RECEIVED Waverley Council

Application No: DA-125/2012/C

Date Received: 08/07/2020

08 July 2020

20 ILLAWONG AVENUE TAMARAMA NSW 2026 S4.55 SUBMISSION

DESIGN VERIFICATION STATEMENT

SECTIONS:

- 1. PREAMBLE
- 2. RESPONSE TO JRPP RECORD OF DEFERRAL
- 3. RESPONSE TO DEAP COMMENTARY
- 4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR ADDITIONAL ROOF HEIGHT
- 5. LIFT IMPACT
- 6. COMMENTS ON SEPP 65 DESIGN PRICIPLES

ANNEXURE A - HYDRAULIC DRAWING - LEVEL 8 PLAN

GroupGSA Pty Ltd Level 7, 80 William St East Sydney 2011 NSW Australia

T + 612 9361 4144 F + 612 9332 3458

www.groupgsa.com

architecture interior design urban design landscape

graphic design ABN 76 002 113 779

ABN 70002 113779 ARN #3990

SYDNEY BRISBANE GOLD COAST MELBOURNE PERTH SHANGHAI BEIJING HO CHI MINH CITY HANOI

1. PREAMBLE:

This Design Verification Statement is in support of the recently submitted S4.55 application. It specifically addresses issues in response to Waverley Council's DEAP correspondence dated 29 June 2020 in conjunction with NSW Planning Panel's Record of Deferral dated Thursday 21 May 2020. There will also be references Design Quality Principles as outlined in State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 (SEPP 65) which is identified in both the DEAP's correspondence together with the JRPP's Deferral document as being required

2. RESPONSE TO JRPP RECORD OF DEFERRAL

New perspective images are now provided as taken from a several vantage points including the west which drew particular attention from some members of the review panel. As indicated in the images, the wave treatment of the cantilevered awning on the east has been added to the west to provide character and visual interest. The gentle wave treatment is considered an improved design outcome over the approved vaulted expression which is arguably a 'heavier' aesthetic and does not create the same 'nautical' context for the seaside area.

BASIX Certificate now attached together with Wind Report

Alternative design with adjustments for higher roof now submitted albeit with the 'barrel vault' roof forms as previously approved for comparison.

3. RESPONSE TO DEAP COMMENTS

We respond to the dot points in the same order as raised in the DEAP correspondence:

- As above new perspective images added for better understanding of visual impression from various view aspects within the public domain
- The leading edge of the wave in the proposed wave awning profile will be detailed to the minimum possible structural depth possible as a primary design objective. At this stage, we expect that to be in the order of 200mm. The soffit will undulate from a fixed height at the window head to the leading edge of the wave profile to profile character and interest from all vantage points.
- Refer to the new perspective images from various vantage points which give an impression of the extent to which the parapet will be exposed
- Both Vodafone and Telstra drive outcomes based on commercial and engineering imperatives. The design team is not party to all of these imperatives and we have little control or influence over outcomes which are likely to be imposed. It is our understanding any proposal by either of

the two 'telco's' is subject to a separate and future Development Application.

- Refer to section below on Supporting Documentation for Additional Roof Height
- Amendments and additional supporting documentation now submitted in order to meet the Design Principles of SEPP 65 and/or achieve design excellence

4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR ADDITIONAL ROOF HEIGHT EXISTING ROOF HEIGHT VARIES

A registered survey has revealed that the existing roof has a variable finished level of 100mm across it's full extent which was not identified at DA stage.

STRUCTURE

The new Level 8 slab is designed not to bear any load on the existing roof – it spans from east to west onto new columns in accordance with the structural engineering details. By necessity, new hydraulic services and existing vent pipes need to reticulate in the void zone created. In addition, the structural engineer has subsequently confirmed the new Penthouse concrete slab requires 200mm thickness rather than 150mm as assume and drawn at DA stage.

HYDRAULICS

The hydraulic engineer confirmed during design development that a 250mm void zone was required between the existing roof slab and underside of new slab - rather than the 150mm allowed for in the DA submission. This is to roll over existing roof vent pipes and rise through the new Level 8 Penthouse to roof in conjunction with traps and hydraulic pipe reticulation to service sanitary fixtures in the proposed Penthouse apartments.

