

RESPONSE DOCUMENT



Project:	DA2020/1756	Project #:	18057
Address:	351 & 353 Barrenjoey Road, Newport	Date of issue:	2021.10.22
to:	Northern Beaches Council	Issue number	01
Subject:	Response Document DSAP mtg 23rd September 2021	By:	PAUL GODSELL

Jordan, in response to DSAP meeting 23rd September 2021, and corresponding letter received on post meeting – Crawford Architects confirm we have adopted and addressed all changes in order to further improve and already quite refined design, and to provide an outstanding building for Newport. This excludes item 10 (as detailed below). Otherwise, Crawford Architects respond as follows (to be read in conjunction with amended documentation).

#	Council cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	General		
A	Parking	<p>Crawford Architects have already demonstrated our commitment to parking solutions and community concern with the provision plans that show great flexibility of the building to respond to future connectivity requirements. This is either to serve adjacent properties, create access where Robertson Road becomes fully pedestrianised, or as needed as a link to connect the post office site as the long term future access for all, to the site to the north (along Barrenjoey Road).</p> <p>Furthermore, w Crawford Architects e have already removed a level of parking, as per previous DSAP request, and as agreed by council, which has multiple benefit (all previously outlined).</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	
	Scale, Built form and articulation		
1	The minor intrusions into the setbacks are acceptable	Agreed	✓
2	Re-arrangement of Unit 13 may result in further intrusions into the 8.5m setback area. The Panel would consider this acceptable if it can be demonstrated that there is no additional impact on the overshadowing of the south side of Robertson Road (refer to section sketch).	The DSAP comments here are commended and logical, and the Unit 13 planning has been adjusted accordingly. CA confirm that the revised layout has no additional impact on the southern side of Robertson Road, but does increase the amenity of the unit substantially.	✓
3	Further investigation should be undertaken, and expert advice provided on the requirements for commercial kitchen exhaust and ducting on the roof top and presented in the architectural plan	The kitchen exhausts have been placed adjacent cores. This enables the following: (a) Enables the rise to be straight, (b) No access required throughout the rise, because they are straight, (c) Access provided in the common areas at the base, where the bend is, for cleanout, as per code. (d) The positions on the roof, being straight and adjacent cores, ensures the exhaust points are not only greater than 6m off the site boundary, but also ensures the maximum distance possible off the roof edge is achieved. This assists with further reduction of smells, and measurably increases the safety aspects pertaining to maintenance, when compared to units located near a roof edge (i.e. fall from height).	✓
	Access, vehicle movement and car parking		
4	Provide further design and construction details regarding the potential for opening to adjoining sites	The Drawings show the area of driveway that is intended to be detailed as a soft construction. CA confirm that the capping beam can be designed as a transfer beam in these two locations, enabling simple removal of the continuous pile and shotcrete at any time in the future.	✓
5	Consider conditions of approval to ensure the potential for connection to adjoining sites	CA have no issue that the design of a capping beam with structural load transfer capacity (enabling removal of contiguous pile wall and shotcrete) be made a condition of approval.	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
6	Provide schematic proposals for the removal and conversion of the driveway at a later date	CA confirm that the only removal will be for the front section of the driveway; i.e. the rise up to the apex), as this will be the portion of shop at footpath level (in the flood zone). And here, a small section to the west needs to be retained for overland flow from the church and post office sites). The rear back section of the driveway (heading down after the apex) will not be removed given (a) this will be lower than the flood zone, and (b) the slab remains useful as fire separation between the parking level and the shop level. A non-combustible deck can be constructed on top of the down ramp, with an approximately positioned and fire-rated blockwork wall constructed to separate the 2 uses on the ramps inside kerb edge.	✓
	Landscaping		
7	Incorporate a planter box accessible from and adjoining lobby B.	Planter box has been added outside lobby B, but also extends right along the outside of Unit 8. This provides additional screening for this unit, an additional external area (providing options for this unit in summer, which will be nice) and increased the acoustic properties here, simply by the inclusion of foliage.	✓
8	Ensure the body corporate is committed to maintenance of the planters and planting in the common areas.	Access has been provided so that this planter, via glazed doors in an operable glass louvred wall, allows for easy maintenance, whilst providing an extremely pleasant outlook for this lobby	✓
	Amenity		
9	Review and amend planning for unit and refer to suggestions on attached drawings. (DSAP 1-4)	Confirming almost all modifications have been adopted. The ramifications across other levels (where not considered by the DSAP panel) have also been undertaken, all of which CA confirm have further improved the amenity of these units also.	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
	Façade treatments/Aesthetics		
10	Delete glass balustrades and replace with non scalable balustrades on the inside of planter boxes	<p>The Idea of adding another half meter of blockwork or OFC (Off Form Concrete) to the outside edge of the planter has absolutely NOT been adopted: Whilst we have adopted all other requests, or made modifications to create the intent of the DSAP requests, the request to build a 1000mm high wall, on top of 500 depth planter, creating a 1.5m high solid wall around the units we see as both strange and awful. Crawford Architects note the following with respect to this request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) This will add to the overshadowing of the southern side of Robertson Road – and goes against everything both Council, the community, and Crawford Architects have been working so hard to avoid. (b) This will add a harsh scale to the façade: We much prefer the laying of materials, rather than the proposed brutalist approach (c) And to create a 1.5m high solid wall on a balcony – that you cannot see out of – especially when sitting, would be absolutely awful. The typical eye-height of someone sitting at an outdoor dining setting is around 1.2m, and if you are sitting on a more comfortable low slung outdoor lounge, this figure closer to just 1m. <p>Crawford Architects are therefore confirming we have NOT adopted this request - but retained the glass detailing – enabling views out across the suburb. CA note the new planter south of unit 8 is constructed 1m depth – so no glass – but increased privacy whilst still providing outlook.</p>	<p>✘</p> <p>😊</p>
11	Investigate finer grain fenestration on Robertson Road	Completed – shown on A300	✓
	Sustainability		
12	Gas cooktops have been included, but a better result will be achieved with induction cooktops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm happy to adopt - Confirm to be included as a condition of consent 	✓
13	Gas hot water is proposed, but heat pump hot water will be a better outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm happy to adopt - Confirm to be included as a condition of consent 	✓

