

Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	32 Edward Street Summer Hill
Proposal:	A 4 storey proposal for a hotel or a short term accommodation
Application No.:	PDA 2021 0459
Meeting Date:	8 February 2022
Previous Meeting Date:	None
Panel Members:	Jean Rice (external member); Matthew Pullinger (external member); Niall Macken (internal member); and Vishal Lakhia (internal member) – chair
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Chirag Bhavan
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Charles Tang – Designer for the Project

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the preliminary drawings and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference. The Panel thanks the applicant for seeking early feedback at the Pre DA stage.

Discussion:

1. The Panel notes a number of fundamental concerns with the proposal, which arise primarily from the relatively small and narrow site being considered in isolation from the adjoining properties, particularly – 34, 36 and 38 Edward Street. The applicant's approach is problematic as the proposed built form seeks to maximise the floor space ratio and building height available on a small isolated lot, and in doing so creates unacceptable overshadowing and visual amenity

INNER WEST

impacts on the adjoining dwelling house to the south. The Panel considers that the proposed built form is not compatible with the character and prevailing pattern of development in the area.

2. Specifically, the proposed single storey form at the front of the site, with three storeys set behind and the lift core exposed to the street is incompatible with the prevailing street character and is not supported.
3. Further, the Panel is concerned the subject site cannot be independently developed at the proposed scale and density due to the site's constrained lot width of approximately 7 metres. The Panel questions whether realistic arrangement for carparking, landscaped areas, deep soil zones, front, rear and side setbacks are achievable if the site is developed in isolation. A lack of footpath or any public domain treatment along the southern side of Mungo Scott Place further exacerbates the Panel's concern for the proposed northern interface to the laneway.
4. The Panel also notes that the proposal is inconsistent with the Inner West Development Control Plan which limits allocation of gross floor area or habitable spaces within the upper-most 3m of the maximum 14m LEP height of building control, with the upper-most 3m anticipated to accommodate lift overruns, fire stairs, architectural roof features, access to roof terraces or other building services elements.
5. The Panel queries the viability of a hotel proposed at the subject site, and whether there is any demonstrated market demand for hotel accommodation within the area. Based on discussion at the meeting, the Panel now understands the applicant intends to provide a form of student accommodation (e.g. international students) within the proposed development in which case different planning regulations would apply. The Panel recommends the applicant seeks formal statutory planning advice to confirm whether a hotel use permits such student accommodation.
6. The applicant is encouraged to investigate a more appropriate building typology to facilitate the intended use. The Panel suggests that a smaller scale 'co-living' proposal as per the statutory provisions of the Housing SEPP 2021 may be a more appropriate type for the proposal.
7. In summary, the applicant is strongly encouraged to advance an alternative redevelopment strategy based on lot amalgamation with - at least - the four adjoining properties (at 32-38 Edward Street) within the urban block. In the Panel's view this is the only basis on which the anticipated floor space ratio and height of building controls are likely to be achieved. The Panel's concerns regarding built form, public domain interface, accommodation of car parking, landscape design, compatibility with the local character and impacts upon neighbouring amenity are all significant. Future discussions with Council and with the Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel are also encouraged.
8. Additionally, the Panel notes further concerns for the proposed aesthetics, car parking arrangement, split level arrangement, waste management, adequacy of building services, internal configuration, and resultant room amenity, these do not form the focus of the Panel's review at this point. Rather, it is the fundamental urban design and site planning issues that need to be addressed as a priority.