

**MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING
LANE COVE COUNCIL
Monday 13th December 2021**

DRP PANEL MEMBERS

Peter St Clair (PSC)	Chairperson	Architect
Stephen Collier	Panel Member	Architect
Alex Haliburton	Panel Member	Landscape architect
Digby Hall	Panel Member	Architect & sustainable design

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES

Alistair Cook	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Alex Yim	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Ben Pomroy (BP)	Rothe Lowman	Architect
Jonathan Cole	Rothe Lowman	Architect
Michel Barnett (MB)	Arcadia	Landscape architect
Sarah Papalio	Ethos Urban	Planner
Clare Swan (CS)	Ethos Urban	Planner

COUNCIL STAFF

Mark Brisby	Executive Manager, Environmental Services
Rajiv Shankar (RS)	Manager Development Assessment
Chris Shortt	Senior Town Planner
Terry Tredrea	Strategic Planner
Angela Panich	Panel Secretary

COUNCIL OBSERVERS

None

APOLOGIES

None

ITEM DETAILS

Property Address: Area 1: 1- 5 Canberra Avenue + 4 Marshall Avenue

Area 2: 6 - 8 Marshall Avenue + 2 Holdsworth Avenue

Area 4: 4 - 8 Holdsworth Avenue St. Leonards NSW 2065

Council's Planning Officer: Chris Shortt

Owner: New Hope Evergreen

Applicant: New Hope Evergreen

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 3 residential flat buildings of 13, 15 and 19 storeys comprising a total of approximately 266 apartments, 5 levels of basement car parking, green spine/communal open space, public park and other associated landscaping.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

RS and PSC welcomed the Applicant and Design Team. All Panel members, Council staff and Applicant's representatives introduced themselves and described their respective project roles. PSC provided an acknowledgement of country. The meeting was held at Lane Cove Council's offices.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3.0 PRESENTATION

The Applicant and Design Team were invited to present the pre-DA proposal for the subject sites within Areas 1, 2 and 4 of the St. Leonards South Precinct. BP presented the architectural proposal contained in Rothe Lowman's Design Review Panel Submission dated November 2021 and associated architectural plans dated 30/11/21. MB presented a summary of the landscape design proposal and CS of the statutory planning matters speaking to the same documents.

4.0 DRP 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 the requirement for the project to demonstrate design excellence.

The Applicant's attention is drawn to the following documents available from the NSW Department of Planning and Lane Cove Council.

- 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.
- Lane Cove LEP 2009 and St. Leonards South DCP 2020 Part A vision objectives that require the project to demonstrate design excellence.
- Lane Cove DCP Parts A & B (Locality 8 St. Leonards South dated October 2020) and Part C (amended February 2016).
- St. Leonards South Landscape Masterplan (the Masterplan) dated October 2020.

All documents are

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 or design excellence 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 and Design Team for presenting the proposal to the DRP at an early stage and commends aspects of the proposal. However a significant number of issues require further development before the proposal could exhibit design excellence. A limited number of drawings were provided to the Panel, restricting the extent of the review particularly in relation to the building elevations, apartment plans and landscape design.

4.3 Principle 1 Context and Neighbourhood Character

The site forms the north-east corner of the St. Leonards South Precinct flanked by other multi-storey residential buildings to the north and east. The existing character to the south and west is exemplified by early to mid-20th century detached bungalows with red face brickwork and terracotta coloured clay tiled roofs. A single bungalow remains to the north-east corner of the site at 2 Marshall Avenue. The pre-DA proposal assumes that this will not form part of the overall development due to failed attempts to purchase the site.

Significant trees to the surrounding streets and within the centre of the site contribute to a substantial tree canopy, attractive streetscapes, summer shade and wildlife habitat. Noting a number of the street trees have poor canopies due to energy authority pruning, Holdsworth Avenue has a number of well-established street trees. Careful consideration needs therefore to be given to the selective removal and replacement of street and site trees substantiated by an arborists report. Detailed cross sections will need to be prepared to ensure that proposed service trench locations do not compromise the health of these trees. The Panel recommends that the applicant liaise with Council's Tree Officer and Stormwater Engineer to ensure that the maximum number of street trees are retained.

The proposal does not fully demonstrate how it responds to the broader context. For example consideration should be given to forming a through-site link between Buildings 2 & 4 and alongside Building 1 to connect Holdsworth Avenue to Canberra Avenue. Better consideration should also be given to existing topographic conditions of the site, terracing and how that could be reflected in the public domain, open space and overall built-form response.

The design narrative should include investigation of ways to connect to Country with the opportunity for references within the overall design. The current design does not adequately respond to this with no evident designing with Country process having been undertaken. The Panel recommends that an indigenous consultant be engaged by the design team to inform the design outcome.

4.4 Principle 2 Built Form and Scale

The height in storeys of all buildings appear to be consistent with the Masterplan. However it does not appear that lift access has been allowed for, to the landscaped roofs. Equitable access would be necessary to all communal open spaces such as that to the roof of Building 2. Lift access will also assist in the ability to service these areas. The Panel would not support the use of stair climbers for this purpose.

The length of Building 2/4 is considerably greater than the maximum 35m identified in the DCP. The continuous podium of 85-90m is not supported in its current form due to the lack of building articulation, ground level site permeability and negative impacts on apartment amenity. It is noted that the Urban Design Report page 4.04 indicates a more permeable podium and ground level.

The setbacks of Buildings 1 and 4 to the southern boundaries do not appear to fully comply with the ADG Objective 3F-1. Where the building to boundary separation should increase above the 4th and 8th storeys, the proposal instead appears to step above the 5th and 9th storeys. This is not supported by the Panel as it will impact the amenity of future development to the south.

