



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 27 October 2022

Item 2 - DA2022 1164 - 34-35 South Steyne MANLY

General

The Panel reviewed the proposal at Pre-DA stage on 26 May 2022 and made 11 recommendations. Some of these recommendations have been incorporated into the revised design.

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The site achieves 0.5:1 bonus by virtue of its commercial use. This additional area is difficult to achieve within the designated height controls.

As previously noted,

the Panel believes that the building would be a good urban fit, and appropriate to its location in a heritage conservation area.

The Panel did comment specifically on the amount of glazing:

The proposal is within the foreshore scenic protection area and Heritage Conservation Area of Manly although not itself of heritage significance. In accordance with Manly LEP 2013 cl 5.10 (4) the consent authority must consider the impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the item or area concerned.

The subject site is on the very edge of the HCA. The proposal for a completely glazed eastern façade is in stark contrast to the adjoining buildings although having architectural merit.

The Panel was of the view that recessing the glass to provide some articulation to the façade in addition to that provided by the curved glass sections could be desirable, as would the introduction of some solid sections or masonry blades to relate to the adjoining buildings and most buildings in the HCA.

Recommendation 1:

Investigate recessing of glazing and the introduction of some solid elements to the eastern façade to better relate to adjoining and nearby buildings.

Has not been pursued, no alternative treatments were presented. It remains the view of the Panel that alternative façade treatments should be investigated.

The application is accompanied by a design statement that sets out the overall approach and includes the following:

The proposal is a contemporary response to its context and use. The fine grain scale of the openings reflects rather than imitates the scale of the street wall, creating a contemporary office environment with generous views and terraces.

The Panel remains of the view that alternatives should be investigated for the following reasons:

- A contemporary response does not necessarily rely on a fully glazed façade
- The size of the openings and glazing can in no way be considered 'fine grain' when seen in the context of surrounding buildings

Recommendation

1. Investigate recessing of glazing and the introduction of some solid elements to the eastern façade to better relate to adjoining and nearby buildings.



Scale, built form and articulation

The Panel is generally supportive of the scale and built form of the proposal.

The Panel notes that the permissible heights and allowable FSR including bonuses for commercial use are not aligned; it is simply not possible to achieve the FSR within the height limits. Additionally, the Panel is supportive of generous floor to floor heights. The 0.5m increase in height from the Pre-DA scheme is noted but is considered to have insignificant additional impact.

It is not clear how much natural light would actually penetrate into the through site link. The applicant is encouraged to maximise the amount of glazing between the circular court and the through site link. This would appear possible on level 01 between grids 4 and 5 with possible extension right through to the proposed 'void to TSL' at the eastern end with minimal loss of floor area.

Some changes have been made but how the basement would function for food and beverage or as a gym is not clear given that these spaces would need to be accessible.

The Panel appreciates the attempt to introduce natural light and ventilation to the basement through the introduction of a 'skylight' but considers this insignificant and consequently could be deleted. This leaves the question of the use of the basement level.

Recommendations

2. The Panel is supportive of the habitable awning and the clear demarcation of the entry to the through site link. Consideration could be given to aligning the southern edge with the subtended extension of the boundary line.
3. Maximise the natural light and extent of the double height portion of the through site link
4. Consider conditions accompanying the approval to restrict the uses of the basement to not include commercial (office) working space

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

No further comment, the Panel remains supportive of the reduced car parking numbers given the location, its accessibility and constraints imposed by the geometry and dimensions of the site.

The Panel is very supportive of the bicycle parking and commitment to end of trip facilities.

The Panel also commented on the arrangement of services in relation to Rialto Lane. The Panel makes no further comment as any technical issues will be resolved in discussion with Council.

Landscape

Generally, the landscape treatments appear suitable in relation to their conditions and location and the appropriate soil depths appear to be provided. The rooftop is a simple refined space which will provide flexibility of use and a quality communal space.

Pool accessibility and fencing is unclear.

The awning terrace is considered a positive for activation of the public domain.

Recommendations

5. Consider the detailed integration of the pool fencing and provision of universal accessibility to the pool so it is beautifully designed in

Amenity

Issues related to exhausts have been addressed.

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

Refer to previous comments about contextual fit (recommendation 1)



Sustainability

The proposal complies with the NCC section J.

There has been no commitment to, or investigation of whether it might be possible to achieve Net Zero in operation.

It would appear that the 15KW that is included in the proposal could be doubled given the amount of roof area available. This would reduce the annual CO₂-e from the proposed 119,000kg CO₂-e emissions by approximately 22,772 kg (refer to p 28 of Energy Efficiency report).

This is still a long way from carbon neutrality, however it is not clear what other strategies or approaches have been explored to further reduce CO₂-e emissions beyond compliance with the NCC.

We are living in a climate emergency – all new buildings should be designed to be as naturally comfortable as possible without heating and cooling (passive design) and should not rely on energy from fossil fuels. This should be possible in a coastal location like Manly that has a very different climate from Observatory Hill that is the weather station used in the Section J assessment.

The impacts of climate change and the changes to energy supply and security are out-pacing policy and regulation. The role of the Panel is to advise on 'design (quality) and sustainability' and is not confined to existing legislation or the approaches of the past. Accordingly, the Panel believes it is appropriate and necessary for it to provide 'forward-thinking advice' to both proponents and to council staff involved in the assessment of development. With the current massive spikes in energy from uncertain times, the advisability to build the comfort and energy resilience of projects is even more obvious.

With the regulatory environment changing in the near future – for efficiency, electrification and mandatory disclosure – these investments at this time will be worthwhile both for future residents and the developers' reputation, market position and marketability of the building.

Recommendations

6. Double the amount of PV to 30kW
7. Increase the number of bi-directional EV charging points. Car spaces 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11 would also be suitable for points
8. All services should be electric – gas for cooking, hot water and heating should be avoided.
 - Heat pump systems for electric hot water should be considered
 - The storage of hot water can be considered a de-facto battery if heated by PVs during the day
 - Note the risk of gas reticulation becoming a 'stranded asset' and the possibility of additional costs to remove gas and rewire the building
9. Consider site battery storage has benefits for the grid and may be a highly desirable back-up during the transition to a de-carbonised grid

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel supports the proposal in general but considers further refinements are needed.

In particular:

- **Investigate recessing of glazing and the introduction of some solid elements to the eastern façade to better relate to adjoining and nearby buildings**
- **Increase the amount of natural light entering the through site link and the extent of the double height volume**
- **The applicant is strongly encouraged to investigate ways of minimising CO₂-e emissions in operation**