

Attachment B

**Design Advisory Panel Residential
Subcommittee Advice Sheet**

DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL RESIDENTIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Project	650 Botany Road Alexandria
DA No.	D/2022/165
Review Date	7 June 2022
Panel Present	Kerry Clare Alexander Koll Matthew Pullinger Michael Zanardo
COI Declaration	None.
Designer	Orosi Architecture. Original design architect (Javad) has left the firm. Paul van der Westhuizen has taken over.
Applicant	Orosi Architecture
Applicant Attendees	Paul van der Westhuizen. Orosi Architecture
Council Officer	Samantha Kruize
History of Application	This application has not previously been presented to the Subcommittee.

Note for Council - Paul van der Westhuizen was in attendance - but is not a registered architect. The applicant will still need to attend to the question of design authorship and provide a valid Design Verification Statement in order for the DA documentation to be complete.

Advice:

The Panel was presented with the Development Application for the site. The Panel considers that the current design does not yet meet the threshold for Design Excellence and noted and recommended the following:

- Permissibility – The ground floor non-residential space is noted as ‘commercial’. The commercial space must be either retail or business. Office use is not permissible. This aspect should be clarified.

- The ground floor non-residential space is too small. This undermines the spirit and the objectives of the B7 zoning. The non-residential space should have a minimum internal depth of 10m to meet the controls for busy roads. The commercial space should have access to a bathroom and kitchenette.
- Site amalgamation with adjacent sites would permit a better development.
- The floor space calculations need to be clarified with Council as the proposal appears to be well over the maximum permissible FSR control.
- The proposed circulation strategy, including vertical circulation, is unacceptable for reasons of amenity and safety. Ascending and descending fire stairs need to exit separately – that is, they cannot be joined. The proposed egress paths include open stairs at a fire source feature, crossing the podium and re-entering the building and pass an active lift lobby prior to discharge. The ability to comply with the requirements of fire egress in a Class 2 Building need to be demonstrated and have the potential to significantly alter the proposal.
- The street interface should be reconsidered. Botany Rd is the main street address and direct front door access to bus stops, local amenity and the nearby school should be provided for building occupants. Any lift serving the Botany Road building should be accessible from a ground floor entry. The long corridor to the Birmingham Road lift creates poor access and visibility to the lobby along with concealment and safety concerns. The addition of a gate to improve CPTED would then reduce access to light.
- The double vehicular access dominates the street interface and should be reduced.
- Architectural façade resolution – The street level façade appears flat and could be better articulated. The façade should be given more material substance and depth. The use of brickwork detailing may assist in providing a more suitable response within the context. If the arches refer to the roof form of the southern neighbour’s building there may need to be a higher solid to void ration to be successful.
- The landscape provision is under sized and the design offers poor amenity. The delivery of canopy trees should form the basis of any well-designed landscape and communal open spaces.
- Retention of the existing significant paperbark tree on Birmingham Road is considered essential and will have an impact on the design.
- All proposed units are one bedroom. The proposed lack of apartment mix is not supported.
- Apartment amenity – the proposal cannot meet the ADG targets for cross ventilation. A minimum of 60% of apartments need natural cross ventilation as described in the ADG. The proposed lightwells may be built out by future development and cannot therefore be relied upon for the achievement of cross ventilation.
- The provision of a door only and no window to bedrooms is unacceptable. As noted above, the lightwells may be built out by future development. The lack of access to good light and ventilation will be exacerbated by the amount of noise and light-spill from the common lightwells. A habitable room cannot rely solely upon small, deep lightwells for light and ventilation. The balconies to the lightwell have the potential to increase noise levels.
- Botany Road is classified by TfNSW as a State Road with a traffic volume of more than 20,000 vehicles and provides the key north-south road link in the area. The balconies and windows facing Botany Road will offer poor amenity. Habitable rooms will require particular acoustic treatment to achieve natural ventilation whilst mitigating noise impacts.
- The open corridors are not configured to provide any amenity to the apartments and risk creating light spill and acoustic problems for both the subject property and neighbours. Cross ventilation and

acoustic plenums from the open balcony are not proposed.

- Floor to floor heights and the provision for large service risers (which are non-continuous) appear to be excessive and should be reduced to ensure a realistic match between an appropriate bulk and height, and so the lift overrun sits within the height control.
- Solar access calculations to the courtyard will need to account for future development of the site to the north which could be expected to block sunlight. The sun-paths shown on the site analysis and the north point do not match.
- The bin rooms for commercial and residential waste are in the basement and will need to be brought up to street via the steep driveway or through the residential lift.
- A nominated architect has not signed the design verification statement required by SEPP 65.
- The proposal in its current form is not compliant with the BCA, multiple SEPP's including SEPP 65 and the Infrastructure SEPP, the DCP, and when measured correctly for FSR, and HOB (lift over-runs) would not be compliant with the LEP.
- This application is not approvable under the BCA and fundamentally fails to meet many of the criteria for design quality and design excellence and therefore is not supported. The applicant is encouraged to consider withdrawing the application.