

Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	2B West Street Lewisham
Proposal:	Modification of Determination No. DA201800505 dated 2 September 2020 to change the number and mix of Independent Living Units and Residential Aged Care beds of both new buildings (Stage 1 &2) and the Novitiate Building (Stage 3) including modifications to the internal design of the buildings and minor external changes to the buildings including changes to the building footprints and basement design.
Application No.:	PDA/2023/0151
Meeting Date:	5 September 2023
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Tony Caro (chair); Diane Jones; and Jocelyn Jackson
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia; Ferdinand Dickel; Andrew Newman; and Martin Amy
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Tom White (WMK) – Architect for the project; Mahmoud Chatila – Applicant/Applicant's Representative; Jack Rixon (Meccone) – Urban Planner for the project

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.
2. The Panel notes that the proposal was approved as part of a NSW Land & Environment Court Class 1 Appeal process, however it is noted that the former proposal (approved as part of the Court process) was not reviewed by the AEDRP.
3. As a proposal subject to the State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 (SEPP 65) – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development, the Panel's review and comments have been structured against the 9 Design Quality Principles set out in the SEPP 65 NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG).

Discussion & Recommendations:

Principle 1 – Context and Neighbourhood Character

1. The Panel acknowledges that the urban design outcome of the proposal in terms of the overall height and building envelopes is fixed, in accordance with the Court-approval already in place. The Panel's comments are therefore largely restricted to a review of the internal amenity of the buildings.
2. The applicant stated that it is their intent to minimise the extent of modifications so that the revised proposal before the Panel could be considered substantially the same as the Court-approved proposal. The Panel recommends that the applicant seeks separate discussions with Council's assessment officer regarding the possibility, as this is a separate statutory planning matter.
3. The Panel advised the applicant that as very little detail in regard to the proposal's architectural expression was presented, a further meeting would be appropriate as part of a more resolved DA. The Panel is interested in understanding how the architectural expression of the various buildings presents to the surrounding public domain and also to the railway frontage, due to its high visibility from the railway corridor.
4. Further documentation should demonstrate how pedestrian connectivity to each building with the surrounding areas is to be provided, to demonstrate how occupants will have safe and compliant access to the local precinct and public transport.

Principle 2 – Built Form and Scale

1. The building identified as 'Stage 1' is a new 8 storey residential building (including Class 2) accommodating Residential Aged Care (RAC) units within the lower 4 storeys and Independent Living units (ILU) within the upper 4 storeys.
2. The building identified as 'Stage 2' is a new 7 storey residential Class 2 building containing ILUs only. The remaining two buildings are existing and proposed to be retained as part of this application. The Panel understands that modifications related to the detailed heritage aspects will be considered as part of a separate development application identified as 'Stage 3' within the documentation.
3. The applicant indicated that their intent is to change the mix through the number of RAC units being significantly increased at the expense of ILUs. Furthermore, the newly introduced RACs (referred to as "RAC Suites" on the drawings) are proposed with a larger 'sole occupancy unit' configuration, whereby the unit layouts provide accommodation for additional family members/carers to be able to stay together.
4. The Panel noted that there are multiple classes of buildings (as categorised by the National Construction Code), and a further layer of statutory compliance is required through application of NSW SEPP 65 and the ADG. The Panel therefore suggested that the applicant seek independent statutory planning advice to confirm application of the SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guide to the proposal.
5. Council's assessment officer advised the Panel meeting that based on Council's assessment, SEPP 65 ADG applies to the both of these unit types within the Stage 1 and 2 buildings, because the "RAC Suite" type units are proposed as 'sole occupancy units/individual dwellings'. types
6. The Panel therefore notes that if ADG is to be applied to the Stage 1 building then, the design as presented has notable departures from the principal controls such as solar and daylight access, and natural cross ventilation within Parts 4A and 4B of the ADG.
7. The Panel queried how the railway protection zone impacts the proposal and whether adequate design considerations have been made by the applicant. Lack of a balcony provision to many of the units within Stage 1 building is considered to be problematic for this proposal. The Panel understands that the proposal is impacted by NSW State Rail corridor requirements, however, natural light and natural cross ventilation would need to be managed effectively through alternative design strategies such as provision of, air quality and sound attenuation strategies,

winter gardens or enclosed/caged balconies, to demonstrate amenity whilst achieving compliance. The design of the southern façade should be given thoughtful consideration to reflect these constraints. Building on the NSW State Rail boundary may have fire protection requirements under the NCC that would need to be confirmed.

