

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Bradley James](#)
Subject: RE: 80-88 Regent Street, Redfern - Independent Planning Commission Meeting with City of Sydney Council
Date: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 3:07:37 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)

Hi Brad,

Please see response to your questions below in **red text**.

Thanks

Vanessa

Vanessa Cagliostro
Senior Planner
Planning Assessments



[REDACTED]
cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

From: Bradley James [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 30 July 2019 2:34 PM
To: Vanessa Cagliostro [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 80-88 Regent Street, Redfern - Independent Planning Commission Meeting with City of Sydney Council

Hi Vanessa,

Thank you for your email.

The Panel have two queries which they could like Council to clarify:

1. Can Council confirm whether there is an existing Council footpath in William Lane and if such a footpath exists how wide is it? – **William Lane currently has no useable footpath, just a kerb and a narrow 300mm broken concrete paved area in poor condition.**
2. Council is proposing that the future 800mm wide footpath in William Lane is dedicated so that it is in Council ownership and is maintained by Council. Will the Council want the same thing to happen with the 800mm being dedicated in Marion Street to become future footpath widening? - **The preferred option would be for the land to be dedicated to Council and that the footpath be widened as part of a roads act/public domain condition.**

If you have any q's please let me know.

Regards,

Brad James | Senior Planning Officer

Independent Planning Commission NSW
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000

e: [REDACTED] | p: + [REDACTED] | f: 9383 2133 | www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Vanessa Cagliostro
Sent: Monday, 29 July 2019 2:22 PM
To: Matthew Todd-Jones [REDACTED]
Cc: David Koppers [REDACTED]; Allison Cronin [REDACTED]; Andrew Rees [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 80-88 Regent Street, Redfern - Independent Planning Commission Meeting with City of Sydney Council

Dear Matthew,

As discussed at the IPC meeting, please find further information to be provided to the Commission on Council's involvement in the design excellence process for this development, further comments on the wind impacts of the development and recommended condition for the footpath widening on William Lane:

Design Excellence Process

The City of Sydney has a nominee at the NSW State Design Review Panel (Professor Richard Johnson). The City's Strategic Planning Team has an observer at each Panel session, (Peter John Cantrill), who is not a member of the panel.

As you aware the State Design Review panel is conducted by the NSW Government Architect, see <https://www.governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au/review/nsw-state-design-review-panel> and not the City of Sydney. All information relating to any proposal undertaking Design Review is communicated to Panel members and review attendees in the strictest confidence.

In relation to any conclusions about wind impacts at 80-88 Regent Street, it is possible that wind impacts were discussed by the Panel, however, the level of scrutiny of the Wind Report is unlikely to match that of the Planning Assessment Team as part of the SSD referral process.

Wind (further information/clarification)

The City's issues in relation to wind impacts can be summarised into 3 points:

- 1. inappropriate Pedestrian Comfort Criteria has been used at some locations;*
- 2. amelioration through planting cannot be relied upon in the Level 1 courtyard;*
- 3. the efficacy of suggested amelioration treatments has not been verified through wind tunnel testing.*

1: Pedestrian Comfort Criteria

The Wind Report nominates pedestrian comfort criteria used in the analysis (refer to excerpt below). The Sitting, Standing and Walking criteria are provided with a performance description corresponding to a Gust Equivalent Mean (GEM) measured in metres/second which cannot be exceeded more than 5% of the time.

Table 3: Pedestrian Comfort Criteria (Draft Sydney DCP 2012)

Classification	Description	Maximum 5% Exceedance GEM Wind Speed (m/s)
Sitting	Outdoor areas that involve seating such as parks, dining areas in restaurants, amphitheatres, etc.	4
Standing	Short duration stationary activities (generally less than 1 hour), including window shopping, waiting areas, etc.	6
Walking	For pedestrian thoroughfares, private swimming pools, most communal areas, private balconies and terraces, etc.	8

Table 3 Pedestrian Comfort Criteria, page 14, Windtech Pedestrian Wind Environment Study August 23, 2018:
The location of test areas within and around the development are shown at pages 21-23 of the report. Table 5 on page 25

shows the wind tunnel testing results. At issue are points **6, 11, 12** and **13**.

