



# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	3 Myrtle Street & 3-5 Carrington Road Marrickville
Proposal:	Planning Proposal to amend the Marrickville LEP 2011 to allow additional building height (34.5m), additional FSR (3.82:1), introduce residential (Build-to-Rent Housing) use, new gallery, exhibition, artisan food and associated spaces and landscape areas.
Application No.:	Planning Proposal
Meeting Date:	24 August 2021
Previous Meeting Date:	23 March 2021, 11 August 2020, and 12 September 2017
Panel Members:	Peter Ireland (external member); Jean Rice (external member); Niall Macken (internal member); and Vishal Lakhia (internal member) – Chair
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Jarrad Sheather, Denise Bengler, and Daniel East
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Stephen Moore (Roberts Day) – Urban Designer for the proposal, and Adam Haddow (SJB)

### Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the amended urban design report provided by the applicant, and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.
2. The Panel compared the latest submission with the earlier version reviewed in March 2021. The Panel notes that the applicant has considered a further reduction in the proposed building height (from 42m to 34.5m), and a further reduction in the floor space ratio (from 4.6:1 to 3.82:1), a reduction in the number of build-to-rent apartments (250 to 179), an increase in the employment floor space ratio, and an addition of a 1,200m<sup>2</sup> new theatre and performance space.

### Discussion:

1. The Panel notes the positive improvements offered by the applicant at the latest AEDRP meeting on 24 August 2021, but considers that the submission does not sufficiently establish the suitability of the proposal at this particular site, given the proposed scale, bulk, height, density, the resultant intensity, and the overall built form differential from its current urban context.

2. The Panel is of the view that the overall scale and density of the proposal are not justified. The current FSR for the site is 0.95:1 and while the proposed FSR has been reduced from the previous proposal it still exceeds the allowable FSR by 4 times. While current planning controls allow a maximum 26m height for future buildings marking the significant and prominent contextual locations for buildings around Marrickville Railway Station the panel considers this does not apply to this site, given its relative distance from the Station.
3. The Panel restates its concern for the resulting impacts upon residential amenity of the adjacent low density dwelling houses to the south of Myrtle Street, due to lack of a suitable built form transition. The Panel considers that the proposal significantly exceeds the floor space ratio and the built form limits on the site, which will majorly impact the surrounding area.
4. The panel is concerned that the addition of housing as an APU in an IN2 zone may set a precedent for other sites in the vicinity (also raised in previous AEDRP report).
5. The Panel recognises that the issues related to flooding, aircraft noise, passenger rail and freight rail noise could be mitigated through successful architectural design and landscape design, and this has been successfully achieved at other Inner West locations along a rail corridor. However, the Panel considers that the submission needs to provide a convincing argument addressing the Panel's concern for the availability of an acceptable minimum level of residential amenity at this particular location.
6. The Panel restates its view that with its current scale, intensity and configuration, the proposal has constrained access to a meaningful public open space for future occupants of the site. The Panel also notes that there is a lack of a meaningful deep soil area allocated to the subject site for planting of large canopy trees and other environmental benefits. The proposed ground floor configuration lacks provision of landscaped areas for amenity.
7. The Panel notes that the proposal was described having a fine grain urban character, however, the details need to be established within the urban design analysis, justification and the architectural concept. The Panel also noted that no architectural design was included for a review of the overall architectural expression and desired character for the proposal.
8. The Panel expects the proposal to comply with the primary controls regarding fire stairs, travel distances etc as well as the NSW Apartment Design Guide for building envelope depths, communal open space, deep soil area, solar access, natural cross ventilation, and a minimum percentage of south-facing apartments (with no solar access). The Panel reviewed the typical residential level, and it seems in its current double-loaded configuration, compliance with the minimum requirements of these primary controls of the ADG may not be achievable. Given the 'pioneering' nature of the project the panel feels the 'diagram' must satisfy these basic requirements in order to focus on the broader issues. In addition to paragraph 7, the Panel expects the architectural drawings require a greater resolution of the practical design aspects such as allocation of an appropriate number of lifts, fire stairs and fire egress to all floor levels.
9. The Panel restates its view that the urban design justification provided by the proposal for a 34.5m height and 3.82:1 FSR mainly appears to be of a floorspace consequence, rather than of urban design considerations. The Panel appreciates the applicant's vision, idea and aspirations for the creative-community, however the urban design concerns cannot be outweighed by this noble cause.
10. The Panel discussed at the AEDRP meeting that Council may possibly consider an investigation to examine viability for urban transformation of the surrounding area in future, and the applicant could re-evaluate their proposal in terms of compatible uses, scale, built form, height, intensity, open space provision, ADG compliance and residential amenity (if a residential use could be reconsidered) and environmental benefits that could closely align with Council's aspirations and vision for the area.