#	Council and DSAP cited issue	Crawford Architects response	
14	Rainwater is no longer included, recommend it is reinstated to improve sustainability	Confirm we intend to have rainwater (This would have dropped off with the removal of the second basement level. Happy for this to be included (including volume) as condition of consent.	✓
15	Investigate additional PV	Larger PV array adopted.	✓
16	The rainwater tank appears to be deleted, none is shown on the drawings and there is no rainwater in the BASIX certificate. If there is a rainwater tank, it should be connected to landscaping or toilet flushing and included on the BASIX certificate	As per item 14: Confirm we intend to have rainwater (This would have dropped off with the removal of the second basement level. Happy for this to be included (including volume) as condition of consent.	✓
	Panel Conclusion		
Note	Despite the changes that have been made Panel does not support the proposal in its current form due to the poor interior planning and low amenity of some of the units.	<p>Crawford Architects are appalled that non-factual opinions have been shared in this manner. We strongly disagree that the interior planning is poor, and furthermore disagree that the amenity of some units is low. This is a difficult flood-prone sloping corner site, with an odd orientation. Crawford Architects consider that our resultant unit interior planning and associated amenity, and the overall building aesthetic to be of a high quality.</p> <p>Furthermore, the panel's recommendation to create a 1.5m high solid wall around the upper floor balconies, has to be one of the worst suggestions that have ever been put to Crawford Architects – and for this panel to come back and share their opinions in the manner they have in their letter, twice, is a bit much.</p>	✗ ☹️



Paul Godsell
Director – Crawford Architects