The proposed pedestrian skybridge appears unresolved and its value is questioned by the Panel. Nor is it compliant with the building height limit that applies to the green spine. Consideration should be given to improving the visual and physical connection between the podium communal decks and ground level communal open space, by dropping the decks down one level or enhancing connections to the ground through staircases or ramps.

4.5 Principle 3 Density

The architectural drawings indicate that the gross floor areas of both Buildings 1 and 2 exceed the maximum permitted FSR. This is not supported particularly as key amenity criteria such as cross-ventilation do not appear to be fully achieved across the development.

4.6 Principle 4 Sustainability

A clear sustainability narrative is not yet evident in the current precinct, landscape and architectural approach consistent with the design excellence requirements for a development of this scale. The Panel strongly encourages the design team to think about sustainability as an opportunity to drive a bigger site wide narrative beyond a standard approach. Specifically the following issues should be addressed:

Water

1. Provide details on how a sustainable water ecosystem can be supported, including harvesting and re-use of stormwater, rainwater, and any considerations of wastewater treatment
2. Provide details on water sensitive urban design, green infrastructure initiatives and in particular how such initiatives might support the proposed landscape scheme during times of drought, extreme heat events or water restrictions.
3. Consider the inclusion of active or moving water in the landscape design, for the purposes of urban cooling and biophilic design.

Carbon Emissions

1. Provide further detail on how the overall development might allow the future community to achieve 'carbon positive' living to align the development with the principles of ecologically sustainable development (SLSLEP 7.6, 4) viii) through aspects such as;
 - a. Photovoltaic panels, energy storage, electric vehicle charging and energy sharing, e.g. through an embedded network.
 - b. 100% electrification throughout the development, avoiding any use of fossil fuels for heating, cooling and cooking
 - c. Provide details on how residents are to manage waste into the future, including the present or future ability to achieve zero organic waste (or zero emissions from organic waste), the separation and recycling of materials, and the potential to re-use / re-furbish / swap furniture and equipment with other residents.
 - d. Provide details on the targeted NatHERS ratings (including compliance against SLSLEP 8.1 Environmental Performance), noting that all proponents are encouraged to significantly exceed minimum compliance wherever possible.
 - e. Noting that the proponent has made allowance for all car parking spaces to be 'EV ready', please provide further detail and/or demonstration that the overall electricity supply to the site has the capacity to provide for full electrification of the site including EV charging
 - f. Noting the considerable exposure to the west for many proposed dwellings, please provide further design development showing how passive shading / cooling is to be embedded in the western elevations. The proponent is encouraged to emphasise external shading such that heat does not enter the dwellings wherever possible.

Biophilic Design

1. Noting that the ground plane and some lower floors indicate reasonable connection with nature (either existing or proposed), the applicant is encouraged to provide further detail on how residents of upper levels are either connected with nature through the design, or are able to introduce their own green space. This might include detailed designs for

balconies and terraces, strata-owned green walls and landscaping, roof terraces and green roofs. Should any façade-greening be proposed please provide detailed explanations of how plants are to be maintained into the future.

2. Please provide further design details and descriptions of the proposed landscape scheme, including materiality and the use of natural elements. The proponent is strongly encouraged to develop this as a genuine integration of connection with Country.

Comfort & Amenity

1. The Panel notes what appears to be a high number of single-orientation dwellings, many of which face east or west and hence are exposed to high heat loads without the ability to cross-ventilate. The proponent is asked to further develop the dwelling mix and configuration in seeking the highest possible number of dwellings that are able to cross ventilate – noting that this is defined as the ability for air to travel from one side of an apartment to the other, or through double-height arrangements. (refer ADG 4B Natural Ventilation, Objectives 4B-1, 2 & 3).
2. Demonstrate how at least 60% of apartments are naturally cross ventilated in accordance with the above principles, as outlined in ADG Objective 4B-3.
3. Provide information describing how apartments are able to harness prevailing breezes, in conjunction with more developed elevation details (refer ADG Objective 4B-1)
4. Noting the prevalence of single-orientation dwellings and notwithstanding the above, please provide further detail on how residents are to shade their apartments from direct sun / heat load without compromising access to quality natural light. It is expected that solutions would be external to the dwelling's glazing.

Climate Risk

1. The proponent is strongly encouraged to carry out a climate risk assessment relevant to 1) the overall site and 2) the proposed design, over a timeline that covers the expected lifespan of the buildings. In particular consider the high likelihood of increases in extreme heat, and increases in heat event severity, frequency and duration. Provide detail on how the proposed design has anticipated these future risks and how necessary adaptations have been made in the design.
2. As noted above, provide further detail on water initiatives to sustain the landscape in the event of extended drought, heat events or water restrictions, with specific descriptions relevant to St Leonards South 8.5.2 Urban Stormwater

4.7 Principle 5 Landscape

The proposed levels of the green spine are not clearly identified and appear to be resulting in a significant loss of large trees to the centre of the site. In addition to the comments made under Principle 1 the proposed removal of trees will limit the ability for existing trees to reduce the scale of the built form. Longitudinal sections through the green spine would be helpful in understanding the proposal.

The percentage of deep soil area proposed across the total site and within the green spine is not clear in the drawings. The basement carpark provides a major intrusion into the green spine which is not consistent with the DCP Part C objectives which state that parking basements should be located beneath perimeter building footprints in order to protect central deep soil zones. This would have major impacts on existing tree retention, proposed tree planting and groundwater recharge. In addition some areas are shown as have only approximately 1 metre of soil depth which is considered too shallow to sustain substantial trees. Desirably the whole green spine needs to have the same quality and intensity of mature trees.

Delineation between the public domain and communal open space indicates a seamless path of travel through the site. There needs to be a clear delineation / barrier to physically separate

these spaces. Care will need to be taken to achieve this sensitively, while also maintaining any through site pedestrian linkages (predominately east / west connections).

