



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 07 October 2021

4. DA2021 1508 - 882A Pittwater Road DEE WHY

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

The proposal is for a nine storey mixed-use development to accommodate a boarding house and commercial premises.

The proposal (as presented at the meeting) consists of the following:

- 20 x boarding rooms;
- 3 x Commercial Premises;
- 1 x Retail Premises (Coffee Shop);
- Managers Office.
- Storage for 17 bicycles; and
- Communal open space (Level 8).

An earlier version of the design was presented to the Panel on 26th November 2020. The Panel did not support the proposals and made a wide range of recommendations, many of which have been incorporated in the revised design.

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The building use as affordable housing in this location, in a small infill building and the inclusion of affordable commercial space is appropriate, particularly as it is located adjacent to the B-line bus stop.

The panel supports the building use generally.

Scale, built form and articulation

Comments from the previous DSAP meeting included:

1. Building built-to lines on Pittwater Road: 5m to kerb for the first 3 storeys have not been complied with (9m for the above storeys has been complied with). The awning on the Pittwater Road facade should provide some street amenity/ shelter. New awnings to be setback minimum 1000mm from the face of the kerb to accommodate utility poles and traffic /parking in the kerbside lane. Where street trees are required, the minimum awning to setback is 1500mm.

2. Rear boundary setbacks to tower and podium section. Consider making the 6m setback to the first 4 storey and 9m from 5 to 9 storey as per recommendations from Apartment Design Guidelines (ADG). The appropriate building separation is necessary as there might be future residential towers proposed around the site and appropriate amenity should be maintained between the towers.

3. Building Height: The 27m building height requirement can be supported if the tower facades facing Pittwater Road and the rear courtyard can be made into slim tower elements sitting on top of the 3/4 storey building podium respectively. Façade treatment/ articulation should be considered for the south-west common boundary elevation to provide some relief from the blank wall proposed currently.

The design has been revised to incorporate many of these changes



Access, parking and services

The Panel supports no car parking provision on the site.

The bin room can be reduced in size as the number of bins appears excessive. This will enable the switch room to be moved from level 1 and provide façade area on level 1 for use for another purpose. The bike space on Level 1 can also be reconsidered, removing the wall to open the space, or increasing the void space and making the bikes visible in the void.

The bicycle storage area of the upper floor also suffers the long ramp and contorted circulation. This could be considered a simple rectangular space as an elevated mezzanine above the cafe (low height Ceiling below). Likewise, the switch room is poorly located in taking up valuable street frontage. An alternative position would be desirable.

The Panel questions the need for accessibility clearances within the cycle storage area.

Recommendations.

1. Reduce the number of bins to allow redesign and improvement of the ground floor layout.
2. The entry area could be reconsidered to provide a better address from the street and potentially create greater connectivity between the public domain, and the ground level up to the cycle storage area
3. Location of fire hydrant booster, firehose reel cupboard and letterboxes could be reconsidered.

Landscape

No comment on planting selections

Introduction of landscape on the façade and the terrace is recommended. Something which is low cost and maintenance

Roof top community space is commended

Recommendations.

4. Introduce low cost, low maintenance planting to the façade to tie into the level 6 terrace planting

Amenity

Previous Panel comment:

Solar Access: The light well proposed will receive limited sunlight so living unit proposed should not have windows just opening into the light well. Issues of noise nuisance and visual/ acoustic privacy should be addressed. A solar analysis should be provided to maintain adequate sunlight into the boarding room units.

a. Consider single aspect living unit facing Pittwater Road all the way up, only double units (subject to good layout/ amenities to units) facing the rear boundary (First 4 storey - 6m rear setback) and single aspect units (above 4 storey -9m rear setback).

b. Lift lobby security issues with sharing of living units with commercial spaces.

Balconies are now bigger to respond to comments from the last meeting. The light well has privacy screens. No living rooms require the light well for light or ventilation purposes.

Quality of the living environment is a concern with regards to the acoustic privacy through the lightwell/ventilation well.

Amenity of room 5.01 is questionable, it is complicated and contrived.

The planning of the upper floors may benefit from east and west wing walls being straight and not splayed perpendicular to the front boundary and rear. This will provide additional usable space.



Recommendations.

5. Resolve acoustic privacy to the bedrooms which open to the lightwell
6. Reconsider the layout of apartment 5.01

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

The narrow facade building “slither” in the streetscape could be used to create visual interest. A more articulated building facade with durable materials expressing themselves as reinforced concrete, glazing, balustrading and light weight panel may provide further opportunities to enhance streetscape. Also, solar louvring to the west may also be useful to shade summer afternoon sun and create a more “kinetic” facade. The Panel supports the use of strong colour in parts.

Recommendation.

7. Give further consideration to the material palette on Pittwater Road.

Sustainability

Shared laundries could be provided to save space and provide social opportunities as well as save materials.

PV is noted on the roof but only a relatively small array. The roof could be filled with PV and it would offset the energy use of the apartments.

NatHERS assessment has been done, but some of these apartments are too small to adequately model using NatHERS software. NatHERS software does not accurately model dwellings under 25m² in size. Although the BCA consultant has classified it as Class 2, it seems Class 3 may be a more appropriate classification, based on it being a boarding house. As Class 3, it should be assessed under Section J.

Recommendations

8. Consider utilising electric heat pump hot water and induction cooktops to replace the use of gas.
9. The Panel recommends increasing the size of the PV array as there is roof space for it and it will offset the dwelling energy consumption
10. Confirm the building class because a Section J assessment should be done instead of NatHERS
11. Communal laundries can provide more space and better social amenity for residents.

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel believes the majority of the comments from the first presentation to the panel have been addressed and the proposal is substantially improved. The use is appropriate to the location and restrictions of the site.

The Panel supports the development provided the applicant can address a few more minor amendments to the layout of the building:

1. Reduce the number of bins to redesign the ground floor
2. Reconfigure the cycle storage area.
3. Introduce low cost, low maintenance planting to the façade
4. Resolve acoustic privacy to the bedrooms which open to the lightwell
5. Reconsider the layout of apartment 5.01
6. Address sustainability issues – electrification of the building, increased PV array