.	Building massing heavily reduced, not only in the 8.5m height limit area (level 2) but on level 1 also, where the splay in Robertson Road façade has the greatest impact (shadow reduction) with this revised scheme.	
6	Modify building massing to minimise impact, introduce vertical shading devices to minimize summer afternoon solar gain rather than relying on roof overhangs.	Building massing has been altered to reduce impact on Robertson Road footpath and future pedestrian plaza. Refer A402 where the current and previous scheme have been compared. Solar gain given the windowless and well insulated northwest facing solid wall orientation are not in need of additional shading devices. The slack sun angles late in the afternoon have minimal impact on Robertson road glazing, and are therefore also not recommended.	✓
7	Unit 14 should be deleted. No part of the building should exceed the 8.5m height limit at the western end of the site.	Unit 14 has been deleted. However, there remains one small part of level 2 on the northern side of the site where there is minor intrusion into the 8.5m height limit. However this has no impact on Robertson Road. Furthermore, level 1 has also been reduced to assist with reduction of overshadowing (as it was level 1 causing the shadows on the future pedestrian plaza, not level 2)	✓
8	Units 13 and 14 should be reconfigured to ensure that their shadows do not exceed that of the parapet at 10am in the morning 21 June.	Unit planning and parapets reconfigured. Refer A402	✓
9	Streetscape and Public domain – Concrete awning looks high and narrow compared with prevailing (and existing) condition -	It is CA professional opinion that the concrete awning is in keeping with the scale of the building, ensures a controlled	☹

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	will this provide adequate pedestrian amenity? Review design of concrete awning	pallet of limited materials, and works nicely with the brickwork and glazing	✓
10	Street awning should have a ceiling to provide pedestrian visual interest.	It is CA professional opinion that the concrete soffit is a robust and timeless material, providing a relatively maintenance free surface that will last and still look contemporary in many years to come. It is less subject to wind, movement, UV unstable materials, breakdown of fixings, and water damage.	☹️ ✓
10.a	Internal amenity and privacy Private open space of level 1 apartments are overlooked from unit 10 balcony. Building footprint is excessively deep and locates kitchens and study spaces too far away from sources of natural light. Required privacy screens impact on daylight and outlook The Level 2 apartments are up to 19m glass to glass and will have poor light and ventilation to centrally located studies and pantries; The above issues would be resolved by reducing the depth of the apartments on Level 2;	With courtyard width increasing, splay introduced to the southwest facing façade, and with the new residential lobby (B) introduced, the unit depths have reduced. Roof windows have been introduced into the communal courtyard to provide daylighting deep into units 06 and 07, whilst unit 09 has the benefit of a newly introduced high level clerestory window	✓
11	Reduce the depth of the apartments and with the removal of apartment 14 re-planning of apartments 12 and 13 could occur.	Unit 14 removed Unit 12 and 13 replanned	✓
11.a	Solar access Despite north facing arrangement, solar access to apartments are unsatisfactory.	Noting that the apartments do not face north, but within the courtyard face both northeast and northeast (the later the majority), the removal of unit entry via the courtyard has significantly changed the structural slabs allowing greater sunlight penetration into unit living spaces, for longer periods of time	✓
11.b	Views from sun show that only 6 of 14 (42%) apartments (units 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10) receive sunlight for 2 Hours between 9:00 and 15:00 on the winter solstice falling significantly short of the 70% minimum requirement in the ADG	With the amended planning solar studies A405, A406 and A407 illustrate a significant improvement in direct winter sunlight on all courtyard units, and now unit 9 also.	✓
11.c	Views from sun show 4 of 14 (28%) apartments (units 1, 2, 8 and 9) do not receive any sun between 9:00 and 15:00 on the winter	Planning configuration changes, in conjunction with reduced unit numbers, (1 less unit, 13, in lieu of 14) the amended design	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	solstice, significantly exceeding the 15% maximum requirement in the ADG	<p>allows 85% of units to receive direct sunlight, exceeding the 70% ADG minimum requirements. However, 2 units receive no direct sunlight – equating to 15% of units, which remains within the constraints of the ADG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit 01 – no direct sunlight - Unit 02 – no direct sunlight - Unit 03 – solar access compliant - Unit 04 – solar access compliant - Unit 05 – solar access compliant - Unit 06 – solar access compliant - Unit 07 – solar access compliant - Unit 08 – solar access compliant - Unit 09 – solar access compliant (large roof window) - Unit 10 – solar access compliant - Unit 11 – solar access compliant - Unit 12 – solar access compliant - Unit 13 – solar access compliant 	
11.c	Solar access is likely to become significantly more problematic with adjacent future development indicating that significant redesign may be necessary. - two storey apartment typologies or a second vertical access core may need to be explored in search of solar access compliance on this site.	The increase courtyard size (width), taking the norther unit living spaces further away from the northeast boundary, reduced the implications of future development impact along Barrenjoey Road.	✓