At point **6** (residential entry on Marian Street), a comfort criteria of 8m/s (walking) is used. As this is a waiting area where short duration stationary activities may occur, a comfort criteria of 6m/s is more appropriate. Table 5 shows that the 8m/s GEM is exceeded 32% of the time. 5% is the target criteria. A full width awning is recommended for amelioration. The amended drawings show the awning with less than full width. Given the non-compliance with upper level setbacks on both Marian and Regent Streets, further wind tunnel testing should be undertaken to confirm the adequacy of the proposed treatment.

Recommendation 1:

A full width awning is included in revised wind tunnel testing. The comfort criteria for the residential entry point on Marian Street is amended to 6m/s and not exceeded more than 5% of the time. New wind tunnel testing is undertaken to demonstrate compliance with the 'standing' criteria.

At points **11, 12** and **13** (external level 1 courtyard), a comfort criteria of 6m/s (standing) is used. As this is an outdoor area which involves seating, a comfort criteria of 4m/s is more appropriate. Table 5 shows that point 13 fails the exceedance criteria. The suggested amelioration of dense evergreen trees is unlikely to be successful and is discussed in more detail below.

Recommendation 2:

The comfort criteria for the level 1 courtyard is amended to 4m/s and not exceeded for more than 5% of the time. Amelioration of wind impacts must not rely on planting.

2: Reliance on planting for wind amelioration

The level 1 courtyard receives a 'moment' of sunlight only at 11am on the winter solstice. This, combined with strong wind speeds, do not provide optimum growing conditions for the suggested amelioration treatment of 'densely foliating evergreen trees capable of growing up to 2-4m in height with 4m interlocking canopies along the centreline of the courtyard'. Reliance on landscape does not provide a resilient strategy for mitigating wind impacts.

Recommendation 3:

An alternative to tree planting must be considered in the level 1 courtyard.

3: Efficacy of suggested wind amelioration treatments

The efficacy of the proposed treatments is not certain and do not guarantee a particular or an acceptable result. The treatments must be physically added to the wind tunnel test building model and analysed against the amended comfort criteria listed above.

Recommendation 4:

Further wind tunnel testing should be undertaken incorporating the recommended amelioration treatments specified in Windtech's report, and the amended comfort criteria listed above. Given that the additional testing may result in changes to the built form, it is preferable that it is undertaken prior to determination.

William Lane footpath widening

William Lane – An 800mm setback to William Lane (eastern side) has been provided for footpath widening.

The following condition is recommended to ensure the footpath widening remains in place:

"A 800mm strip of land along the sites William Lane frontage is to be dedicated to Council to allow for the construction of a widened footpath. The details of the widened footpath are to be in accordance with Councils Technical Specifications and approval for the works under section 138 of the Roads Act, 1993 is to be obtained prior to issue of a Construction Certificate."

Regards

Vanessa

Vanessa Cagliostro
Senior Planner
Planning Assessments



Telephone: [REDACTED]

From: Matthew Todd-Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 24 July 2019 3:17 PM
To: Vanessa Cagliostro [REDACTED]
Cc: David Koppers [REDACTED]
Subject: 80-88 Regent Street, Redfern - Independent Planning Commission Meeting with City of Sydney Council

Good afternoon Vanessa,

Thank you for meeting with the Commission on Monday.

I would be grateful if you could provide the Commission with further information on the Council's involvement in the design excellence process for this development and Council's comments on the wind impacts of the development, as discussed at the meeting.

Please provide this further information by close of business **Monday 29 July 2019**.

Regards,
Matthew

Matthew Todd-Jones | Senior Planning Officer

Independent Planning Commission NSW
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

e: [REDACTED] | p: [REDACTED] | f: 9383 2133 | www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

FOLLOW US ON:



 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain information that is confidential or subject to legal privilege. If you receive this email and you are not the addressee (or responsible for delivery of the email to the addressee), please note that any copying, distribution or use of this email is prohibited and as such, please disregard the contents of the email, delete the email and notify the sender immediately.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain information that is confidential or subject to legal privilege. If you receive this email and you are not the addressee (or responsible for delivery of the email to the addressee), please note that any copying, distribution or use of this email is prohibited and as such, please disregard the contents of the email, delete the email and notify the sender immediately.
