



# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	212 Addison Road Marrickville
Proposal:	Follow up to PDA/2024/0048 for demolition of existing structures and construction of three storey residential flat building including 6 apartments, basement car parking and tree removal
Application No.:	PDA/2024/0140
Meeting Date:	17 September 2024
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger (chair) Russell Olsson Jocelyn Jackson
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia Camille Guyot Sinclair Croft
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Paul Lam (Green Square Design) – Architect 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 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.
3. The Panel thanks the applicant for attending this follow-up meeting to respond to the Panel's concerns previously identified at the 14 May 2024 AEDRP meeting.

## Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Panel recognises the applicant has revised the site planning strategy and design concept to create a 3-storey proposal totalling 6 apartments, with 2 apartments per typical level. However, the concept presented at this AEDRP meeting raises a series of further amenity and streetscape issues that remain of concern.
2. Having reviewed the current proposal, the Panel believes there are fundamental urban design and amenity concerns arising due to the narrowness of the site. As a result, it appears that a residential flat building that provides an adequate level of amenity and yielding 6 dwellings with corresponding basement car parking is unlikely to be achievable on this site. The Panel therefore strongly encourages the applicant to explore amalgamation with the adjoining R4-zoned neighbour to the east.
3. The majority of proposed habitable rooms (16 out of 18 bedrooms) rely on orienting towards side boundaries of the adjoining properties in order to achieve amenity, outlook, daylight and ventilation. Given the narrow site width, these proposed side setbacks are 3m, significantly less than the 6m setback encouraged in the ADG.
4. The Panel does not offer detailed commentary on the architectural character and expression of the proposal as there are more fundamental concerns regarding the proposed siting and general arrangement of the proposal that indicate that the proposal exceeds the capacity of the site. The following issues were raised by the Panel at this review:
  - a. Constrained side separation distances significantly below the ADG Part 3F Building separation guidance.
  - b. Undersized dual key studio apartment on ground floor, below the minimum 36m<sup>2</sup> guidance provided by the ADG.
  - c. Two isolated fire stairs exiting from the basement provided without enclosure, raising potential drainage issues as well as concealment opportunities and streetscape impacts. The Panel encourages all building elements, including fire stairs, to be incorporated within the building footprint.
  - d. Based on Council's traffic advice, a car waiting bay needs to be incorporated at the vehicular entry point, which would require a minimum 6.1m driveway width, further compromising the street presentation of a lot that is less than 13m in width.
  - e. Potential structural and earthworks impacts on neighbouring residential buildings and vegetation given the basement extends to the side boundaries.
  - f. A convoluted pedestrian entry sequence from the front street address to the entry foyer/lift area raising safety and security concerns.
  - g. The need for occupants of dual key apartment Unit 2 to exit the building to enter their apartment after arriving in the basement car park.
  - h. An unresolved architectural expression and building form that appears out-of-character with the surrounding area.



- i. Poor amenity offered by the communal rooftop open space given the absence of shade and landscaping.
  - j. Potential safety concerns in basement with lift directly opening into the car parking aisle.
5. Overall, the Panel is of the view that redevelopment of the subject site to the FSR and building height controls requires amalgamation with adjoining properties to the east (zoned R4 high density residential - the same as the subject site), while the properties to the west of the subject site will likely remain low-scaled due to their lower density zoning.

### **Conclusion:**

The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form and configuration for the streetscape, urban design and residential amenity concerns noted above, and recommends the applicant considers alternative redevelopment strategies based on amalgamation with the neighbouring site to the east.