

Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 28 July 2022

6 – DA2022/1000 - 14-22 Wentworth Street and 19-21 South Steyne MANLY (Royal Far West)

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Connection to Country

The Panel supports the State Design Review Panel recommendations, letter dated 10th August 2021:

Given RFW's long-standing connections to Aboriginal staff and communities across NSW and Australia through policies and programs for social and health outcomes, it is recommended:

- a) that this unique opportunity forms the basis for ongoing consultation with Aboriginal communities as part of a long-term strategy for Connecting with Country*
- b) that outcomes of consultation make a significant contribution to the project, including informing the project's key moves and development of proposals to connect with Country such as the final masterplan, building uses, planting, artworks and architectural expression.*

Royal Far West expressed this commitment during the presentation and the Panel acknowledges the:

- long standing and continuing connections to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Communities and the place on Country on which Royal Far West now resides,
- continued commitment to Community,
- continued commitment to providing social and health support and services for Communities,
- expression of those commitments through the policy document *Reflect Conciliation Plan*.

The Panel acknowledges engagement with local Aboriginal Communities has been progressing since the last presentation (28 October 2021) and that continuing Cultural guidance be embedded with the project. Community has identified how Cultural voices are represented with the evolution design work.

Recommendations

1. The Panel encourages the design team to continue enriching long-standing Community relationships so that voices of Aboriginal people are interwoven with a project of this significance. Guide the imagining of what might occur on this place, how it can respond over time, and that in its final form will become part of Country embedded with the significant social and health services that RFW continues to provide to Community.

Heritage

The Panel acknowledges the modified Master Plan strategy for Drummond House proposes the demolition of the 1960s rear addition to retain only the original building addressing Wentworth Street. The Panel supports the rationale, which has the potential for a superior long-term outcome compared to retaining the rear addition, intact, with internal adaptive re-use/refurbishment.

Further design development has achieved a superior outcome compared to the previous presentation. The alignments of rear addition and Building B and the spaces between Drummond House the CCK and Building C create a streetscape presence for Drummond House within a pleasing rhythm of form, space and scale along Wentworth Street.

The rearrangement of ground floor internal layout presents a clear order of entry and public functions for Drummond House that better suits its street/public interface, its engagement with the CCK building and to

Building B at the rear. The treatment of the entry to the CCK then provides a pivotal character linking the public functions and a characterful address.

Likewise, the introduced void between the CCK entry/Level 3 rooftop connection to the CCK play space retains the integrity of the Drummond House form and permeability through the site.

Master Plan and Architecture

The Panel acknowledges the work carried out since the previous presentation in considering the public domain relationship and boundary interface conditions.

The main central space between buildings C and D is more clearly defined as public and private and secures spaces after hours while ensuring clear sightlines from streets through the undercroft and central space.

Further design development of Building D has achieved a bolder and more robust north-eastern building form that holds the corner better resolves the spatial definition of the public domain as Wentworth Street intersects with The Steyne.

The Wentworth Street setback of Building C is slightly inboard of the previous presentation, similar to that of the CCK. This enables the more diminutive Drummond House to stand proud and in balance with the differing relationships of scale.

The design intent that building D be broken into two 'mirrored' pieces to reflect the smaller scale subdivisions and mix of amalgamations is acknowledged. The Panel notes the further development in resolving wind modelling with the full exposure to the ocean front and implications for the quality of the central public space with the introduction a large, curved blade walls at ground level and the infill of commercial spaces for the southern components of Building D.

Further work has raised the ground floor-Level 1 floor-to-floor height of Building D, which achieves a streetscape datum to neighbouring heritage buildings to the south along The Steyne. This has also improved the ground level undercroft amenity and east-west visual relationship though the site.

The consistent ground plane through Building C and central space of Building B has improved the multi-function space, the loss of height by removing the sunken floor level has been offset with raising of the awning level of Building C and overall Level 1.

Increased setbacks of Building C from the western boundary will improve daylight amenity over the long-term for the neighbouring apartments (heritage items) at 29 Victoria Parade.

The reduction of Level 3 of Building B has also resolved overshadowing impacts to the neighbouring Victoria Parade apartments that will also serve well for future redevelopment over the long term.

Recommendations

2. Design development should ensure the continuing connection to the horizon through buildings and spaces is realised in the final built form. (Including continuing consideration of proposed ground floor soffit and structural design to maximise the clearance).

Landscape

The Panel notes the site's fundamental connection to landscape and being fully exposed to the vagaries of a significantly changing climate. Design development since the last presentation has further considered the challenging undercroft conditions. The approach has acknowledged there is likely to be little, if any, full vegetation cover deep within the spaces, but has allowed for its natural limit to be reached within the ground plane design and material selection so its long-term quality is more certain.

The Panel recognises the further engagement with Aboriginal Cultural knowledge holders in identifying and guiding the landscape response more broadly.

Structural depths have considered soil depths for the internal courtyard planting with mounding. The Panel recognises that this is being developed. The Panel acknowledges the consideration of planting selections suited to the conditions, tested, and the work in providing conditions for acclimatising and their establishment over the long term.

A deep soil zone is largely limited to Drummond House and its surrounds, which provides some opportunity for deep root selections along Wentworth Street.

Ground level blade walls are intended to address conditions particularly in winter and where stiff onshore winds prevail during summer months. Public spaces are desirable to be cool and breezy in midsummer, need that protection in Winter, and to a less extent in Spring and Autumn.