It is proposed to retain and replant a number of established palms on site. This concept is supported, as these will provide a sense of establishment and help provide human scale to the communal open space.

The Panel recommends that the Applicant and Council ensure that the WSUD and landscape design elements that support the creation of natural habitat features and ground water re-charge, are carried through to the site to the south and then onto the Berry Creek wildlife corridor.

Consideration should be given to the provision of landscaping solutions to the western facades of all buildings, which together with sun shading should serve to reduce radiant heat gain.

Further details should be provided explaining the legibility of the park and communal open space entrance from Marshall Ave, indicating how this will be designed and managed as genuine public domain, not appropriated by the private residential buildings.

4.8 Principle 6 Amenity

The general distribution and configuration of the buildings across the sites is generally supported. However the continuous podium of Buildings 2 and 4 is not supported in its current form as it results in long common corridors with minimal daylighting and outlook (particularly levels 3,4 and 5) and a very high number of single aspect apartments with limited cross ventilation. The common corridors to levels 4 and 5 in Building 1 also receive little daylight benefit from the single window due to the configuration.

A significant number of apartments to Buildings 2 and 4 are identified as complying with ADG cross-ventilation requirements. The Panel questions if these do in fact comply given they are single aspect apartments (for example level 2 of the Building 2/4 podium). Additional details of apartment layouts should be provided demonstrating cross-ventilation air paths consistent with figure 4B.8 and Objective 4B-2 of the ADG.

In order to maximise northerly orientation consideration could be given to modifying the façade/edges of apartments with for example a serrated edge and balcony, to allow each apartment the opportunity for good solar access to their private open space.

It is not clear if the apartment building floorplate depths comply with the ADG due to the lack of dimensions. However it appears Building 1 is considerably deeper than the 18 metres identified in Part 2E of the ADG. Whilst this may be acceptable at the upper levels, which contain a reduced number of apartments, the lower levels are compromised by deep apartment layouts, limited cross-ventilation and minimal access to daylighting and outlook for common circulation areas.

Whilst it is recognised that the apartment layouts are preliminary, they appear to be driven by the external building form resulting in some poor outcomes for balconies, living rooms and bedrooms in particular to the north elevations of Buildings 1 and 2. Consideration should be given to developing /making the concave impressions more part of a functional design strategy to get light and air into the centre of floorplans and to wet areas, rather than as a decorative treatment to the façade. The Panel would like to see this curvature /surface expression based on an internal design strategy that advances the amenity of the apartments.

Building entrances are generally well located affording opportunities to activate streets, however additional details are required. Entrance canopies, courtyard entrances, seating, signage graphics and lighting are encouraged to all building entrances consistent with part 3G of the ADG.

The communal decks on level 3 should be configured to improve connections with the ground plane communal open space thereby promoting their utilisation. The Panel notes that the GFA calculation plans indicates the communal decks as being unenclosed. Further details are requested to identify how the nominated activities could operate in unenclosed fully shaded space and how the pool depths are accommodated within the structure given apartments are located immediately below.

Consideration should be given to providing a direct connection from the town houses at level 1 to the communal open space. Similarly ground level apartments to Holdsworth and Canberra Avenue should be provided with direct street access.

The Panel requests additional graphical data to demonstrate 2 hours of solar access is achieved to all the east facing apartments shown as compliant, given the sun eye views show the sun-path as almost parallel to the east facade at 11.00am. It is noted that the north sign shown on the site plan is different to that shown on all other drawings. Neither of these appears to be correct as Holdsworth Ave is not aligned north-south. This should be reviewed and if necessary corrected as should all the related solar access compliance. Details of the over-shadowing impacts on the public park and communal open space on the subject site from the adjacent building to the north at 5-7 Marshall Street are also requested.

4.9 Principle 7 Safety

Additional details are requested of the building entrances to determine how visual surveillance and safety will be managed. The location and type of fencing and security control between the park and communal open space should also be identified. The introduction of individual dwelling entrances at the ground levels of the streets and communal open space would assist with both social activation and passive surveillance over these spaces.

4.10 Principle 8 Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

A greater variety of housing typologies would be expected within a project of this scale. Whilst the provision of a both apartments and townhouses is supported, additional typologies should be introduced such as dual frontage and cross-over apartments to the Building 2/4 podium and additional corner apartments.

The proposed incorporation of communal recreation decks within the building podium is supported and seen as supporting social interaction, animating and activating the communal open space and street frontages and providing some level of visual permeability to the built form.

4.11 Principle 9 Aesthetics

The general principle of stone and masonry podiums with differentiated tower forms above is generally supported. However the drawings do imply extensive use of dark coloured glass to the towers which is not seen as consistent with the existing or future character of the precinct and is questionable, in particular to the extensive west elevations, which will be subject to significant heat loads in summer. Detailed elevations should be provided indicating composition and scale, material palette, response to existing and future precinct streetscapes, balcony treatments, extent of glazing and solar shading.

4.12 Summary of key recommendations

1. Demonstrate more clearly how the development responds to the broader context and consider east-west through site links for the Area 1,2 and 4 residents, connecting Holdsworth Ave to Canberra Ave.
2. Further develop the landscape design and provide a narrative and design response that provides connections with Country. Reference can also be made to the draft framework *Connecting with Country* on the GANSW website.

