

Attachment C

DAPRS Advice Sheet

DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL RESIDENTIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Project	17 Billyard Avenue, Elizabeth Bay
DA No.	D/2021/1261
Review Date	7 December, 2021
Panel Present	Kerry Clare Libby Gallagher Tony Caro Michael Zanardo
COI Declaration	None
Designer	Environa Studio
Applicant	Environa Studio
Applicant Attendees	Tone Wheeler, Principal Architect, Environa Studio, Architect Melanie Aussel, Environa Studio, Architect Amy Sutherland, Director, Sutherland & Associates, Planner John Pooley and Prudence Harper, Owners (with Tone Wheeler offscreen)
Council Officer	David Reynolds
History of Application	This application has not previously been presented to the subcommittee.

Advice:

The Panel was presented with the Development Application for the site. The Panel considers that the current design does not meet the threshold of Design Excellence for a number of reasons as noted and recommended in the following:

- The physical and visual impacts of the proposed additions on the existing contributory item are considered unsatisfactory. The monolithic, dark and glassy aesthetic of the proposal is considered highly inappropriate and out of character with both the contributory item itself and the mixed character of the area. The proposal looks to have a commercial building expression with highly tinted glass in a curtain wall construction and is highly unsuited to residential use. The proposal does not respond sympathetically to the heritage conservation area in terms of setbacks, siting, form, bulk, scale, landscape and materials (SDCP 3.9.6(1)). The scale of the building does not mediate between the height of the contributory item and the surrounding apartments.
- Character – the bulk and setbacks are not compatible with the character of the area (SEPP ARH 30A). The Local character statement SDCP 2.4.6 notes that the area "...allows view sharing to continue from the private domain and gaps between buildings". SDCP 2.4.6(j) notes "...building separations are encouraged to provide views to the harbour and sky...". Proposed side setbacks and overall height should permit view sharing, particularly from the lower levels of 14 Macleay Street and 16 Macleay Street. The proposed bulk and siting are uncharacteristic. A view analysis should be provided. The L&EC Planning Principle on 'views' (Tenacity v Warringah Council) should be referred

to. The concept of compatibility includes both physical and visual impacts (Project Venture v Pittwater Council).

- The cantilevered overhang of the proposal over the house (Room 18) demolishes a part of the existing roof and creates a poor relationship with the existing building and an area of roof and guttering that will be difficult to access and maintain.
- Shadow and view loss impacts on neighbours need to be clearly articulated. View from the sun diagrams should be provided.
- The building separation to the western neighbour should be clarified.
- The proposed stair is close to the western boundary and there is potential for light-spill impacts on neighbours.
- The provision of deep soil is non-compliant (does not achieve the required proportion or dimension of 3m). Deep soil and planting to the rear boundary should be prioritised. It is noted that while the site is located on sandstone, there are native tree species adapted to grow in these conditions. The planting strategy should be further considered, and appropriate species incorporated into the design.
- The reliance on the green wall for privacy and aesthetic outcome is highly problematic in terms of ongoing maintenance and longevity.
- There is insufficient information about the cliff face treatment/protection.
- Meters, services and fire boosters need to be clearly shown on the plans and with appropriate areas and access. Deep soil areas should not be used for services
- Some of the rooms are very low in amenity in terms of ventilation and outlook, for example room N02, N09 and N14 which have very small windows. In addition, these may not comply with the BCA in terms of ventilation. The lower floors behind the house in particular have poor access to outlook, light and air. The very narrow windows are insufficient.
- The proposed floor-to-floor height of 2950mm is likely to compromise ceiling heights. A ceiling height of 2700mm is preferable to achieve.
- Some of the existing rooms (eg N04 and N05) may be greater than 25m² (SEPP ARH 30(1)(b)) as the areas being excluded for the kitchens are excessive. This is a must not consent clause and may require a Clause 4.6.
- It would be more appropriate for the attic stair be configured to be accessed from the manager's dwelling rather than through Room N10.
- Accessibility to entrance doors should be checked for compliance.
- Stair handrail spatial requirements and fire egress pathways need to be checked for compliance.
- The BCA report provided does not include a detailed assessment of items that need to be addressed.
- Environmental performance is a concern – extensive east facing glass with no sun shading will trap heat within the rooms. Tinting the glass reduces transmission of visible light and heat, but the non-transmitted heat is largely absorbed by the glass which becomes heated and radiates to the interior. External sunshading appropriate to orientation will provide superior environmental performance.
- Awning windows combined with fall protection perform poorly in relation to ventilation. The best example is the current UK regulation for ventilation which nominates awning windows opening less than 15 degrees are unsuitable for good ventilation.

- Amenity of the undercroft communal area given the amount of bike parking, lack of winter sun access and “moist” environment is problematic. Bike parking dominates the usable area and impacts on circulation. This undercroft space offers very limited amenity and could be an uncomfortable space to occupy.
- The windows on the adjacent buildings need to be provided in plan and section at each level to assist with the assessment and understanding of the relationship and impacts between dwellings.
- Existing Rooms N01 and N06 have privacy issues with the shared verandah.
- The lack of an airlock between bins and cars and the foyer to the existing lift has the potential for poor air quality.
- Private outdoor space needs to be provided to 30% of the rooms.
- The generous communal rooms at Level 1, and the communal open space to the front with solar access, are commended.