Recommendations

The Panel has no specific recommendations but notes the following:

3. The Panel supports opportunities for Aboriginal guidance in exploring a holistic ground plane relationship of space, form and experience within and beyond the site to land, ocean and sky and through other identified engagement embedded with the project.
4. The narrow courtyard has been provided with a substantial soil volume in planters to achieve large growth but limiting factors will be shade and salt laden onshore breezes.
5. Undercroft and courtyard spaces will be shady and exposed to wind with the building permeable to sea wind. Public spaces are desirable to be cool and breezy in midsummer but uncomfortable especially in Winter and to a less extent in Spring and Autumn.

Common areas

The common areas are confined to building C. It is possible that these will be more in demand from the residents of building C given units in the southern end of building C levels 3 and 4 will not enjoy views of the ocean and may have limited private solar amenity during winter months.. The Panel strongly supports the use of rooftops as the common space and supports minor breaching of height limits if necessary to allow for shading devices and planter beds.

Recommendations

6. The Panel would support a single common space on the northern part of building C.

Sustainability

Significant sustainability initiatives will be expected for this development in demonstrating design excellence.

The modified design improves solar access and cross ventilation to the residential apartments. In terms of sustainability, this is a much improved outcome. However:

- Solar access to some of the apartments in building C may could be improved and barely meet the minimum expected by the Apartment Design Guide. Some have potentially minimal solar access, such as Apartment C3.4, with a deep balcony and solid side walls. While others have significant glazing which may lead to overheating – such as apartment C6.2. This appears resolvable with further design development,
- Cross-ventilation calculations will need to take into account any openings that are in the vicinity of boundaries and otherwise relied upon for achieving natural and natural cross ventilation. Fire protection that results in openings not being openable would impact on natural and natural cross ventilation performance. The site is not constrained, and it would be expected ADG minimum performance objectives, and preferably exceeding minimum performance with be achieved through design excellence.
- Rainwater storage is nominated on the plans, it is recommended that it is linked to irrigation as well as toilets or laundries. The Panel is supportive of the 5-star WCs being included.

Landscaped roofs on the residential are supported in principle. Amendments to the rooftop communal open space have located it more centrally and inboard of the building edge which provides both additional protection and a contained communal benefit. It would be beneficial to allocate more of that roof space to PV, or combine the uses and have PV over landscaped space, as the landscaping will improve the efficiency of the panels (cooling effect).

Opportunity to significantly improve the sustainability of the development from what was originally improved, for example through targeting all electric design with heat pump hot water and induction cooktops, increasing PV allocation, improved thermal envelope with higher insulation levels, thermal breaks and better glazing. No gas should be considered given the foreseeable rapid shift to all electrification and the risk of stranded assets needing to be removed from buildings when that occurs. Implications for resources and minimising the carbon footprint from the outset.

Bike storage – ensure the residential storage has dimensions that accommodates bike storage.

Solar amenity for the Sensory Garden children's play area, especially in winter requires further consideration. However, it is noted there are rooftop communal spaces associated with Drummond House and Building B where solar amenity is available.

Acoustic privacy for Buildings C and D requires further consideration and/or additional information to ensure achieving adequate levels of acoustic comfort/privacy does not impact on the ability to naturally cross ventilate units in close proximity, and directly opposite each other. This will need to demonstrate how the solution achieves SEPP 65 objectives noting a variation to measurable performance target is sought.

The Panel notes the slightly increased floor-to-floor heights of residential levels (50mm). This is fully supported as being consistent with sustainable long-term building performance addressing Design and Building Practitioners Act requirements at an early stage.

Recommendations

7. Review solar access and thermal comfort of the design of the apartments in Building C.
8. Increase solar amenity for lower-level units (3 and 4) in close proximity in Buildings C and D.
9. Additional information to demonstrate how acoustic amenity is achieved without impacting on natural cross ventilation for units in close proximity Buildings C and D.
10. Connect rainwater reuse to uses inside the building such as toilets and laundries.
11. Increase the proposed rooftop PV and consider incorporation with rooftop communal open space opportunities for a dual purpose to provide shade.
12. Investigate an all-electric building through heat pump hot water and induction cooktops, no gas connection.
13. Include provisions for increased car share, EV charging for future full electrification, considering bidirectional charging points.
14. Maximise external windows to bathrooms and utility rooms wherever possible including commercial components.
15. Investigate material choices with low embodied carbon; low carbon concrete mixes with 70% less cement are readily available. Fly ash concrete should be investigated for the structure of the building, as well as other low carbon materials
16. Select roofing materials with high albedo roof to reduce urban heat and install high insulation levels.
17. Bike storage – ensure the residential storage has dimensions that accommodates bike storage.

Accessibility

Accommodating accessible housing options is supported.

The Panel notes amended pre-adaption layouts require minimal modification (limited to joinery) to achieve the post-adaptive layouts. This will assist with an outcome for accessible/flexible dwellings to be realised over the long-term.

Recommendations

18. Accessible layouts constructed at the outset so that any future modification is limited to joinery changes and cosmetic changes will achieve the most cost-effective and functional long-term outcome for future residents.

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel supports the SDRP advice and looks forward to the project continuing its design development.

The Panel acknowledges the iterative work through the former Part 3A approved Concept Master Plan and the currently sought s75W Modification.

The Panel notes that design development to date has led to some inconsistencies between document packages so that the final urban proposition subject of the modification will need to be finalised and clarified for the DPIE submission.