

Attachment D

DAPRS Advice Sheet

DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL RESIDENTIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Project	13-17 Ithaca Road, Elizabeth Bay
DA No.	D/2021/1253
Review Date	7 December, 2021
Panel Present	Kerry Clare Libby Gallagher Tony Caro Michael Zanardo
COI Declaration	None
Designer	SJB
Applicant	North East No.1 Pty Ltd – ATF The Billyard Trust
Applicant Attendees	Adam Haddow, SJB, Architect Joanne McGuinness, SJB, Architect David Maes, SJB, Architect
Council Officer	Daniel Stanley
History of Application	This application has not previously been presented to the subcommittee.

Advice:

The Panel was presented with a new Development Application for the site. There is an existing court approval for D/2015/1200 granted 7/2/17 for the site which retains the existing building structure constructed in the 1990s. The Panel understands that this is a new Development Application (not a Modification Application) and whilst the LEC consent is a material consideration, the application must be assessed as a new application. The Panel notes that generally it is unfortunate to reduce existing dwelling numbers in an area of high amenity. Further comments are as follows:

- The impact of the proposed changes at street level, such as the plant room louvres is not supported. The street interface should be reconsidered with increased indoor and outdoor communal space. A positive contribution to the public domain is required and ADG guidelines for communal space should be met.
- Noise and heat impacts from plant room areas needs to be clarified.
- Deep soil (of a minimum 3m dimension) should be provided in accordance with the SDCP requirement of 10% site area. As there is an over provision of car parking, additional deep soil could be achieved by reducing the car park area. Car parking spaces could be removed in the southwest and southeast corners and made deep soil. The driveway area adjacent to the storerooms 4, 5, 6 and 7 could also be changed to two deep soil areas for better planting and tree canopy cover.
- Tree planting should be provided in the deep soil zones and comply with the COS DCP section 3.5.2 which states that at least 15% canopy coverage is to be provided on a site within 10 years from the completion of development. It is noted that the applicant proposes to remove and replant existing

palm trees and provide 3 new trees. The proposed species do not appear to provide the 15% canopy requirement and should be further reviewed. Additionally, one species proposed *Schefflera actinophylla* is listed as weed species by the NSW Department of Primary Industries and should be reconsidered.

- The upper-level soil area provides only 200mm soil depth. This may be insufficient for healthy plant growth. Alternate solutions may need to be explored that increase soil depth in some locations. Detailed Landscape sections should be provided.
- Consideration should be given to direct access from Ithaca or Billyard Streets for the first floor apartments. This would increase activation and amenity.
 - There is a concern that many areas in the apartments will need artificial light and air throughout the day due to the deep plans, the amount of fixed glass windows and areas of unprotected glass. Excellent environmental initiatives should be pursued. ADG 4D-2 notes the depth penetration of daylight relative to the height of internal rooms.
- The number of solar panels on the roof may be able to be increased to improve the environmental performance.
- The reuse of the existing structure is a good use of resources however the structural engineering required for the larger room spans, the changes to the majority of the interior load bearing walls and changed core arrangements are extensive and may offer only minor benefit in this regard.
- The windows facing the west boundary are less than 6m separation from the boundary (ADG 3F-1 1) therefore information describing the neighbouring window configurations is required and should be included in a site analysis (ADG 3A-1 1). The setback should be increased or methods to ameliorate visual privacy introduced. Shaping the wall/window to face the boundary at an angle is preferable to window screening that reduces the amenity and outlook.
- It is noted that the existing building 2.7m floor to floor heights are less than the current ADG recommendation of 3.1m. Due to the low existing ceiling heights, the Panel supports the initiative expressed to locate all services, lighting etc on the wall rather than within the ceiling/floor. No bulkheads should be introduced.
- Air conditioning units on balconies are not supported by the Panel due to acoustic and heat issues between balconies and apartments, as well as loss of useable area.
- The common circulation is very lean – 1700 wide circulation space in front of lifts and less for the private lift lobbies. A more generous stair with a much larger void would improve light access deep into circulation and be more in keeping with the luxuriousness of the apartments proposed. ADG 4F-1 4 is relevant. SDCP 4.2.3.3 requires that:
 - (1) Internal common areas, corridors and lift lobbies are to have access to daylight and an outlook.
 - (2) Provide modulation and adequate dimensions to common corridors to give a feeling of spaciousness. Common corridors must also be designed to maximise safety and security.
 - (3) Common corridors are to be at least 2m wide in front of lifts.
- Alternatively, given the amount of structural changes proposed to the original building the introduction of an indented courtyard on the east and west that extends to the private lift entries would provide access to natural light and increase opportunities for cross ventilation as well as deep soil planting (if some of the basement parking is reduced).
- Consideration should also be given to making the ground floor lobby more generous and in keeping with the type of housing proposed.
- Waste management, bin rooms in lobbies and collection issues should be discussed with Council. The current proposal (no garbage chute or recycle bins on habitable levels) is not commensurate

with the type of apartment offered.

- Silver level LHDG accessibility should be provided to all units given their size
- The Panel considers the elevational treatment superior to the previously approved proposal. The brickwork is considered to be a particularly important element to maintain.
- The Panel supports the reduction of the lift overrun height described compared to the previously approved proposal.