



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	65 New Canterbury Road Petersham
Proposal:	Partial demolition of existing structures and construction of a five storey shop top housing development.
Application No.:	PDA/2024/0156
Meeting Date:	15 October 2024
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Diane Jones (chair) Peter Ireland Tony Caro
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia Ferdinand Dickel Andrew Newman Martin Amy Sinclair Croft
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Chris Katris (Katris Architects) – Architect for the project Adam Byrnes – Urban planner for the project Andrew Papas – Applicant's Representative

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and discussed the proposal with the applicant's team through an online conference.
2. The Panel thanks the applicant for providing a Pre-DA submission and allowing an early discussion of the proposal.
3. The Panel notes 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 notes that the applicant did not provide any urban design or context analysis as part of the architectural drawings. A comparative built form analysis of the proposal with the existing buildings on the adjoining sites (including oblique views of the streetscape) to show massing, floor plan and spatial relationships is an essential component of development in a significant streetscape.
2. In terms of the upper-level front setback, the Panel recommends consistency with the relevant controls within the DCP while maintaining compatibility with the predominant streetscape character.
3. While the Panel recognises that the proposal sits comfortably below the maximum floor space ratio and height controls, the proposal does not comply with the fundamental ADG criteria of:
 - a. Solar access – It appears that less than 50% apartments would meet the ADG Part 4A criteria (a minimum 2 hours direct solar access to both the habitable areas and balconies in mid-winter).
 - b. Natural cross ventilation – None of the apartments have natural cross ventilation to meet ADG Part 4B criteria (a minimum 60% apartments with natural cross ventilation).
 - c. Minimum ceiling heights – It appears that ceiling heights may be 2.4m or less in some instances, significantly below the minimum 2.7m required by Part 5C of the ADG.
 - d. Deep soil, landscaped area and communal open space – There appears to be a numerical shortfall and resultant lack of residential amenity.
 - e. Internal apartment amenity – The Panel expressed concern about the constrained spaces within the apartments; for example, the lack of comfortable and intuitive circulation around conventionally sized furniture.
 - f. Apartment storage – None of the apartments appear to have internal and external storage allocation as expected by Part 4G of the ADG.
 - g. Adaptable housing – The proposal does not demonstrate that pre and post adaptation is achievable within the development.
 - h. Excessive apartment depths – The Panel expressed reservations about internal amenity, daylight, outlook and natural ventilation owing to the building's narrow width and the long, dark apartment depths.
4. Reliance on barrier-free access to the main entry through a stair climber before access to a lift is not supported by the Panel.
5. The laneway appears to have a poor urban environment in this location, and the Panel expressed potential safety and CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) concerns if the residential entries are not designed to provide appropriately scaled and secure spaces.
6. The Panel briefly discussed other compliance matters that need to be addressed in the design, including carparking configuration and fire egress.
7. The Panel did not offer detailed commentary on the architectural expression, landscape design quality, sustainability provisions, and other matters at this stage as there are more fundamental concerns regarding the site planning diagram, residential amenity and general arrangement of the proposal.

Conclusion:

1. The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form and configuration. The applicant should consider alternative site strategies to develop a different site parti that will provide a high amenity for occupants and an urban form compatible with the existing context and constraints. It must also satisfy the amenity objectives of NSW Apartment Design Guide.

INNER WEST

2. Additionally, the design needs to clearly demonstrate that the site, on its own and without amalgamation with the adjoining property, is suitable to offer quality residential living with contemporary standards expected from a development within the Inner West area.
3. As part of the meeting, the Panel discussed alternative design options. However, the applicant should note that it is beyond the Panel's remit to give specific design recommendations or directions. The Panel's primary role is to offer independent review of architectural, urban design, landscape design quality and design excellence.