8. The Panel notes the common lobby areas serving the RAC units are constrained to allow complying furniture layouts (lounge and dining areas) whilst allowing ample movement and circulation. The quality of natural light and natural ventilation and outlook to green achieved within the common areas is also a concern for the Panel, given that congregational activities are expected to occur within these common areas. In addition, many of the circulation paths are convoluted and not suitable for people with the level of frailty found in RACs.
9. The Panel discussed about how the common spaces will between the Residential Aged Care and Independent Living Units will be segregated (for example – through a wall to create separate compartments). The current layout does not adequately explain the separation between the unit types. Additionally, a separation may be necessary based on the NCC requirements.
10. The Panel requested compartmentation lines (BCA requirement) and the location of service areas to provide 24-hour nursing care be shown on the drawings.

Principle 3 – Density

1. The Panel notes that the proposal appears to be consistent with the Court-approval in terms of its height and building envelopes. However, the Panel considers that amenity outcomes will need to be carefully reviewed within the units as part of achieving greater compliance with the ADG.

Principle 4 – Sustainability

1. The Panel expects the proposal to be consistent with key targets established within the NSW Apartment Design Guide for solar access and natural cross ventilation. The solar access and natural cross ventilation should be considered on individual building basis rather than an overall precinct basis, to ensure consistency with the NSW ADG.
2. As a minimum, the Panel expects that the applicant demonstrates consistency with the sustainability targets within the ADG for solar access (Part 4A-1, design criteria 1, 2 and 3) and natural cross ventilation (Part 4B-3, design criteria 1). Additionally, the applicant should identify any further commitments related to energy, waste and water efficiency.
3. The Panel encourages use of ceiling fans within all bedrooms and living areas as a low energy alternative/augmentation to mechanical A/C systems.
4. Provision of a rainwater tank should be considered to allow collection, storage and reuse within the subject site.
5. The applicant should include details of an appropriate photovoltaic system on all architectural drawings and 3D views.
6. Full building electrification is encouraged along with the inclusion of EV charging points within the basement carpark.

Principle 5 – Landscape

1. The landscape design proposition was not confirmed at the meeting, and the Panel would expect to see substantial design development and documentation at a future meeting.

Principle 6 – Amenity

1. The Panel expressed concerns regarding internal amenity achieved within the units in terms of consistency with the guidance offered within the ADG particularly, Parts – *4D Apartment size and*



layout, 4E Private open space and balconies, 4F Common circulation and spaces, and 4G Storage.

Principle 7 – Safety

1. The applicant should work with a suitably qualified specialist to confirm the maximum travel distances from the units to the nearest fire egress corridors.

Principle 8 – Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

1. The Panel queried barrier-free circulation and accessible spaces through-out the proposal, including the internal unit layouts. It appears to the Panel that these are not resolved as part of this early discussion.
2. The Panel expressed concern regarding wayfinding due to excessively lengthy corridors that have dead-ends (the Panel notes that such configuration could be problematic for residents with the level of frailty found in RACs).

Principle 9 – Aesthetics

1. The applicant should provide a comprehensive design proposal for all buildings at a future meeting. This include 1:20 sections and details of primary facade types to clearly show materials, balustrade design, balcony edges, junctions, integration of rainwater drainage including any downpipes and similar details within the proposal. Sections should also demonstrate that a 3.1m floor to-floor height will be adequate in achieving compliance with the relevant NCC provisions, whilst also achieving minimum 2.7m floor-to-ceiling heights within all habitable spaces of the apartments.

Conclusion:

1. The Panel thanks the applicant for seeking early feedback through a Pre DA discussion.
2. In order to achieve the Panel's support, the proposal should establish clear correlation and consistency with the NSW Apartment Design Guide, particularly in terms of the solar access, natural cross ventilation and residential amenity provisions.
3. The Panel considers that amenity is the key requirement for residential accommodation designed for older people, which needs to be further developed and demonstrated in order to obtain the Panel's support.
4. The Panel recommends the proposal should benefit from further design review at a second meeting, to review design development in response to the Panel's comments and after further refinement of internal layouts and the architectural expression.