



5 December 2017

The General Manager
City of Canada Bay
1A Marlborough Street
Drummoyne NSW
Attn: Shannon Anderson

RFI Response to Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel | DA206/0492
Property: 227 and 231 Victoria Road, Drummoyne

Dear Shannon,

We write as the applicant for Development Application 2016/0492 pertaining to 227 and 231 Victoria Road, Drummoyne to respond to the Reasons for Deferral set out in the Record of Deferral by the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel dated 16 November 2017 and the subsequent comments of Council at the meeting of 30 November 2017.

Revised Architectural Plans have been prepared to respond to the issues raised which were:

- The rejection of the Clause 4.6 Variation Requests for Clause 4.3 and Clause 4.4 of the LEP (although the panel will accept a height variation in respect of the lift tower for access to the roof)
- Inconsistency in floor-to-floor heights – 3.04 m and 3.1 m
- Poor natural cross ventilation – using skylights
- Inaccuracy in the floor space calculation

The amended architectural drawing set is listed on the following page. The plans which have been amended to respond to the Panel comments are noted in red.

Dickson Rothschild

D.R. Design (NSW) Pty Limited
ABN 35 134 2237 540

65-69 Kent Street www.dicksonrothschild.com.au
Millers Point, NSW 2000 Australia +61 2 8540 8720

Nominated Architect: Robert Nigel Dickson Reg. No: 5364

DRAWING LIST		
SHEET	DRAWING NAME	REV
0xx - GENERAL		
DA-0-001	COVER SHEET	D
DA-0-002	PHOTOMONTAGE SHEET 1	B
DA-0-003	PHOTOMONTAGE SHEET 2	B
DA-0-004	DRAWING LIST	D
DA-0-005	PROJECT SUMMARY	D
1xx - SITE		
DA-0-101	SITE ANALYSIS 1	A
DA-0-102	SITE ANALYSIS 2	A
DA-0-103	SITE ANALYSIS 3	A
DA-0-104	SITE ANALYSIS 4	A
DA-0-104a	SITE ANALYSIS 5	B
DA-0-105	SITE PLAN 1	C
DA-0-106	SITE PLAN 2	C
DA-0-107	DEMOLITION PLAN	A
DA-0-108	SURVEY	
DA-0-109	AMALGAMATION PLAN	A
2xx - PLANS		
DA-0-200	BASEMENT 2	C
DA-0-201	BASEMENT 1	C
DA-0-202	GROUND FLOOR PLAN	F
DA-0-203	LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN	D
DA-0-204	LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN	C
DA-0-205	LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN	C
DA-0-206	LEVEL 4 FLOOR PLAN	C
DA-0-207	LEVEL 5 FLOOR PLAN	C
DA-0-208	LEVEL 6 FLOOR PLAN	B
DA-0-210	COMMUNAL OPEN SPACE	C
DA-0-211	ROOF	C
DA-0-212	ROOFTOP LIGHTING PLAN	B

DRAWING LIST		
SHEET	DRAWING NAME	REV
DA-0-251	GFA PLANS	E
3xx - ELEVATIONS		
DA-0-301	NORTH ELEVATION	E
DA-0-302	SOUTH ELEVATION	B
DA-0-303	WEST ELEVATION	D
DA-0-304	EAST ELEVATION	E
DA-0-305	VICTORIA ROAD ELEVATION	D
4xx - SECTIONS		
DA-0-401	SECTION AA	D
DA-0-402	SECTION BB	E
DA-0-403	ACCESS RAMPS	C
DA-0-404	FACADE SECTIONS	C
6xx - DETAILS		
DA-0-601	ADAPTABLE UNITS	C
DA-0-602	LIVEABLE HOUSING DESIGN – SILVER LEVEL	B
9xx - DIAGRAMS & SCHEDULES		
DA-0-901	FINISHES SCHEDULE	C
DA-0-902	SHADOW ANALYSIS - SHEET 1	C
DA-0-903	SHADOW ANALYSIS - SHEET 2	C
DA-0-905	DCP/ADG ENVELOPE DIAGRAM	A
DA-0-911	HEIGHT PLANE DIAGRAM - TOP OF PARAPET 1	C
DA-0-912	HEIGHT PLANE DIAGRAM - TOP OF PARAPET 2	B
DA-0-913	HEIGHT PLANE DIAGRAM - TOP OF PARAPET 3	B
DA-0-914	VIEW ANALYSIS 1	A
DA-0-915	VIEW ANALYSIS 2	A
DA-0-921	SOLAR & CV - SHEET 1	C
DA-0-922	SOLAR & CV - SHEET 2	C
DA-0-923	SOLAR & CV - SHEET 2	C
DA-0-933	FUTURE BUILT FORM ANALYSIS - VICTORIA ROAD 1	B
DA-0-934	FUTURE BUILT FORM ANALYSIS - VICTORIA ROAD 2	B
DA-0-935	FUTURE BUILT FORM ANALYSIS - VICTORIA ROAD 3	B
DA-0-936	FUTURE BUILT FORM ANALYSIS - VICTORIA ROAD 4	A

An updated Clause 4.6 Variation for Height of Buildings (Clause 4.3 of the LEP) is also attached which has been amended to reflect the reduced height proposed. The previous Clause 4.6 for FSR (Clause 4.4 of the LEP) is retracted as the proposed development as amended complied with the applicable FSR control of 2:1.