3. Further develop the sustainability strategy in response to the issues raised under Principle 4.
4. Expand the ground floor private open spaces into the communal open space to further activate the space and enhance solar access as per St. Leonards South Landscape Masterplan Private Open Space Typologies - Private Courtyards and Terraces.
5. Coordinate the communal open space with neighbouring properties to the south to achieve a contiguous design with Areas 3, 5 and 6 as per the St Leonards South Landscape Masterplan Private Open Space Typologies - Communal Open Space.
6. Separate Building 2 and 4 and/or provide greater articulation to the connected podium through the introduction of courtyards, voids, through-ways, additional corner apartments and variation in materiality to improve street and green spine activation, apartment amenity and site permeability.
7. Remove the pedestrian skybridge or modify to comply with the building height limits and better connect to the communal open space at ground level.
8. Reduce the extent of the basement carpark below the green spine by dropping by one level to enable an artificial soil profile of approximately 1 storey to be created and/or reduce the basement width to a vehicle cross over adding the lost parking to a deeper basement.
9. Provide compliant deep soil at 25% of the site area, in accordance with Part J of the Lane Cove DCP and predominant deep soil (in excess of 50%) of the communal open space in accordance with Part C of the Lane Cove DCP page 63.
10. In order to demonstrate design excellence, develop and clearly communicate the apartment designs including the governing architectural idea and objectives. This should include a description of the planning principles in regard to orientation, privacy, cross ventilation, solar access and shading, views and bedroom configuration relative to living spaces and private outdoor space.
11. Develop the building elevations to respond to the differing contexts and street characters of the various site areas, differing orientations and solar control requirements and differing outlooks, noting that the predominant use of dark coloured glass to the towers is not consistent with the precinct nor supported by the Panel. The internal setbacks and elevations of the 3 buildings addressing the green spine should be more varied and articulated to avoid a canyon like appearance to this space.
12. Review solar access to all east facing apartments and graphically demonstrate that 2 hours of sunlight is achieved to living spaces and private open spaces in accordance with Part 4A of the ADG.
13. Provide sun-shading devices to west facing windows consistent with Part 4A of the ADG.
14. Enhance housing diversity and cross-ventilation airflow by reducing the number of single aspect apartments, particularly in Buildings 2 and 4. Verify that 60% of the total apartments are cross-ventilated within the first 9 storeys in accordance with Part 4B of the ADG.
15. Provide additional detailed drawings including all elevations identifying proposed materials, 3d renders (seen at the review but not supplied to the Panel), apartment floor plans, landscape plans, arborist's report and survey to allow Council and the Panel to review this material in advance of the next Design Excellence Review.

5.0 OUTCOME

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

- The Panel does not support the proposed development in its current form. An amended proposal should be prepared satisfactorily addressing the identified issues and recommendations in Section 4.1 - 4.12 above and returned to Council and the Panel for consideration.

MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING

LANE COVE COUNCIL

Friday 13th May 2022

DEP PANEL MEMBERS

Peter St Clair (PSC)	Chairperson	Architect
Stephen Collier	Panel Member	Architect
Alex Haliburton	Panel Member	Landscape architect
Digby Hall	Panel Member	Architect & sustainable design

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES

Alistair Cook	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
David Johnson	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Alex Yim	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Taisei Tam	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Ben Pomroy (BP)	Rothe Lowman	Architect
Russell Isaac-Cole	Rothe Lowman	Architect
Michel Barnett (MB)	Arcadia	Landscape architect
Tom Goode	Ethos Urban	Planner
Sarah Papalia	Ethos Urban	Planner
Lachlan Finn	Stantec	Sustainability

COUNCIL STAFF

Mark Brisby	Executive Manager, Environmental Services
Rajiv Shankar (RS)	Manager Development Assessment
Chris Shortt	Senior Town Planner
Terry Tredrea	Strategic Planner
Angela Panich	Panel Secretary

APOLOGIES

None

ITEM DETAILS

Property Address: Area 1: 1- 5 Canberra Avenue + 4 Marshall Avenue,
Area 2: 6 - 8 Marshall Avenue + 2 Holdsworth Avenue, Area 4: 4 - 8 Holdsworth Avenue St. Leonards
NSW 2065

Council's Planning Officer: Chris Shortt

Owner: New Hope Evergreen

Applicant: New Hope Evergreen

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 3 residential flat buildings of 13, 15 and 19 storeys comprising a total of approximately 266 apartments, 5 levels of basement car parking, green spine/communal open space, public park and other associated landscaping.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

RS and PSC welcomed the Applicants and Design Team. All Panel members, Council staff and Applicant's representatives introduced themselves and described their respective project roles. PSC provided an acknowledgement of country. Digby Hall was not present at the meeting however had reviewed the documents and provided comments and recommendations to the Panel prior to the meeting.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3.0 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 dated October 2020, Lane Cove LEP 2009 (including Clause 7.6 Design Excellence) and Lane Cove DCP Locality 8 (Parts A & B), dated 22nd October 2020. 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 to the Panel for further review.

4.0 DESIGN REVIEW

4.1 Presentation

The Applicant and Design Team were invited to present the revised pre-DA proposal for the subject sites. BP presented the architectural design report dated April 2022 and drawings dated 21 April 2022. MB presented the landscape design report dated April 2022.

4.2 Panel comments and recommendations

The Panel commends the Applicant and Design Team on the development of the built form that now achieves increased site permeability, improved building articulation and pedestrian scale and enhanced apartment layouts and amenity. The detailed response provided by Ethos Urban to the Panel's previous review comments is also appreciated.

The Panel however continues to have concerns around the minimum compliance approach taken to a number of design issues. These include the facade designs (e.g. overly repetitive, limited materials palette, potentially high maintenance materials, lack of solar shading) and the approach taken to sustainable design, that targets only minimum legislated standards instead of the design excellence standard required within the precinct.

The Panel makes the following specific comments and recommendations in relation to the project.

