

**MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING
LANE COVE COUNCIL
Monday 9th August 2021**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS:

Peter St Clair	Chairperson	Architect	Nettleton Tribe
Brendan Randles	Panel Member	Urban Designer/ Architect	Brendan Randles
Ben Jones	Panel Member	Sustainability consultant	Steensen Varming

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

Na

COUNCIL STAFF:

Rajiv Shankar	Manager Development Assessment
Henry Burnett	Senior Town Planner

COUNCIL OBSERVERS:

None

APOLOGIES:

Angela Panich	Panel Secretary
---------------	-----------------

ITEM DETAILS:

Property Address: 10-12 Marshall Avenue and 1-3 Holdsworth Avenue St Leonards NSW (Area 12)

Council's Planning Officer: Henry Burnett

Owner: New Golden St Leonards Pty Ltd

Applicant: New Golden St Leonards Pty Ltd

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, construction of a 13-storey residential flat building comprising 105 apartments, 2.5 storey basement with approximately 113 car parking spaces, provision of 400 m2 public open space and green spine/communal open space on ground level and other associated landscaping

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

The meeting was an online documentation review and therefore not attended by the Applicant.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Panel members had separately indicated that there were no conflicts of interest.

3.0 PRESENTATION

There was no presentation by the Applicant.

4.0 DEP PANEL COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This design review forms part of the St Leonards south pre-DA process. The Panel is engaged by Council to provide independent and impartial advice on the design of development proposals and applications to lift the design quality of projects. The Panel's comments and recommendations are intended to assist Council in their design consideration of an application against SEPP 65 principles and where relevant the requirements of the St Leonards South Landscape Masterplan (the Masterplan) dated October 2020, Lane Cove LEP 2009 and Lane Cove DCP amended 2016. This review also assesses compliance with the LEP design excellence requirements Parts 7.6. The absence of a comment under a particular heading does not imply that particular matter to be satisfactorily addressed, more likely the changes are suggested under other principles to generate a desirable change.

Your attention is drawn to the following;

- SEPP 65, including the 9 Design Quality Principles and the requirements for a Qualified Designer (a Registered Architect) to provide Design Verification Statements throughout the design, documentation and construction phases of the project.
- The Apartment Design Guide, as published by Planning NSW (July 2015), which provides guidance on all the issues addressed below.

Both documents are available from the NSW Department of Planning.

1. To address the Panel's comments, the applicant may need to submit amended plans. **Prior to preparing any amended plans or attending additional Panel presentations, the applicant must discuss the Panel's comments and any other matter that may require amendment with Council's assessing Planning Officer.**
2. When addressing the Panel's comments by way of amendments, if the applicant does not propose to address all or the bulk of the Panel's comments and wishes to make minor amendments only, then it should be taken that the Panel considers the proposal does not meet the SEPP 65 requirements. In these instances it is unlikely the scheme will be referred back to the Panel for further review.

4.2 General

The Panel thanks the Applicant for the Natural Ventilation Assessment Report.

The Design Review Panel makes the following comments and recommendations in relation to the project. These are based on the previously presented PTW design report and the Natural Ventilation Assessment Report completed by SLR and dated June 2021.

4.3 Design Review Panel technical assessment of Natural Ventilation Assessment Report

The assessment is technically good, however questions remain over the basic assessment criteria and therefore the validity of the results. We request further narrative around the assumptions and results, plus improved imagery for the general interpretation of these results. Report specific comments include:

- Why was a static vs dynamic calculation method proposed ? There are advantages / disadvantages for both, but general commentary should be provided. A CFD static calculation is very detailed, but its validity can be reduced if the dynamic assumptions are questionable.

- 3 ACH relates to contaminant removal / air quality. We would interpret this as the requirement for outdoor / makeup air, rather than a suitable allowance for passive conditioning purposes. However, ASHRAE recommends that homes receive 0.35 air changes per hour but not less than 15 cubic feet of air per minute (cfm) per person. Therefore the advised 3 ACH is considered in excess of background outdoor air requirements and will ultimately provide a degree of passive conditioning. However, 3 ACH remains questionable, is this considered sufficient or comparable?
- A 3D image / markup of their CFD model would be useful. To see how opening types have been applied. We assume these opening types are accepted by the architect from an aesthetics compliance, weather protection, security perspective etc.
- We appreciate that a CFD study is a static / single point in time calculation. Therefore the inputs must be based on conservative annual averages or alike. The 1.7m/s seems reasonable. However, we wouldn't agree in suggesting the 93.7% occurrence / frequency of Sydney airport is a good reference. Sydney airport is on the coast and is completely unobstructed. We would suggest that Sydney Olympic Park is a representative comparison. Accounting for some conservatism, is it fair to say that the result presented will be achieved for 70% of the time only?
- It's good that blocks were used to represent neighbouring buildings. Please confirm this includes for the proposed neighbourhood and not solely what is shown at present, noting that its pending immediate redevelopment.
- It's difficult to comment on Appendix A as the images are hard to interpret. We would suggest that each apartment is shown with a clear scale, description, and next to its associated floor plan.

4.4 Design Review Panel comments and recommendations

The Panel does not support the north facing one-bedroom apartments as being naturally ventilated in accordance with the ADG. A recessed balcony is not considered as providing a satisfactory air pressure variation enabling cross ventilation.

In the case of the east facing 2 bedroom apartments the effectiveness of the cross ventilation may be enhanced through the relocation of some internal doors.

It appears that a number of 2 bedroom east facing apartments besides the vertical slot have not been designed or identified as being naturally ventilated. The Panel notes that with further design development and the appropriate CFD modelling these apartments may possibly be considered naturally cross ventilated. However the Panel notes that if additional windows were provided to these apartment side walls besides the vertical slot, this may be problematic. This may cause visual and acoustic privacy issues with the common space in front of the lifts.

The Panel also highlights the recommendation made following the second DRP meeting, for additional daylighting and outlook to be provided to the typical corridors at the northern or southern end. Given the unacceptability of the north facing one bedroom apartment for purposes of cross ventilation, the removal or reconfiguration of this apartment may permit this additional amenity to the corridor.

The Panel recommends that the Applicant:

- Replan the north end of the building so as to provide two larger complying natural cross ventilated units or remove them from the natural ventilation count. As part of this amendment additional daylighting and outlook should be provided at the end of the corridor consistent with the Panel's previous advice from the DEP held 8th July 2021.

- Investigate the possible re-design of east facing apartments adjacent to the vertical slot. It would appear that a number of these are not currently counted, yet have the potential to achieve natural ventilation and compensate for the loss of natural ventilation to the north facing one bedroom apartments.
- Complete revised CFD modeling of the other apartments based on a comparative study between neighbouring ADG compliant and non-compliant apartments within the proposed building (possibly select 3 examples of this including the worst-case apartment). Compare ACH and air velocities. In this way apartments will be subject to the same external parameters and variables. The Panel would consider this methodology to be more representative of natural ventilation performance than adopting a questionable benchmark.

5.0 OUTCOME

The Panel has determined the outcome of the DRP review and provides final direction to the Applicant as follows:

- The Panel recommends that the architectural drawings, schedules and Natural Ventilation Assessment Report be further developed in accordance with the above recommendations and returned to Council for consideration.