A new BASIX certificate forms part of the application. The only difference in the updated BASIX commitments pertains to thermal comfort.

Overview of Amendments

1. Complying with FSR of 2:1

- The amendments have reduced the Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the proposal from 2,145 m² to 1,733 m² by reducing the number of units from 23 to 18. To achieve this, Level 6 has been removed reducing the number of apartments by 3 and Level 1 has been redesigned to reduce the total number of apartments from 6 to 4.

- The Level 1 redesign has modified the layout to be somewhat similar to Level 2 above.
- In redesigning Level 1 to be similar to Level 2 in terms of circulation, the Ground Level Residential Lobby has been modified with the central void previously proposed eliminated and the stair to Level 1 removed.
 - Arising from the Council meeting of 30 November, the pedestrian accessway and lobby have been widened and the retail tenancy reduced in size.
- Other benefits arise from the redesign of Level 1. This removes habitable rooms from the northern boundary shared with McDonalds. It also removes windows from the proposed driveway entry and instead provides a roof over the driveway, achieving better acoustic and visual amenity for Level 1 apartments.
 - Arising from the Council meeting of 30 November, the planter areas have been increased and the northern boundary condition clarified with a clear glass balustrade above the proposed planter proposed to ensure safety while maintaining solar access into the proposed Level 1 courtyards.
- Due to the reduction in the total number of apartments, requirements in regard to the following has arisen and each has been addressed as follows:
 - Adaptable Housing

With the reduction of units from 23 to 18, two adaptable units are now required where previously three adaptable units were required. The previous design designated one of the Level 1 apartments as adaptable (Unit 1.05). This has been removed with the redesign of Level 1 which now only comprises 4 apartments. The layouts of the two remaining designated adaptable units has not changed.
 - Waste

With the reduction of apartments from 23 to 18, the total number of waste bins required is reduced by 1 and the total number of recycle bins required reduces by 1. However, the proposed waste room size is not proposed to be reduced. This allows for additional manoeuvring space within the room which is beneficial.

2. Reduction in Building Height

The proposed amendments have eliminated one storey from the development, making the building 6 storeys. The floor to floor height of the Ground Level has been kept to 4 m (consistent with the ADG), and each floor-to-floor height above is now 3.1 m (where previously Level 1 Level 2 and Level 4 had Floor-to-Floor Heights of 3.04 m). At the roof level an additional 0.2 m is provided to allow for sufficient roof structure. Overall, the height of the building (including architectural roof feature) has reduced by 2.72 m.

The roof parapet at the north-east corner of the building exceeds the height limit by 0.12 m. The roof parapet levels at the south west corner of the building is below the height limit by 1.5 m. Portions of the rooftop garden balustrades and planter edges exceed the height limit by a small degree. The maximum non-compliance of the planter which doubles as balustrade is 0.63 m. This allows for safety and sufficient planter soil depth. The majority (but not all) of the architectural roof feature is above the 20 m height plane.

This is consistent with the Panel's discussion which accepted that roof elements may exceed the height limit to facilitate the proposed accessible roof garden. A comparison of levels is provided in the table below:

Element	Previous Proposal (7 Storey)	Amended Proposal (6 Storey)	Difference
Architectural Roof Feature	RL 57.38	RL 54.66	-2.72
Lift Overrun	RL 57.22	RL 54.5	-2.72
Top of Parapet (Roof garden)	RL 54.52	RL 51.8	-2.72
Top of Parapet (Roof)	RL 53.62	RL 50.9	-2.72
Top of Roof	RL 53.42	RL 50.7	-2.72

Due to the elimination of the top floor, the positions of the timber panel elements on the party wall facing south have been adjusted.

3. Inconsistency in Floor-to-Floor Heights

The proposed floor levels have been amended so that each residential floor has a minimum floor-to-floor height of 3.1 m. It is noted that the top floor (Level 4) has a Floor-to-Floor height of 3.3 m to allow for roof structure.

4. Poor Natural Cross Ventilation

The proposed redesign of Level 1 to reduce GFA has achieved two additional cross-ventilated units without reliance on skylights. Therefore, the total number of units cross-ventilated is 12 out of 18 or 66.7%. It is noted that the skylights are proposed to remain; however, they are not factored into the cross-ventilation figure. The cross-ventilation diagrams are provided at DA-921-923.

5. Inaccuracy in the floor space calculation

The proposed floor space calculation has been revised to include the horizontal fire stair/plant egress on Ground Level. This is confirmed at DA-251.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Dickson Rothschild

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Nigel Dickson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Nigel Dickson

Managing Director