12	Investigate alternative planning strategies to improve solar access and take into consideration the potential impacts of future development of the adjoining site (355 Barrenjoey Road)	The increase courtyard size (width), taking the norther unit living spaces further away from the northeast boundary, reduced the implications of future development impact along Barrenjoey Road.	✓
12.a	<p>Access and Fire egress</p> <p>The residential lobby is buried deep in the building and has no natural lighting or ventilation.</p>	<p>There are now 2x lobbies, the original but reconfigured, and an additional new residential lobby.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lobby A has a full 2x storey windows running up the main access stair, providing both natural light and ventilation - Lobby B has its level 1 corridor hard against the southwest boundary, detailed with adjustable glass 	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
		louvres. This lobby at level 2 now opens directly onto the roof top communal courtyard	
12.b	Access to apartments is extremely circuitous (apartment 14 in particular)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Courtyard access now removed - No 'circuitous' circulation remains - New lobby (B) introduced - All units have internal access 	✓
12.c	Not clear how fire egress works or whether the balcony path of travel is acceptable	Being 3 stories, not fire isolated stair is required. However, the design will be detailed to be either fully DTS, or being provided with a fire engineered alternative solution	✓
13	Assess compliance with egress requirements as part of the investigation of options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All Egress widths will be compliant. - All AS1428 circulation requirements will be met. 	✓
14	Provide natural light and ventilation to the lobby	Both lobbies are naturally ventilated, Lobby B has a greater ability natural daylighting light, whilst lobby A utilises borrowed light from corridors and stairs.	✓
15	<p>Common area</p> <p>The common area is small, inaccessible and unlikely to be used. Recommendation</p> <p>Reconsider location and size of common area as part of the re-planning.</p>	<p>The Communal area has been redesigned. It is now substantially larger, offering multiple separated seating options, serviced with a BBQ area, greater areas of landscaping, and has direct access to Residential Lobby B.</p> <p>In addition to this, unit numbers 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, an 08 all have increased external landscaped POS space, resulting from the removal of external unit access, and the widening of the courtyard (reduction in depth of units). Furthermore, it is noted that units 09, 10, 11 and 12 still benefit from quite large terrace areas)</p> <p>During the DSAP zoom meeting, the idea of further roof landscaping was raised. This however would constitute a fourth storey, as it would introduce accessibility issues, lift extension, fire egress requirements, trigger sprinklers throughout the entire building, and this lift, stair, lift lobby, etc would protrude way above the height plane.</p>	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
16	<p>Heritage</p> <p>The proposal adjoins St Michaels heritage item that is on the lot to the north west of the subject site. Page 6</p> <p>Recommendation - Set back the excavation from the NW boundary to provide an area of deep soil that could allow for screening vegetation that may provide a 'backdrop' for the church building.</p>	The ground floor plan (and both basement levels) reflect a setback allowing a substantial deep soil planting zone, providing relief and landscaped backdrop for the adjacent church.	✓
16.a	<p>Landscape</p> <p>Landscape planters shown on building sections should have adequate planting soil depth indicated.</p>	Building sections have been design to maximise planting depth	✓
16.b	The area of landscape should be increase when the unit depths are reduced	Correct: However, not only did the courtyard width increase with unit depth reduction, but the access to this units was relocated to Robertson road side of the development. In doing so, all the area that was once circulation (concrete) is now soft landscaping of at least 600mm depth	✓
17	The Level 2 bedroom balconies are minimal and would benefit from having a planter to enhance the semi-tropical landscape character of the development;	All level 2 bedroom balconies (terraces) are provided with a full length planter	✓
18	Ensure a number of large street trees are selected for planting in consultation with Council in the public domain both on Clients setback and in Council verge to assist in meeting GANSW Urban canopy targets	Crawford Architects have no issue with council providing direction (condition of consent) with respect to street trees.	✓
19	Ensure set-down for planting areas on private courtyards on level 1 & 2 is minimum 300mm for Ground covers, 600mm for shrub planting and 1000mm for trees.	Crawford Architects confirm al these are achievable. We also note that an addition to landscaping not seen on the previous scheme, is a roof planting matrix above unit 13. This not does this detail reduce the roof height of this portion of the building, but provides an ideal insulating natural media for this north, northeast, northwest facing unit.	✓
20	Ensure private courtyard fences on level 1 are between 1200-1500 high to ensure the access path is not a corridor and gardens provide a communal visual amenity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access path has now been removed – unit access provided from a new lobby (B) on the Robertson Road façade side of the building 	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fencing between what is now 10% POS will be minimum 1500mm high, measured above the internal units Finished Floor Level. 	
