

Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	66 Railway Road Sydenham
Proposal:	Modifications to Determination No. 201400097 made operative on 25 August 2015 for a number of internal and external changes including modifications to parking, the existing building at the front of the site and the provision of a green roof.
Application No.:	PDA/2023/0177
Meeting Date:	5 September 2023
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Tony Caro (chair); Jocelyn Jackson; and Diane Jones
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:	Bruce Eeles and Simon Coorey (Eeles Trealease Architects) – Architects for the project; Helen Mulcahy – 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 applicant has a previous consent (201400097, 25/08/2015) and no increase in the number of apartments is proposed as part of this modification.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The proposed 6m separation between the building wings is problematic given that a 12m separation is required between habitable rooms and balconies for buildings up to 12m (4 storeys) based on NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG) *Part 3F-1*. The applicant should provide a rationale for why such a significant departure should be supported in this instance.
2. The Panel discussion focussed on impacts of the proposed two-level apartment above the existing building on Railway Road. This apartment and its private open space/courtyard

INNER WEST

occupies most of the ground floor area in the space between the front and rear building forms, and in doing so negatively impact on the amenity and clarity of access to the four new units proposed at the rear. The Panel is concerned that ground level common circulation is unacceptably convoluted in the current layout.

3. The Panel notes the proposed private courtyard will be overlooked from the apartments above. It therefore recommends the ground floor component of the front apartment be removed and a common, ground level courtyard be created to improve overall amenity for all occupants. The two-storey front apartment should be modified to be a one bedroom apartment substantially located on the first floor, with access from the ground floor common corridor.

As noted this space will not satisfy ADG metrics. However, the above would create potential for generous deep soil and large trees to assist with visual privacy across the courtyard. Thoughtful fenestration and screening/deletion of any window openings within the street front unit towards the courtyard would further mitigate this problem.

4. A safe and more amenable pedestrian entry with clear line-of-sight to the lift should be provided in any re-planning of the ground floor. An additional pedestrian connection to the rear laneway should be considered, to facilitate waste removal and fire egress from residential levels of the rear building. The Panel would support removal of one car space to achieve this.
5. The Panel appreciates that there are design challenges due to the site levels, however this reconfiguration should be considered by the applicant as it creates better spatial planning efficiencies related to circulation, building services, other common access, and egress arrangements.
6. The applicant should ensure that NCC fire egress compliance is achieved. This includes fire protection of all windows and skylights in proximity of the side boundaries.
7. The Panel noted that the open fire stair to the roof could create weather protection and drainage issues.
8. There was insufficient time or detail provided to comment on other aspects of the proposal, including internal apartment configuration, architectural expression and landscape design.
9. The proposal is not supported in its current configuration and should be refined to demonstrate better consistency with the Apartment Design Guide and the matters discussed in this AEDRP Report.. A second meeting to further review an amended proposal is recommended.