4.2.1 Principle 1 Context and Neighbourhood Character

The large site amalgamation achieved by this project, combined with the three distinct street frontages provides a unique opportunity and need for a variation of built form, facade designs and material palettes in order to form the rich neighborhood character anticipated by the precinct masterplan. The Panel believes that the current design proposal continues to be too uniform and commercial in character and does not yet demonstrate an appropriate response to the current and future context.

The Panel commends some aspects of the proposal that seeks connections with country. However, a more substantial and holistic response is expected that supports the design excellence threshold applying to this precinct. This is not yet sufficiently demonstrated in the architectural design and sustainability proposal. An indigenous design consultant or indigenous community representative has not been engaged as previously recommended. A more thorough response could implement the Government Architects Office Draft Framework for Connecting with Country as a guide. The Applicant may also consider contacting the Aboriginal Heritage Office to obtain further advice.

Consider how the concept of “coalescence” as described (pivots on intersection between natural and urban landscape and between people and place) be articulated and readily perceived by visitors / observers /users. Consider if the reading, degree of transparency, shape of property boundaries become part of a strategy.

The proposed facade design is considered too uniform and does not adequately respond to the varied neighbourhood and street characters. The elevations should be further developed to consider and respond to each street and landscaped outdoor space, incorporating a greater diversity of materials and variety and layering of architectural elements. Variation in the identity of each tower is encouraged.

4.2.2 Principle 2 Built Form and Scale

The Panel supports the reduction in the building envelope and physical separation of Buildings 2 and 4 with the resulting improvements to site permeability, reduction of long corridors to level 1-5 and improvements to apartment amenity as a result of additional corner apartments. Although the east-west pedestrian link also provides improved connectivity to the communal open space, it seems that there is a lost opportunity in the execution of this linkage. There needs to be a human scale provided to this link perhaps through the use of greater landscape treatment to provide scale, additional windows for passive security and to better activate the link and decorative facade treatments.

The Panel notes the overall built form is heavily dependent on the success of the design, construction and ongoing maintenance of the horizontal slab edges and spandrels. There is a discrepancy between their representation on section detail drawing and perspective renderings. In addition, while the 3d renders suggest a sandstone look podium and metal finished slab edges to the towers, BP confirmed these are proposed as in-situ concrete with an applied finish. The Panel is concerned that the design intent will not be achieved. These signature feature of the architecture needs further refinement. Refer to Principle 9 for recommendations.

The Panel supports the removal of the subterranean apartments to Holdsworth Avenue with resulting improvements to the built form, street activation, apartment amenity and a reduction to the perceived number of storeys. The architect confirmed there are no ground level apartments with outdoor space below street level.

The relocation of the pool to the ground level provides an improved solution more integrated with the green spine, although it appears some areas of dark undercroft space may be provided at Level 1.

The architect confirmed that lift access is provided for all residents to the roof communal open spaces by separate hydraulic lifts and that all lift motor rooms sit within the maximum permitted building height. It is recommended however the Applicant explore if the main lift core can be extended to the roofs thereby encouraging greater use of the communal roof terraces and avoiding the additional maintenance and energy costs of installing the hydraulic lifts.

4.2.3 Principle 3 Density

The proposed density, FSR and GFA allocation is supported subject to the comments and recommendations described in other sections being satisfactorily addressed.

4.2.4 Principle 4 Sustainability

The Applicant has not responded to several of the Panels previous comments relating to carbon emissions, sustainable water, climate change resilience and preparedness and caring for Country. The project has not demonstrated how greenhouse gas emissions have been minimised, particularly given the inclusion of fossil gas in the project and has not demonstrated how the future residents are being provided with homes that will be thermally comfortable in the context of rising global temperatures.

The ESD Report dated 18th February and the architectural drawings demonstrate only standard practice and minimum compliance rather than design excellence as required within this precinct. Furthermore, whilst the design may satisfy some minimum standards of the DCP it is not considered as meeting higher level DCP's requirements such as being ecological sustainable or minimising greenhouse gas emissions. While some issues have been addressed in the Ethos Urban letter and ESD Report, the Panel requests further development of the sustainable design proposal in order to demonstrate design excellence. This includes but is not limited to:

- sustainable water ecosystem and wastewater - expand upon the proposed 30kl rainwater tank which is considered only standard practice
- water/green infrastructure - address drought tolerance and water restriction risk mitigation
- carbon emissions - consider full electrification including cooking and domestic hot water
- electric vehicles - more detail required - consider allowance for 1 charger per car space in the future, substation design and locations should reflect the additional future demands of electrification of the development
- NatHERS rating for apartments - the proposed 6-star rating is the minimum legislated requirement - consider implementing 7 and 8 stars
- climate risk/water initiatives - address heat events and landscape perishing
- PV to roof gardens - report refers to these however cannot be seen on drawings
- facade shading - report refers to these but cannot be seen on drawings, extent of exposed glazing not consistent with ADG or low carbon/energy efficient design
- Green Electricity - how will this be delivered and guaranteed as a permanent feature

4.2.5 Principle 5 Landscape

Although there had been significant progress made with the landscape design, the connection to country is largely limited to artworks. It is recommended that the Landscape Architect, engage with an indigenous design consultant to further explore connection to country. This could have particular focus on the pocket park. Refer also to comments within Principle 1.

It was acknowledged that the landscape design and materials selection had advanced substantially, with clear definition of spaces and delineation between communal open space, public space, and private space. Several the palms on site were to be saved and transplanted which is encouraged. Greater consideration could be given to the Landscape Master Plan which provides a more even distribution of landscape elements across the entire green spine.

It is understood that a number of trees have been removed to allow for the subterranean carparking, and that this was preferable to splitting the carparking and requiring an additional vehicle access point from Holdsworth Ave.

Currently the soil depth over the basement carpark is proposed as 1300mm. The Panel recommends this be increased to 1500mm which would also be acceptable to Council.