21	<p>Aesthetics and materials The Panel supports the simple material palette proposed and considers it appropriate for the location. Recommendation Brick detailing at windows and parapets would raise design quality.</p>	<p>Confirming Crawford Architects have no issues with the proposed detailing of brick soldiers at window head and sills</p>	✓
21.a	<p>Sustainability Amount of glazing in the ground floor retail may need to be reduced</p>	<p>The introduction of a second Residential Lobby (B), has not only reduced the overall area of shopfront glazing, but broken down the scale of the footpath façade.</p>	✓
21.b	<p>A better ESD outcome if the car parking is reduced</p>	<p>As noted above - If this is seen as a benefit to the amenity of Robertson Road, the removal of a basement is agreeable, noting that this will still provide at least 1 parking space for each unit (13), at least one parking space for each retail unit (7 for shop owners), a couple of visitor spaces, retention of the loading area, and provision of a turning bay. Crawford Architects confirm our client is happy to take direction here.</p> <p>Crawford Architects are in agreeance, that eliminating the need for an entire basement level (approximate 34 spaces) could be accommodated, noting the revised garbage collection planning in conjunction with street side loading would have the following benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced embodied carbon in the construction, - reduced operating energy consumption - reduced construction time and disruption to the centre - Reduced difficulties of constructing both below the water table and below sea level 	✓
21.c	<p>10000kL rainwater tank on the drawings but the space allocated for it seems far too small – is it realistic? Rainwater reuse is recommended, and is likely to be required for BASIX.</p>	<p>Given the proposal for an in ground tank, this tank could be at any size. Alternatively, a series of in-basement tanks could be provided, again, sized to suit maximum requirements</p>	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
21.d	Stormwater provisions are inadequate.	Crawford Architects would be agreeable to any reasonable conditions to ensure adequacy.	✓
22	Recommendations: Develop a schematic approach for rainwater harvesting and re-use and part of the investigation of options	Rainwater reuse for toilet flushing, clothes washing machines, landscaping irrigation, car washing, refuse and rubbish store hose cocks, and the like, Crawford Architects have no issue this being included as a condition of consent.	✓
23	Test Section J compliance of retail to avoid needing a s4.55 later	Envelope, including glazing, insulated floor slab, and insulated roof slab, shall be designed to meet or exceed Section J compliance requirements.	✓
24	The Panel encourages the maximization of onsite renewable energy generation and electrification of all appliances and services in anticipation of decarbonisation of the grid	A full solar array is provided on the roof A ventilated Solar battery and inverter room is provided at B1	✓
25	The panel would strongly suggest the inclusion of EV charging in the basement to encourage and support increased usage of electric vehicles. ('Level 2' electric vehicle charging points)	Crawford Architects have no issue with Level 2' electric vehicle charging points being made a condition of consent. This would be extended to include the charging of ebikes also.	✓
26	Provide natural light and ventilation to the bathrooms on the top level	Skylights (which will be detailed as Velux roof windows) have been introduced to units 9, 11 and 12.	✓
27	The Panel would support a roof with high albedo.	Unit 9 has been provided with a large clerestory window	✓

.....
 Paul Godsell
 Director – Crawford Architects