

Attachment B

DAPRS Advice Sheet – 7 December 2021

DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL RESIDENTIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Project	422-424 Cleveland Street, Surry Hills
DA No.	D/2020/993
Review Date	7 December, 2021
Panel Present	Kerry Clare Libby Gallagher Tony Caro Michael Zanardo
COI Declaration	None
Designer	JSA Studios
Applicant	Pyrafount No. 6 Pty Ltd
Applicant Attendees	Kim Jones, JSA Studios, Architect Gemma Bassett, Ethos Urban, Planner
Council Officer	Shannon Rickersey
History of Application	This application has previously been presented to the Subcommittee in December 2020.

Advice:

The Panel was presented with the Development Application for the site. This application was reviewed by DAPRS in December 2020. The LPP has required that the amended plans to return to DAPRS.

- The Panel appreciates the Applicant's aspiration to provide a cultural entertainment venue and the desire to for the commercial aspects of the development to contribute to viability.
- The proposed changes to the design have increased the retention of heritage fabric which is supported by the Panel.
- The reduced height and overall scale of the additions can now be considered acceptable, however any impacts on neighbours due to additional shadowing need to be clarified. Although there is a distinct jump in building height from High Holburn Street and Goodlet Lane to development controls along Cleveland Street the proposal has improved to include landscape and terrace to step down in scale on the north of the upper level.
- Spatial requirements for risers from the basement workshop and amenities should be clarified. The fire hydrant booster assembly needs to be sized correctly, access to plant rooms shown and comms risers included, etc. Air intakes are shown however the all the exhausts are not clear. Vents for the Hall's AC plantroom in the existing roof is also unclear.
- Two lifts have now been provided which improves the amenity for building occupants. Is there a need for both lifts to be large or could one be smaller if more service riser area is required?
- Zero setback on east boundary leads to difficulty with privacy screening and results in poor outlook from the rooms and compromised amenity. A larger scale louvre or some shaping to

the wall could help direct views to the north east while providing better outlook and amenity. Visual privacy of the neighbouring properties appears to have been achieved. The solar access to 426 Cleveland Street appears to comply with the requirements of the ADG and the City's Draft Overshadowing Documentation Guide.

- For the top two floors, it may be possible to introduce some upwards looking clear glass windows above eye height.
- Moving the stair is a good move as it locates non-habitable uses in the most sensitive location to neighbouring backyards. To the south of this, would a more solid scooped wall to the accessible room be a better solution (similar to that in a previous version of the scheme)?
- The amount of wardrobe space and kitchen area in each room needs to be clarified.
- The relationship between new additions and existing structure has improved with the retention of all timber support arches, the deletion of new columns through the space and a reduced basement area, however still needs further resolution (refer Section D on DA 5.02). The overhang remains excessive creating a poor relationship with the heritage item. The overlap of the church ridge and the cantilever needs structural clarification. The scale of the overhang could be further reduced without a reduction in room numbers. The geometric and material resolution of the underside of the overhang may benefit from further modelling studies.
- The unconventional design and appearance can generally be considered compatible (or not incompatible) with the character of the local area on the basis of the uniqueness of the site and existing building, the varied existing context and the proposed intended cultural uses. SDCP 2.13.1(h) notes to 'encourage a mix of building types to reflect existing diversity of form and massing'. SDCP 2.13.1(i) notes to 'protect the curtilage of special building types along Cleveland Street, notably church building, to enable visual appreciation of the buildings' which is achieved. SDCP 2.13.1(k) is to 'encourage active uses on ground floor... Above ground uses should be diverse such as... residential' which is achieved. SDCP 2.13.1(j) 'notes to encourage cafes... (to offer outdoor dining to activate and enliven the street where footpath width permits)' which is enabled.
- Whilst developing the proposal further the Panel recommends a reduction in the number of materials and styles, in particular, reconsideration of the use of heat treated stainless steel. Although the design has improved the compatibility with the local character and relationship to the dwellings in High Holborn Street needs to be considered.
- Window operation should be indicated on the elevations.
- The area of communal living may not be sufficient for the number of people served.
- Private outdoor space needs to be provided to 30% of the rooms.
- There is no landscape package with the DA that adequately describes the landscape proposal and no demonstration that canopy cover requirements are met. The ac units in the western garden should be reconsidered.
- The landscape proposals are limited to the provision of a communal roof top space, and green wall to the western frontage. Detailed annotated plans and sections should be further developed for these spaces. A maintenance plan should also be developed showing requirements and responsibilities for the building manager. Irrigation should be incorporated into the DA landscape package.
- The front courtyard nominates no landscape change with retention of the two palms in planters. Paving in this area appears to be in poor condition. Further consideration should be given to this zone.

- The communal laundry unfortunately has no natural light or ventilation. However, the upper common drying room could have a ventilating skylight.