



# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	138-152 & 154-156 Victoria Road, 697-699 Darling Street & 1-7 Waterloo Street Rozelle (The Tigers Leagues Club Site)
Proposal:	Section 4.55(2) Modification of Development Consent D/2018/219, seeking modifications to approved mixed-use development. Changes include modifications to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ the commercial club and retail podium;</li><li>○ approved building envelopes and façade;</li><li>○ public domain landscaped areas;</li><li>○ residential unit design and mix resulting in a reduction of units;</li><li>○ private and communal open space areas;</li><li>○ basement and sub-structures; and</li><li>○ incorporation of construction staging.</li></ul>
Application No.:	MOD/2022/0447
Meeting Date:	21 February 2023
Previous Meeting Dates:	31 January 2020, 12 November 2019, and at previous AEP reviews
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger – chair; Dr Michael Zanardo; and Garth Paterson
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia; Eric Wong; Samantha Hamilton; and Iain Betts.
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Tom Hansen, Esther Dickins(landscape architect), Doug Southwell (Scott Carver) – Architects for the project; and Kate Bartlett – Urban Planner for the project.

## Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings, landscape design drawings and the design report, and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference. The Panel thanks the applicant for providing a comprehensive set of documentation.

## Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Panel notes that the Modification Application retains the DA-approved gross floor area, including the floor space ratio mix allocated to each – residential, retail, commercial and club use. The overall building massing and the extent of public domain areas also appear to be consistent with the DA-approved scheme.
2. The Panel understands that while the applicant retains the DA-approved residential floor space ratio, the apartment mix and sizes have been modified by increasing the average apartment size and reducing the overall number of apartments. The proposal reduces the proportion of smaller apartments (studio and 1 bedroom units) to 9% which is significantly below the minimum LLEP 2000 requirement of 25%.
3. The Panel noted that this minimum target within the LLEP 2000 is likely in the interest of supporting housing diversity and affordability. Whether a 9% proportion of smaller apartments is acceptable in terms of its impact on Council's housing affordability aspirations, and whether the modification remains 'substantially the same' is a separate statutory planning matter to be discussed with Council's assessment officers.
4. The Panel recommends that the residential floor space ratio calculation method undertaken by the applicant should be confirmed with Council's assessment officers to ensure a 'like-for-like' basis of comparison with the method used to calculate the existing approved GFA, in particular the Panel is keen to ensure whether winter gardens as proposed should be included in the gross floor area calculations.
5. The Panel supports the proposed connection of building entries for Buildings B and C to provide an additional address and presentation for Building C. The Panel encourages any further potential to expand the points of address for Building C to Waterloo Street, or the publicly accessible plaza space.
6. While the Panel remains supportive of the overall architectural expression described within the proposal, a number of suggestions are offered to improve the expression of the various buildings.
7. The glassy Building A at the eastern corner of the site includes lower level apartments which are likely to be exposed to visual privacy issues from Victoria Road and the properties to the south east (addressing Darling Street) which are expected to be redeveloped in future. The applicant should consider effective design strategies to improve residential amenity and privacy in the vicinity of the south eastern site interface.
8. Additionally, the Panel notes the earlier, more prominent horizontal expression provided by the residential slab edges in Buildings B and C on both their northern and southern elevations. Reintroducing some form of stronger horizontal expression would be appropriate to the residential nature of this building and would also assist with the balance of horizontal and vertical elements within the overall building composition. Such a strategy should also consider the management of built form and scale from Victoria Road viewpoints.
9. The Panel appreciates the applicant is seeking more, larger apartments as part of their modification, however further resolution and refinement of the following internal layouts is encouraged to resolve various concerns:
  - a. 'Snorkelled' bedrooms within typical apartments B101, C104, A202, A602, A604 (and all other apartments with similar layouts) should be carefully justified to ensure the full extent of the window is visible from all points within the room;
  - b. Combined living, dining and kitchen areas with depths greater than 8m should be avoided to ensure consistency with the guidance offered within the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG) Part 4D-2;

- c. Potential inter-tenancy privacy issues between the master bedrooms of typical apartment B102 and the balconies of typical apartment B103 should be resolved. The Panel is concerned that privacy screens alone are unlikely to resolve acoustic privacy issues due to the adjacencies.
  - d. Although not specifically discussed at the meeting, residential storage volumes for all apartments should be confirmed in terms of consistency with Part 4G of the NSW ADG.
  - e. There are potential privacy issues at the re-entrant corner where typical apartment C107 is located. The bedrooms and balconies are in close proximity to the common corridors and reconfiguration is recommended to avoid visual and acoustic privacy issues. The outlook of bedrooms from typical apartment C207 into a blank wall should also be reconsidered.
  - f. The Panel expects the proposal to be broadly consistent with the targets set out in the NSW ADG, and Council's assessment officers should satisfy themselves of the suitability of any detailed SEPP 65 assessment – including mid-winter solar access, natural cross ventilation, maximum proportion of south-facing apartments, targets for communal open space, deep soil and other requirements. The overall amenity of the proposal should be 'substantially the same', or greater, than in the previous approval.
- 10. The Panel recommends that each communal open space within the proposal should be provided with an outdoor kitchenette or a barbeque, a sink, and a unisex accessible toilet.
  - 11. The Panel suggested that the width and proportion of central stair off Victoria Avenue linking into Tigers Lane be reviewed.
  - 12. Developed architectural documentation should include details of each primary facade type setting out the design intent with 1:20 or 1:50 sections indicating materials, balustrade types and fixing, junctions, rainwater drainage including any downpipes, A/C condenser unit enclosures, any acoustic plenums and similar details in line with the Department of Planning and Environment Application requirements March 2022 1.2(k).

## **Conclusion:**

With acceptable resolution of the recommendations made in this report, the Panel is of the view that the proposal is capable of delivering an acceptable level of design quality.