Negotiation with the developers of the diagonally adjacent Area 5 is recommended to ensure a continuity in the levels of the green spines.

The north-east entrance approach to Building 1 is included in the 900sqm pocket park. Regardless of the eventual owner, this entrance approach from street to door should remain accessible to public users of the pocket park.

Landscape solutions do not appear to have been explored to the facade as previously recommended. The Panel requests that this be explored together with the potential for increased green space to the roofs and podiums such as Level 6 Building 2. This could provide a valuable contribution towards reducing solar heat loads/increased energy efficiency and developing a more residential street character.

4.2.6 Principle 6 Amenity

The Panel commends the development of the floor planning and the more rational resulting built forms and greater amenity provided to the apartments. In particular the greater use of corner and cross-over apartments and improved cross ventilation, daylighting and outlook. These changes may provide an opportunity to introduce some natural ventilation to bathrooms.

The Panel recognises that existing and proposed buildings outside of the site will cause significant overshadowing of Buildings 1 and 2. Given these constraints the Panel would consider the provision of bay windows to the eastern facades of Towers 2 and 4, extending up to 1 m into the 24m building separation zone, in order to improve solar access to living rooms and balconies and meet the ADG Objectives 4A-1.

PSC noted the conflicting measurements of winter solar access identified in the architectural drawings and Ethos Urban assessment. BP confirmed that the correct measurements are included within the architectural drawings, averaging 67.9% of apartments with solar access in winter. However more detail analysis of solar access compliance is requested as there appears to be other conflicts between drawings such as the solar POV studies which indicate less than 2 hours of solar access to some apartments (such as the SW corner of Building 1) and the SEPP 65 compliance drawings that indicate the same apartments as achieving 2 hours of solar access to living spaces and private open spaces.

The Panel recommends that the Applicant explore the relocation of the Building 2 core and lift lobby to the southern end of the floor. This could provide a greater visual and physical connection between the northern corner pocket park and those apartments that would overlook it, while also activating the pedestrian link between Buildings 2 and 4. If this change is not adopted then the Level 2 studio apartment in Building 2 should be re assessed, as the amenity is generally poor given its proximity to the entry foyer and lift core.

Similarly mirroring some apartment plans may allow an increased number of living spaces to be located at the building corners thereby providing improved amenity. For example the south-east corner apartments to Buildings 2 and 4, Levels 4 and 5.

Other items that should be addressed include:

- lack of daylighting or outlook to the common corridor of Building 1 Level 17
- significant areas of un-enclosed shaded space provided to Level 1 Building 1 with no solar access and minimal daylighting

- individual entrances, courtyard gardens and landscape elements should be provided to the Level 2 townhouses on Holdsworth Avenue consistent with Part 3C of the ADG - it is not clear to what extent this has been provided in the re-submitted drawings dated 10/05/22
- the depth of single-aspect apartments needs to consider adequacy of sunlight.

The Panel has significant concerns regarding the facade design which relies too heavily on glazed walls and provides little to no solar shading. This effects a number of design review considerations including building massing, neighbourhood character and sustainability but in particular resident amenity.

The minor horizontal slab projections will be ineffective in shading the facade particularly to the west. Furthermore while the expressed design intent is for clear vision glass, in the absence of external shading the reality is likely to be a reliance on performance glass and coatings which may be opaque and dark in colour. This would not be supported by the Panel.

The facade proposal is not considered consistent with the ADG Part 4A nor with the design excellence requirements of the precinct. The extensive use of glazing and lack of vertical sun-shading demonstrate a number of concerns including:

- undesirable visual reflectivity
- undesirable heat reflection to the surrounding streets and buildings exacerbating the urban heat island effect
- excessive dark glass which is considered unsuitable in a residential neighbourhood
- reduced building energy efficiency and resulting NatHERS ratings
- reduced indoor thermal comfort
- reduced solar heating benefits in winter and increased heating costs
- reduced resident use of balconies and opening of facades for natural ventilation
- lower visual light transmittance to the interior and resulting increases in the use of artificial lighting

The facade designs should be further developed to respond to these concerns and to demonstrate a design excellence outcome. The Applicant is encouraged to provide samples of the proposed glazing materials.

4.2.7 Principle 7 Safety

No additional issues were raised.

4.2.8 Principle 8 Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

No additional issues were raised.

4.2.9 Principle 9 Aesthetics

The material palette is very limited and relies mostly on painted concrete and full height glass. The Panel is concerned that this contributes to:

- an excessively uniform neighbourhood character and a commercial building aesthetic not suited to the context
- ongoing maintenance issues with painted concrete and applied finishes
- the construction methodology of post tensioned in-situ concrete and applied finishes or skim coats may over time lead to visual deterioration of the slab edges (which are proposed as key architectural elements)
- inconsistency between the proposed materials and 3d images which suggest a stone look material to the lower levels and metal to the upper levels

The proposed elevations and materiality should be further developed to respond to these concerns and to demonstrate a design excellence outcome that is innovative and responsive to the different street

characters, topography and landscape settings, climatic orientations and will maintain a long term high quality visual appearance.

Where concrete is provided a high quality off-form natural finish is preferred. Applied finishes and painted and stained finishes are discouraged. Other slab edge and spandrel materials could be considered such as precast concrete that may provide a higher quality and more durable appearance.

The Panel also recommends that the glazed and faceted balcony balustrade detail be reviewed to achieve a more continuous built form that does not interrupt the clean lines of the façade. A more robust material like the landscape fencing typology could be explored. Confirmation should also be provided that all vertical downpipes and balcony drainage will be concealed and integrated into the structure.

