



# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	73-75 Beattie Street Balmain
Proposal:	An adaptive reuse proposal for multi unit housing
Application No.:	DA/2021/0521
Meeting Date:	10 August 2021
Previous Meeting Date:	None
Panel Members:	Russell Olsson (External Member); Michael Zanardo (External Member); Niall Macken (Internal Member); and Vishal Lakhia (Internal Member) – Chair
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Iain Betts; and Eric Wong
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Tone Wheeler – Architect; and Amy Sutherland – Urban Planner

### Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and 3D views, and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.
2. The Panel considers that the applicant has provided a well-resolved design response that retains the significant buildings and generally achieves an acceptable level of residential amenity within the multi unit dwellings.

### Discussion & Recommendations:

#### 1. Secondary Dwellings:

- a. Regarding the provision of the rear studios addressing Beattie Street, the Panel considers that it is a statutory planning matter whether secondary dwellings can be provided to multi unit housing dwellings in strata-ownership. The applicant should seek independent statutory planning advice from an expert to confirm if rear studios can be achieved for Dwellings 1 to 5.
- b. While the Panel generally supports the 2 storey built form presentation to the Beattie Street frontage, in addition to Recommendation 1a, a suitably qualified certifier should also review the provision of the rear studios and the internal configurations of the dwellings for compliance with the NCC.

#### 2. Adaptive Reuse:

- a. *Little Llewellyn Street:* The Panel considers that the 5 existing window frames at the north eastern corner should be retained, repaired and reinstated if possible in situ with the existing



façade. The Panel notes that if these windows are retained then these would effectively correspond with the proposed internal layouts of Dwellings 1 and 2 on Level 2.

- b. *Beattie Street*: The Panel recommends retention of the 3 existing rectangular windows above the existing loading bays, including retention of the timber sashes and the muntins within these windows.
- c. The Panel encourages the applicant to maximise the extent of external and internal conservation works, and maximise the retention of historic fabric for a successful adaptive reuse. The internal structure, timber floors, herringbone strutting, steel trusses and/or any interval evidence of the past use of the building should be conserved wherever possible, as it would retain evidence of the internal warehouse character of the building. These elements should be documented in the development application drawings.

### 3. Ground Floor Configuration:

- a. The Panel notes that the proposal exceeds the maximum permissible floor space ratio, and at the same time lacks provision of an appropriate deep soil area for environmental benefits.
- b. The Panel discussed that one strategy of achieving some deep soil within the subject site would be by considering reconfiguration of the south eastern corner where the infill building element is proposed. The Panel's suggested strategy is to preferably remove or possibly reduce the extent of built form at the south eastern corner (Home Office and Lobby for Rear Studios 1 and 2). One option could be to reconfigure Studio 1 and 2 into an independent dwelling at Level 1.
- c. Removal or reduction of the built form at the south eastern corner would allow addition of a deep soil area at this location. The Panel also suggested that the built form and deep soil alignment at this corner should be consistent with the built form alignment of the existing terraces on the adjacent property 67 Beattie Street. Any re-configuration of this building should avoid a splayed corner for car exit sight lines, as the currently proposed splay is inconsistent with the rectilinear character of the existing buildings.
- d. The Panel appreciates that the overall site configuration and the carparking layout make the provision of deep soil challenging, and considers that addition of a deep soil area at the south eastern corner in the above suggested configuration will allow planting of trees and shrubs to soften the street edge and improve the streetscape character.
- e. The Panel notes that the pedestrian entry to the adaptable Dwelling 6 on Level 3 is provided from the central foyer connecting Little Lewellyn Street. The Panel considers that the ground floor entry, foyer and lift space serving Dwelling 6 should be designed to be accessible since it serves an adaptable dwelling.

### 4. Architectural Expression:

- a. The Panel encourages the architect to further refine and enrich the building facades for the new buildings and new building elements to both street frontages. The new openings should follow a similar proportion, solid to void ratio, pattern, materiality and should borrow architectural cues from the existing building, to form a unified architectural expression for the proposal. A consistency in the architectural language of new interventions is encouraged.
- b. The Panel discussed that there is a further potential for resolution and refinement of the Little Lewellyn Street façade, particularly for the proposed concrete bands around the void/entry spaces, and the perforated metal screens, which are considered discordant elements.
- c. Revised architectural drawings should confirm the location of AC condenser units and other mechanical equipment. The Panel considers these should not be located within the patios or anywhere visually apparent from the surrounding public domain.
- d. Revised architectural drawings should include details of the proposed design intent for key façade types in the form of 1:20 sections indicating façade type, balustrade fixing, balcony/patio edges, junctions, rainwater drainage system including any downpipes and similar details within the proposal.



- e. The Panel recommends that the side walls to the two storey building addressing Beattie Street should be provided with a more robust material with an integral finish such as face bricks, as these walls will be visible from the surrounding public domain. The Panel considers that rendered and painted surface should be avoided due to the anticipated longevity and life-cycle costs.
- f. The Panel notes that the DA documentation describes that the applicant has considered provision of a Photovoltaic system (peak 6.5kW) within the Energy inclusions. Revised architectural drawings should confirm location of this PV system in plans, elevations and 3D views.

### **Conclusion:**

- 1. The Inner West Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel notes that the applicant seeks a 96% variation for the maximum permissible floor space ratio based on the Inner West Local Environmental Plan.
- 2. The Panel considers that a variation (such as a Clause 4.6 variation) could be supported if the proposal responds positively to the recommendations offered in this AEDRP Report.