

# **Attachment C**

**Design Advisory Panel Residential  
Subcommittee Advice Sheet**

## DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL RESIDENTIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

<b>Project</b>	349 Liverpool Street, Darlinghurst
<b>DA No.</b>	D/2022/831
<b>Review Date</b>	1 November, 2022
<b>Panel Present</b>	Kerry Clare Paul Berkemeier Libby Gallagher Matthew Pullinger
<b>COI Declaration</b>	None
<b>Designer</b>	Woods Bagot Architects
<b>Applicant</b>	Toohey Miller
<b>Applicant Attendees</b>	Jason Fraser, (Woods Bagot Architects) Clare Swan (Ethos Urban) Mercedes Janecek (Ethos Urban)
<b>Council Officer</b>	David Reynolds
<b>History of Application</b>	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 yet meet the threshold of Design Excellence for a number of reasons noted below, and recommends the following:

- Generally, it is acknowledged that the proposed apartment layouts have the potential for good amenity for the occupants, however the proposal does not align with the requirements of building separation as described in the Apartment Design Guide. The result is notable negative impacts on neighbouring dwellings.
- The proposal will impact the amenity of several of the adjacent apartments in Mont Clair. In particular, as a consequence of extending and enclosing the existing light well, the central studio apartments on the eastern side of Mont Clair will have reduced outlook, reduced access to natural ventilation and daylight, and reduced acoustic and visual privacy. There will also be increased issues of light spill between neighbours at night. Building separation distances encouraged in the ADG are

6m (height 4 storeys) and 9m (height 7 storeys). Council should satisfy itself that any negative impacts can be avoided or mitigated.

- The proposal will negatively impact the residential dwelling house immediately to the south of the site at 1 Darley Street which has local historical significance. More generous rear setbacks should be considered. No further reduction in amenity to this neighbour (when compared with the existing condition) would be a good outcome. Compounding this, the proposed rear set back results in a constrained landscape solution as demonstrated in the section drawing. More information is required about this narrow area, for example, the neighbour's roof (shown extended to the boundary on the survey), the adjacent ground level, extent of basement retaining walls and any retaining requirements at the boundary.
- The communal open space to the south on the ground floor does not achieve appropriate solar access. Good quality rooftop communal open space would assist in meeting the ADG targets. This COS should be relocated to roof top areas and be of a sufficient area to achieve the ADG 25% site area requirement.
- Deep soil provision is insufficient in the current design, and provides only 2% site area, whereas the ADG recommends 7% of the site area of a minimum 3m dimension. The narrow zones adjacent to the carpark driveway and along the rear boundary do not meet the ADG definition of deep soil.
- A reduced building and basement footprint would also enable a better deep soil outcome. This deep soil should accommodate new tree planting of an appropriate scale (medium to large) in alignment with City of Sydney Tree Canopy requirements. It is noted that two established trees are proposed to be removed from the site; the new proposal should plant at least two trees in deep soil zones at a minimum.
- A reduction in the proposed car park provision could be considered to support a reduced extent of basement and increased deep soil and landscaped areas. The basement design also needs development to meet fire safety requirements. Currently the size of the basement requires two egress stairs.
- Courtyards above basement to the east, west and south have been provided, however they are considered narrow and not adequate for good crown growth. The sections do not convincingly demonstrate the provision of soil volume over basements for planting on structures. This needs to be designed as a wider zone to provide adequate crown growth and root ball area.
- Any services/exhausts/risers that are located within these landscaped areas (above risers shown in the south-east corner of the basement) should be clearly identified on the plans. All plant areas should be tightly planned, co-ordinated and integrated. No air conditioning compressors should be mounted on balconies or on facades. Services should be located clear of deep soil zones.
- The need for an airlock between the lift lobby and garbage rooms should be investigated to reduce potential for odours.
- Acoustic separation for lifts located within the apartments will need appropriate cavity wall construction.
- The method for achieving fire separation for windows close to side boundaries needs to be demonstrated.
- The proposed fire hydrant booster may have an unacceptable impact on the existing street tree. The placement and presentation of services at the front boundary should not impact the quality of the streetscape or building address and entry. The Arboricultural Impact Statement notes trenching adjacent to and significant pruning of street trees, which would not be acceptable. The architectural response to canopy retention needs to be resolved in the design.

- The flight of stairs addressing the building entry at the street, while typical of traditional buildings in the vicinity, is not ideal for equitable access under current codes. A new building should provide equitable and dignified access to all people at its primary entrance. The proposed stair climber is considered an inferior outcome and a more appropriate solution should be sought.
- Environmental concerns include the increased overshadowing, reduced access to daylight for neighbours and the potential overshadowing to neighbours' solar panels. Full height, fixed glazing facing north would benefit from more extensive sunshading (particularly during the mid-seasons) and improved fenestration to permit natural and cross ventilation to living areas. This would also reduce reliance on air-conditioning. The Panel is concerned for the achievement of acoustic privacy between neighbouring properties that results from the enclosure of the light well and from the reduced capacity for tree canopies to crown. The applicant discussed options for additional operable windows for increased natural ventilation with security and weather protection.
- Cross viewing within the development and between neighbouring properties to private outdoor spaces needs further consideration.
- The Panel supports in principle the introduction of an infill building on this site. Key to making this work in this context will be a stronger, more direct relationship with the Mont Clair building to the west. In its current form, the proposal does not adequately address its architectural and functional relationship with Mont Clair. In particular, the street wall and cornice lines of the two adjacent buildings should relate more closely and avoid the incongruous step currently evident in the proposal. A stronger sense of differentiation between the base of the building and the primary façade is encouraged. The highly pronounced frame and the concave vertical element (an inversion of the Mont Clair central façade element) could be reconsidered in several different ways and the Panel encourages further exploration in discussion with the City of Sydney.
- The resultant number of dwellings on the site will be notably reduced. The area is highly suited to smaller apartments due to its proximity to the city, parks and services. The Panel questions whether the provision of more, smaller apartments with no basement car parking could be considered - at least to some extent and in concert with the amendments that follow other recommendations of this report. This may also reduce or eliminate the extent of underpinning of neighbouring heritage buildings during deep excavation.
- The excavation near heritage items should be more thoroughly investigated. A desktop Geotech review is considered insufficient given the risk to neighbouring properties. A safe construction methodology should be demonstrated.
- The building exceeds the maximum height of building control. It is the Panel's view that this could only be contemplated if impacts to neighbours are significantly reduced or mitigated, and if the extent of deep soil and rear setbacks (particularly) are increased.
- Stairs to roof spaces from apartments are shown uncovered in drawings. This requires drainage at the lower level which is not failsafe and is likely to cause problems for future occupants. Operable, trafficable and flush-finished skylight systems may resolve this issue.
- The proposed materials palette has potential for a quality outcome. Any sandstone used should be a Sydney sandstone without bedding grain, as characteristic in the precedent historic buildings cited as precedents in the applicant's presentation. Carefully considered architectural detailing will be essential to ensure arrises, and corners avoid any appearance of tiled surfaces.