Each of these issues impact accumulatively on the Level 8 Penthouse slab height resulting in a required design height of RL 79.47 rather than the approved height of 79.255 - as indicated graphically on the extract diagram below:



EXTRACT FROM ANNEXURE A AS PREPARED BY HARRIS PAGR HYDRAULIC ENGINEERS – EXPLAINS WHY APPROVED LEVEL SLAB LEVEL OF 79.255 NEEDS TO BE RAISED TO 79.470 TO ACCOMMODATE HYDRAULIC SERVICES

P:\160455 20 Illawong Road Tamarama\2 Design\3 Authorities\1 Council-Dept Planning\200708_Design Verification Statement The photograph below illustrates the number of existing vent pipes on the roof (52 off) which all need to be rolled over to rise in new locations to accommodate the new Penthouse design



PHOTOGRAPH ILLUSTRATING EXTENT TO WHICH EXISTING ROOF VENT PIPES NEED TO BE ROLLED OVER

The following extract from the current hydraulic drawings prepared by Harris Page give an indication of the extent and impact of existing vent pipes on the roof in conjunction with new sanitary bathroom layouts to the Penthouse – all of which require a 250mm void zone to roll over and accommodate the new design and existing.



EXTRACT FROM HARRIS PAGE HYDRAULIC DOCUMENTATION SHOWING EXISTING VENT PIPE ROLL OVERS

CEILING HEIGHT AMENITY

Having determined the new Level 8 floor slab had to be raised to accommodate existing constraints, new structure and new design (non-

P:\160455 20 Illawong Road Tamarama\2 Design\3 Authorities\1 Council-Dept Planning\200708_Design Verification Statement level roof, vent pipe off-sets, and increased slab thickness), our attention was drawn tom the available ceiling height.

SEPP 65 recommends a ceiling height in Living areas of a minimum of 2700mm. The approved vaulted design would have created a low point in the vault through the middle of the living room. As the design is all about maximising the view outlook, the full eastern frontage needed to have maximum available ceiling height across the full eastern frontage to maximise the amenity and opportunity of the penthouse design. A low point of any vaulted ceiling less than 2700 would not yield the return on the development to make this upgrade viable. Hence, the design team sees a modest increase in floor to ceiling height, removal of the vaulted ceiling and a proposed new roof form as an improved outcome for the project with little consequence or compromise to the amenity of the surrounds. To the contrary, we consider the proposed new design as a significant improvement.

5. LIFT IMPACT

HEIGHT

The top of the lift core over-run has been increased in height from RL 83.465 on the approved S96 drawing A3003-100 [DA203] Issue A to RL 84.040 on the same drawing in the current S4.55 application. This was required by default as a result of the new Level 8 Penthouse slab being lifted for reasons as noted in Section 4 above in addition to the detailed requirements subsequently revealed to enable a stretcher lift to fit within the given constraints.

WIDTH

The current S4.55 approval shows the west face of both lift cores 2800mm across from outside face to outside face as a result of the client requesting a 24 person car. The current S4.55 application has reduced the lift car capacity back to a 16 person car resulting in a reduction the visual bulk of 2800mm wide west face of both lift cars down to 2600mm

6. COMMENTS ON SEPP 65 DESIGN PRINCIPLES Context and Neighbourhood Character

With respect to the proposed changes to the roof and associated nominal increase in height, there is a negligible impact on the increase in shadows as evidenced in Drawing No. A1104 – DA116 Issue G from the previously approved scheme.

From a visual perspective, the proposed new roof will have a gentle wave representation from both east and west elevations rather than a more grounded heavier barrel vault representation.

Built Form and Scale

The modest increase in roof height of the proposed S4.55 design would barely be noticeable from most vantage points in the neighbourhood. The waving cantilevered awning expressed in both east and west elevation creates images of both waves in the sea and is reflective of the edge of an oyster shell. This is contrasted to the currently approved roof expression which creates images which is articulated in a 'heavier' manner and reflective of vaulted bunkers for army barracks from the 1950's. The proposed new treatment is considered more subtle, in keeping with it's nautical context and deemed an improved aesthetic.

Density

No change

Sustainability

No change

Landscape

Ostensibly no change from the currently approved design intent

Amenity

The objective with any good design is to take advantage of the best outlook for a given site. The best outlook at 20 Illawong Avenue is the ocean views to the east and the provision of the balconies with which to partake in these views. The vaulted structure on the currently approved design have structural members which are grounded on the Penthouse levels and compromises the visual outlook together with functionality of the terrace. The proposed new scheme removes this issue resulting in an improved amenity for the occupants whilst at the same time improving the visual outcome with no detrimental impact on context or neighbours.

Safety

No change

Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

No change

Aesthetics

The proposed design results in an improved aesthetic for reasons as outlined in Design Principles above. More contextual design with nautical references, more subtle with a less heavy visual impact of a vaulted treatment. This design also results in significant improvement in the amenity for the residents of the proposed penthouse apartments.

I am an appropriately qualified and competent person to make and support the above comments.

Name Arch Reg No. Brian Graham 5107

Signature

for nan

Date

08 July 2020