5.0 OUTCOME

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

The Panel does not support the proposed development in its current form. An amended proposal should be prepared, satisfactorily addressing the identified issues as detailed under each Principle and returned to Council and the Panel for consideration.

MINUTES OF NSROC DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING

LANE COVE COUNCIL

Thursday 16th June 2022

DEP PANEL MEMBERS

Peter St Clair (PSC)	Chairperson	Architect
Alex Haliburton	Panel Member	Landscape architect
Digby Hall	Panel Member	Architect & sustainable design

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES

Alistair Cook	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
David Johnson	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Alex Yim	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Taisei Tam	New Hope Evergreen	Applicant
Ben Pomroy (BP)	Rothe Lowman	Architect (remote)
Russell Isaac-Cole	Rothe Lowman	Architect
Michel Barnett (MB)	Arcadia	Landscape architect
Tom Goode	Ethos Urban	Planner
Sarah Papalia	Ethos Urban	Planner
Lachlan Finn	Stantec	Sustainability

COUNCIL STAFF

Mark Brisby	Executive Manager, Environmental Services
Rajiv Shankar (RS)	Manager Development Assessment
Chris Shortt	Senior Town Planner
Terry Tredrea	Strategic Planner
Angela Panich	Panel Secretary

APOLOGIES

Stephen Collier	Panel Member	Architect
-----------------	--------------	-----------

ITEM DETAILS

Property Address: Area 1: 1- 5 Canberra Avenue + 4 Marshall Avenue,
Area 2: 6 - 8 Marshall Avenue + 2 Holdsworth Avenue, Area 4: 4 - 8 Holdsworth Avenue St. Leonards
NSW 2065

Council's Planning Officer: Chris Shortt

Owner: New Hope Evergreen

Applicant: New Hope Evergreen

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 3 residential flat buildings of 13, 15 and 19 storeys comprising a total of approximately 266 apartments, 5 levels of basement car parking, green spine/communal open space, public park and other associated landscaping.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

RS and PSC welcomed the Applicants and Design Team. All Panel members, Council staff and Applicant's representatives introduced themselves and described their respective project roles. PSC provided an acknowledgement of country. Panel member Stephen Collier was not available for the meeting.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3.0 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 dated October 2020, Lane Cove LEP 2009 (including Clause 7.6 Design Excellence) and Lane Cove DCP Locality 8 (Parts A & B), dated 22nd October 2020. 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 to the Panel for further review.

4.0 DESIGN REVIEW

4.1 Presentation

The Applicant and Design Team were invited to present the revised pre-DA proposal for the subject sites. BP presented the architectural design report and drawings dated June 2022 and MB presented the landscape design report dated June 2022.

4.2 Panel comments and recommendations

The Applicant and Design Team are commended on their updated approach to connecting with country and the development of the landscape design. The Panel appreciates the additional context and solar access studies as well as the extensive design illustrations. However a number of issues require more substantial development particularly in respect to the façade design and sustainability.

The Panel makes the following specific comments and recommendations in relation to the project. Items raised at the previous DEP meeting (but not yet fully addressed) have not been repeated in these minutes.

4.2.1 Principle 1 Context and Neighbourhood Character

The Applicant has provided additional street character studies. The design of the podium facades demonstrate minor changes in response to the surrounding street characters and individual building entrances now better respond to changes in context and topography.

The design of the tower facades continue to appear commercial in character due to a very high proportion of glazing and concrete.

The Panel recommends a greater use of local residential materials such as face brickwork. The proposed use of sandstone to street courtyards is supported and consistent with the local area however a more traditional thicker sandstone is recommended in lieu of a sandstone tile TL01.

Design sketches are requested that demonstrate a future re-development of 2 Marshall Avenue could be both commercially viable and sympathetic to the masterplan and entrances to Buildings 1 and 2. Council may require other material to demonstrate that all efforts have been made to purchase the site.

4.2.2 Principle 2 Built Form and Scale

A number of townhouses have been removed from Canberra Av adjacent to the Building 1 pedestrian entrance. This results in a change in level of approximately 3.5m between level 0 and 1 made up by a steep landscape terrace and private staircases. This area needs further design development and illustration.

The entrance sequence and visual privacy to the townhouses on Holdsworth Av at Level 2 could be improved by forming a spatial transition incorporating elements such as lobby spaces and trellis.

The proximity of the Level 2 bedroom to the Building 2 entrance at Holdsworth Av continues to cause visual and acoustic privacy issues. Suitable architectural and/or landscape screening should be considered.

The podium level building separation between Buildings 2 and 4 is not consistent with the ADG. The rooms abutting the building gap cannot be considered both habitable (for purposes of cross ventilation) and non-habitable for purposes of reduced building separation. This should be addressed in a way that ensure visual and acoustic privacy.

4.2.3 Principle 3 Density

No additional comments.

4.2.4 Principle 4 Sustainability

The design team have predicted some improvements to the thermal comfort and related NatHERS ratings of west facing apartments achieved through reduced window to wall ratio. While this is supported, the Panel continues to be concerned at the potential heat loads and consequent impacts on thermal comfort and over reliance on air conditioning. A number of apartments typically located to south-west corners have NatHERS star ratings below 6.0 which should be addressed.

The Panel recommends consideration be given to the future electrical load of the development should the project become fully electrified, inclusive of electric vehicle (EV) charging. In particular the Proponent should consider the potential substation size to support this.

Noting that the proposal continues to include the use of gas for cooking, the Panel maintains a concern that the development will not thoroughly support a Net Zero (zero carbon emissions) outcome. Whilst not distinctly a DCP requirement, it remains an expectation that design excellences includes an outcome that mitigates climate change and enables the future community to access clean and affordable renewable energy whilst enjoying pollution-free indoor environments. The Proponent noted that prospective purchasers are to be offered a choice between electric and gas cooking. The Panel prompted the Proponent to continue testing market assumptions and to continue to develop fossil-fuel free outcomes.

