

[Redacted]

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment
<noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Sunday, 28 February 2021 8:27 AM
To: PDPS DRDE Design and Places SEPP Mailbox
Cc: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Subject: Webform submission from: Design and Place State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)

Categories: Nagham, EIE submissions

Submitted on Sun, 28/02/2021 - 08:27

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Submission

Hello

Specific feedback:

It remains unclear what the purpose of either the solar access or cross ventilation requirements are.

Multiple benefits are listed but many of them (especially thermal comfort) can be achieved without solar access or cross ventilation.

While there is nothing wrong with appropriate SA or CV, the mandatory requirements are often unhelpful and counter productive.

It would be good if the Purpose was clear. If it's about thermal comfort then specify thermal comfort NOT solar access. Ditto for cross ventilation.

In Sydney's climate it is fairly easy for apartments to achieve great thermal comfort (and indoor air quality) with minimal direct solar access by constructing a certified Passivhaus building.

The historical focus on cross ventilation for cooling is increasingly irrelevant as occupants are less active in opening windows and the external environment is increasingly hostile to natural temperature regulation (too hot, too noisy, too dirty).

As the new SEPP claims to be about innovation, would it not be more appropriate for these antiquated 'controls' (as that's what they are taken to be) to be reframed in a more holistic way?

Happy to discuss any of the above in more detail if desired

Best



I agree to the above statement

Yes