



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

| | |
|--|--|
| Site Address: | 18-30 Faversham Street Marrickville |
| Proposal: | A light industrial warehouse building |
| Application No.: | DA/2022/0057 |
| Meeting Date: | 10 May 2022 |
| Previous Meeting Date: | 5 October 2021 (PDA/2021/0286) |
| Panel Members: | Jocelyn Jackson (external member); Garth Paterson (external member); and Vishal Lakhia (internal member) – Chair |
| Apologies: | - |
| Council staff: | Glen Hugo |
| Guests: | - |
| Declarations of Interest: | None |
| Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel: | Nicholas Grimes (Bennet Murada Architects) – Architect for the project; Kate Bartlett – Urban Planner |

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and 3D views, and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.
2. The Panel thanks the applicant for considering and thoughtfully responding to the recommendations made at the previous AEDRP meeting. The Panel notes and supports in principle the evident improvement in the architectural expression of the building.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Panel notes the proposed height exceedance of approximately 2m beyond the allowable 20m would result in potential visual impacts on the surrounding public domain and adjacent sites. In order to mitigate the visual impact, the applicant has considered managing the architectural expression in 2 distinct parts – a 2 storey brick building base with a metal sheet cladding for the above levels. Addition of fenestrations to the upper levels create a sense of human scale for the building to its setting. An upper level setback to the building massing addressing Faversham Street is offered to manage visual impact caused by the extent of height exceedance. The Panel supports the applicant's strategy in principle, once it satisfactorily demonstrates consistency with further recommendations made in this Report.
2. The Panel discussed about the complexity of integrating the subject site with its surrounding public domain (Wicks Park, the proposed pedestrian link and the shared way), and recommends that the applicant undertake a discussion with Council's public domain team to establish an agreed public domain strategy and plan that resolves ownership and management of all of the ground level spaces around the building. The Panel also recommends that the applicant prepare a CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) strategy to be implemented throughout the proposal. A pedestrian lighting plan would be useful in this review as the public realm area will be used by retail users and visitors to mixed use building.

3. The extent of hard surfaces within and around the proposal is of concern and requires introduction of more generous soft landscaped spaces (supported by deep soil) to allow large canopy trees and shrubs to enhance the outlook and for environmental benefits.
4. The Panel recommends reconfiguration of the ground floor level to create a more generous lobby area with increased greater street presence. The current location of the lobby area appears to be in conflict with the vehicular driveway ramp (providing access to the basement). The Panel also recommends development of the interior architectural quality of the foyer. The Panel restates that the proposal should have a minimum of 2 lifts given the intensity of the proposal and considering some redundancy in a scenario where any single lift is out-of-service or being used for deliveries.
5. The Panel recommends safe pedestrian access paths be identified in the central vehicular spine between the units and that this be shown on the plans.
6. The Panel queried the applicant regarding waste storage and collection for the ground floor retail uses and the above level industrial units. Revised documentation should include a relevant waste management strategy and details within the architectural drawings.
7. The Panel expressed a concern with the extent of internalisation of habitable spaces within the industrial units 1.12, 2.12 and 3.12 as it creates issues for natural light and ventilation to its interior. There are potential NCC compliance issues relating to light and ventilation which should be reviewed by/with a suitably qualified certifier.
8. The Panel encourages commitment to sustainability targets for water, energy and waste efficiency. The applicant is encouraged to include a rooftop photovoltaic system for environmental benefits, including power/lighting to common areas. Provision of rainwater tank should be considered to allow collection, storage and reuse within the site.
9. The applicant is encouraged to consider inaccessible (access restricted to maintenance) green roof/s within the rooftop space for environmental benefits. The applicant should use Council's Green Roof Policy and Guidelines for further details.
10. The applicant should ensure building services elements such as ducts and vertical risers are well-planned and thoughtfully integrated within the building layouts (particularly within the mezzanines) and concealed from the public domain.
11. Revised architectural drawings should confirm location of A/C condenser units and other mechanical equipment. The applicant should ensure these are not located anywhere visually apparent from the public domain.
12. Revised architectural drawings should include details of the proposed design intent for key façade types in the form of 1:20 sections. The drawings should also include a schedule of proposed materials and finishes including the brick format, metal sheet cladding profile and colours, window framing, and other building elements.
13. The Panel appreciates that the applicant is considering a design competition for public art along the south western blank wall. The applicant is encouraged to submit a separate development application for the art work and it should be referred to the Inner west Public Arts team.

Conclusion

The Panel acknowledges that the applicant is working with an emerging typology where industrial units are in a stacked multi-level configuration.

The Panel considers that the proposal, including the LEP height breach (of approximately 2m) should be supported if the applicant satisfactorily demonstrates consistency with further recommendations made in this AEDRP Report.