4.2.5 Principle 5 Landscape

A strong commitment to Caring for Country was demonstrated, with the engagement of a local Indigenous elder, to be involved through the design and construction process, including providing input into the design and construction of the proposed artworks. This was strongly supported by the Panel.

The strengthening of the swale through the site, both assists with the management of overland flow and helps delineate the interface between Private Communal Open space and the pocket park.

An improved urban design response has been provided with the addition of direct access to Building 2 from the Holdsworth Ave / Marshall Ave intersection. This provides better access to the building and improved wayfinding. This is supported.

Building 2 has an improved interface with the pocket park, with lobby levels and balcony's providing a much-improved connection to the pocket park.

The agreement to increase the soil depth on areas over car parking from 1200mm to 1500mm is supported and a positive outcome.

The pedestrian connection between Buildings 2 & 4 has greatly improved with consideration given to the façade treatment that expresses the form of the building. Previously this was expressed as a single material only, articulated by two corridor windows. The landscape treatment has provided a link that is inviting and responds to the change in level.

The Panel supports the integration of landscape and planting with green infrastructure and stormwater management. This is a strength of the scheme and the Proponent is strongly encouraged to maintain this high standard into the delivery process. The Panel recommends that nominated plant species are optimised for likely climate change conditions.

Additional planter boxes have been provided to the podium such as the west facing Levels 4 and 5. This is supported although additional details are requested to demonstrate how these will grow and be maintained given the very narrow planting zone.

Negotiation with the developers of the diagonally adjacent Area 5 is recommended to ensure a continuity in the levels of the green spines. This does not appear to have been addressed.

4.2.6 Principle 6 Amenity

The Panel notes the calculated solar access has now been corrected to consider the overshadowing of Tower 1 by Tower 2, reflecting an average of 64% of apartments achieving 2 hours of winter solar access. Given the Applicant has demonstrated significant over-shadowing of the site by neighbouring high-rise buildings, this level of solar access is supported.

All common circulation areas appear to now have daylighting and outlook. This is supported.

The summer solar analysis presented in Section 7.03 of the Urban Design Report, is of questionable value if the facade exposure hours shown are between 9.00am and 3.00pm. It would be expected that much of the problematic solar heat gain in summer would occur after 3.00pm. Therefore the western elevation remains particularly exposed to thermal loads from afternoon direct sun. Whilst the proponent states that these apartments will meet NatHERS requirements, the Panel remains concerned with the extent of unshaded clear glazing, noting that despite air conditioning providing cool air, internally the glazing will still feel hot when in direct sun and is likely to cause thermal discomfort unless blinds are drawn. Reliance on air-conditioning will also lead to reduced energy efficiency.

The Panel recommends further façade design development such as increasing the ratio of solid to glass via more extensive spandrels, wider mullions and framing and less glass in general. The Proponent is also encouraged to consider vertical external shading or the application of an external frit and/or interstitial blinds to double glazing. Any other methods of reducing heat load are also encouraged.

The Panel questioned to what extent the future residents will be able to maintain safe living conditions and comfort in the event that energy supply to air conditioning is interrupted or fails, particularly when the western façade is exposed to direct sun during heat events. The solution remains uncertain, and the Panel strongly encourages that this risk be resolved. For example window types, locations and the extent of openable area should be optimised to maximise the effectiveness of natural ventilation to occupied areas.

4.2.7 Principle 7 Safety

No additional issues were raised.

4.2.8 Principle 8 Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

No additional issues were raised.

4.2.9 Principle 9 Aesthetics

The design of the building envelopes and selection of materials remains excessively uniform particularly within the tower elements. The incorporation of more varied facade materials and other elements is recommended.

The design team advised that no colour tint or reflective treatment will be necessary to the façade glazing. However, the architectural drawings and schedule of finishes note a tinted glazing GT-02. This should be clarified noting that the Panel consider the use of only clear glazing to be essential, particularly given the extent of façade glazing and already commercial appearance of the buildings. The Design Team should also clarify the extent of vision glass and solid wall panels to the facades, which are not clearly apparent on the drawings.

The Panel continues to have concerns around the expressed slab edge and spandrel detail, on which the overall building aesthetic is heavily dependent. While there have been improvements the Panel remains unconvinced that the proposed detail will be easily achieved.

There is a risk that the slab edge detail is not well executed, with grouted post tension pockets being visible that will need treatment. The adjacency of the formed concrete slabs and precast spandrel upstands with differing visual quality and colour variations, are a concern. This is particularly the case with the proposed application of a penetrative concrete stain to the slab edge, against a precast integral oxide coloured detail sitting above this.

It is acknowledged that the proposed penetrative stain has a 25-year warranty, however this will be dependent on the initial quality of the finish. In addition, no façade access strategy has been proposed, meaning that any rectification or re-application of the stain in the future will be very difficult and expensive to achieve.

5.0 OUTCOME

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

The Panel provides conditional support for the proposed development and considers that design excellence can be achieved if the issues raised and recommendations made by the Panel are satisfactorily addressed.

Post meeting notes:

Supplementary Material

The Applicant submitted an additional character study to Council following the meeting. This included colour options for the tower and an illustrated material schedule.

No significant changes were apparent from the drawings presented on the 16th of June.

The additional 3d images further highlight the commercial character of the tower designs and the potential benefits of more varied façade materials, sun-shading and screens to the building character, resident amenity and sustainable design.

The additional material schedule raises questions regarding the use of tinted facade glazing and sandstone 'tiles' as noted in the minutes above.

The Panel is not in a position to provide a specific opinion regarding the colour options, other than noting they appear to be very similar.