

Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	314 Liverpool Road Ashfield
Proposal:	Amending development application to approved residential apartment building to increase height and number of units under the in-fill affordable housing provisions. Pre-DA proposal.
Application No.:	PDA/2024/0060
Meeting Date:	19 June 2024
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger (chair) Peter Ireland Jocelyn Jackson
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia Annalise Ifield Thomas Irons Sinclair Croft
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	No interests were declared
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	The applicant's team members were invited but did not attend the AEDRP meeting

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and discussed the proposal through an online conference.
2. The Panel acknowledges that the proposal is subject to Chapter 4 – State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) Housing 2021 - Design of residential apartment development - and the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG) applies to the proposal.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Panel understands that the applicant is seeking to access the 30% floor space ratio bonus available under the in-fill affordable housing provisions and proposes to either Modify or Amend an existing approved development, granted by the NSW Land and Environment Court. The approved development is currently under construction.
2. The Panel notes that the documentation provided as part of this pre-DA review does not provide any urban context or analysis for review, hence constraining meaningful consideration of the appropriateness of the proposed additional built form and height upon its surrounding context, particularly in terms of scale, form, visual impacts, cross-viewing and overshadowing impacts on the public domain and the adjoining Miller Street Heritage Conservation Area to the east.
3. Based on the limited contextual information provided as part of the pre-DA documentation, the Panel is unable to fully assess fundamental aspects of the project including but not limited to:
 - a. Whether the applicant is working with a suitably qualified Community Housing Provider and which of the proposed (or approved) apartments will be nominated as affordable housing, or the extent of timeframe proposed as affordable housing.
 - b. The total number of apartments to be added as part of the proposal.
 - c. The intended purpose of the large loft spaces located within the rear building wing.
 - d. The location, size and configuration of communal open space required by the ADG Part 3D.
 - e. The impacts of the proposed additional building volume relative to the approved scheme in terms of building form, streetscape character, visual impacts, privacy and cross viewing and extent of any additional overshadowing.
4. The Panel was informed at the Council officers' briefing that the applicant has not provided a complete, comprehensive set of drawings, and several inconsistencies were noted on the floor plans, where proposed modifications are not colour-coded or clouded. For example – the addition of private open spaces/courtyards on the ground floor are not shown colour-coded. The Panel notes that proposed private open spaces for G12 and G13 result in visual privacy issues with the adjoining dwellings within the HCA, and the applicant should revert to the currently approved configuration.
5. The method used for calculating floor space ratio should be consistent with the method used during the NSW LEC proceedings.
6. Overall, the Panel does not have a philosophical opposition to additional floor space ratio or building height being accommodated at the subject site, however the merits of any potential additional development are not able to be assessed, and the onus falls to the applicant to demonstrate any merits through a credible and clear urban design process that provides adequate analysis of the existing site context, 3D views, site and neighbourhood sections, and particularly to illustrate the comparison between the approved and the proposed schemes.

Conclusion:

The Panel recommends that a revised proposal with the recommended amendments should return for a review as part of any further pre-DA stage.