Attachment 1 – AEDRP Report – Pre DA stage – 5 October 2021



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

| | |
|--|--|
| Site Address: | 18-30 Faversham Street Marrickville |
| Proposal: | A light industrial warehouse building |
| Application No.: | PDA/2021/0286 |
| Meeting Date: | 5 October 2021 |
| Previous Meeting Date: | None |
| Panel Members: | Tony Caro (external member); Diane Jones (external member); Niall Macken (internal member); and Vishal Lakhia (internal member) – Chair |
| Apologies: | - |
| Council staff: | Matthew Di Maggio |
| Guests: | - |
| Declarations of Interest: | None |
| Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel: | John Wilkin (Bennet Murada Architects) – Architect for the project; and Kate Bartlett – Urban Planner |

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and 3D views, and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.

Discussion & Recommendations:

The Panel acknowledges that this form of commercial development is a new typology emerging within inner Sydney. It entails double-height light-industrial units stacked over multiple levels, with vehicular access provided to each unit throughout the building.

The Panel has also reviewed precedents (weblinks provided by applicant) and makes the following comments in relation to the proposal.

1. Urban Design Impact:

- a. The proposed 24m height exceeds the allowable 20m maximum by 20%, due principally to the inefficient allocation of floor area within the building.
- b. Although compliant with the FSR control metric, the small mezzanine spaces located within each unit necessitate 6m high minimum module heights. This circumvents the principal intent of FSR (which is to control building height and bulk), and is further exacerbated by the length of ramps and internal volume required to provide vehicular access that has to traverse 6m vertically between floor levels. The 6m high vehicle aisles on each floor create further unnecessary internal volume.
- c. The Panel therefore recommends compliance with the height control, to reduce the visual impacts of the proposal on the surrounding public domain and adjacent sites.

- d. The Panel appreciates the complexity of integrating the subject site with its surrounding public domain (proposed pedestrian link and shared way), and recommends that the applicant undertake a discussion with Council's public domain team to establish an agreed public domain strategy and plan that resolves ownership and management of all of the ground level spaces around the building. The Panel also recommends that the applicant prepare a CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) strategy to be implemented throughout the proposal.
- e. The extent of hard surfaces within and around the proposal is of concern and should be reviewed at this point by a suitably qualified landscape architect, to ensure an appropriate balance between built form and landscape. Introduction of more generous soft landscaped spaces (supported by deep soil) for the benefit of all users is recommended.

2. Proposed Typology & Internal Configuration:

- a. The Panel questioned environmental air quality, provision of natural light and ventilation, and acoustics within the building. These are critical design quality issues to be resolved across the various spaces within the building.
- b. The Panel expressed a concern with the extent of internalisation of habitable spaces within the industrial modules and common spaces. The building façade design should foster generous natural light and ventilation to its interior. And in doing so present a sense of human scale through fenestration to its setting.
- c. The Panel suggested that not all light industrial units require bulky storage and height, and this could be deployed to vary façade composition and reduce overall height through a combination of different floor-floor heights.
- d. The building layout prioritises vehicular access and movement over people. The lift lobby is too small, dark, and has safety conflicts with the typical floor driveways. Pedestrian and vehicular movements require a more explicit segregation, to prioritise safety and amenity of people.
- e. The Panel queries the vehicle parking strategy, which appears to allocate internal space within relatively compact tenancies at the expense of efficient/high storage racking space.
- f. The meaning of a 'hi-tech industrial development' (as described by the applicant at the meeting) is unclear. The relationship between light industrial and commercial units offered through the proposal should be clarified. The Panel further notes that compatibility between the users of these boutique light industrial units (eg. a photographers studio or a coffee roaster, compared with bulky storage or a plumbers office) needs to be carefully managed in terms of inter-tenancy environmental impacts, particularly air quality and noise transmission.
- g. As noted above, the Panel is concerned that the proposed spatial planning configuration is inefficient and creates unnecessary building height and volume. Has the applicant considered other combinations, for example, lower level ramp access only, with vehicle lifts or multiple loading docks/goods lifts from Ground Floor as an alternative to reduce the bulk and mass of the proposal?
- h. A more generous, visible and naturally lit lobby should be provided on the ground floor. The panel suggests that the proposal should have a minimum of 2 lifts to accommodate its users.
- i. The Panel also queried the applicant regarding waste storage and collection.

Conclusion

The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel thanks the applicant for seeking early feedback at the Pre DA stage.

The Panel acknowledges that the applicant is working with an emerging typology where industrial units are in a stacked multi-level configuration, however the review has raised a range of design issues regarding the overarching urban design impacts, building bulk, architectural quality, pedestrian

INNER WEST

and vehicular conflict, and internal amenity. The Panel also considers that the LEP height breach (approximately 4m) should not be supported for the reasons outlined in this report.

At a second review, the Panel would welcome an opportunity to review a revised proposal that responds to the issues raised in this report.