



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	94-98 Addison Road, Marrickville
Proposal:	Demolition of existing structures and construction of shop top housing development with basement parking.
Application No.:	PDA/2021/0357
Meeting Date:	16 November 2021
Previous Meeting Date:	None
Panel Members:	Dr Michael Zanardo – chair Jean Rice Michael Harrison
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Niall Macken Matthew Di Maggio
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Glenn McCormack, Damian Laybutt and Paola Moran– Architect Daniel and Leonard Cordoro - Owner

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings, were briefed by the Council planning officer, and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.
2. As a proposal subject to the State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development (SEPP 65), the Panel's comments have been structured against the nine Design Quality Principles as set out in SEPP 65 Schedule 1 and the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG).
3. The Panel notes that the site has the benefit of an active approval for a mixed use boarding house over a gym. The Panel understands that the site is flood affected with a freeboard of approximately 1m. The Panel understands that the site constraints that applied to the boarding house approval have been taken into account for the present application.
4. The Panel commends the general design resolution and level of documentation of this Pre-DA application.

Discussion & Recommendations:

Principle 1 – Context and Neighbourhood Character

“Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is the key natural and built features of an area, their relationship and the character they create when combined. It also includes social, economic, health and environmental conditions.

Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of an area’s existing or future character. Well designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood.

Consideration of local context is important for all sites, including sites in established areas, those undergoing change or identified for change.”

1. The Panel notes that the application draws positively on qualities from a previously approved application which has guided several design decisions of the present application with regard to context and neighbourhood character (see below Principle 2 – Built form and scale for detailed discussion).

Principle 2 – Built Form and Scale

“Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings.

Good design also achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building’s purpose in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type, articulation and the manipulation of building elements.

Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.”

1. The Panel generally commends the approach to the Addison Road streetscape with the ‘grain’/rhythm of the street expressed through vertical bays, the retail glazing meeting the footpath (and tenancies stepping up inside the glass line), the careful alignment of parapet lines with the existing buildings to the west, and upper levels set back.
2. The Panel appreciates that the Level 2 plan has been setback so as not to compete with the parapet line even though the MDCP front massing control permits it to be built to the street edge. The Panel notes however that the proposed Level 3 is built forwards of the 6m setback required for the uppermost level massing. The Panel is concerned that the double stepping of the upper levels maybe too complex in form. The Panel recommends that the Level 2 setback be increased to strengthen the reading of the parapet and that the face of the upper two levels be aligned to simplify the form (and avoid the ‘ziggurat’ form described by ADG 3F-1 2). An approach justified on the basis of using an single ‘averaged setback’ may be appropriate.
3. The Panel notes that the maximum building height is exceeded by 4.63m (33%). Whilst the height exceedance includes part of the volume of habitable space of the topmost level, if the flood freeboard (approximately 1m) is taken into account, only parapets, skylights, lift overrun and canopy structure breach the height limit. The Panel notes that apart from relatively minor breaches of height at the perimeter due to parapet walls (seemingly in the order of 300-400mm), the majority of the height breach is of small footprint and centralised on the rooftop and would not contain habitable space. The Panel supports this approach as the height breaches are unlikely to contribute to unreasonable overshadowing or be readily seen from the public domain. The lift overrun and canopy structure serves the purpose of providing access to a rooftop communal open space which is a positive. The Panel recommends that solar access studies and view studies accompany the formal development application to provide justification for the design approach.
4. The Panel notes that the rear of the building to Handley Street appears to breach the MDCP rear massing control. The Panel is able to support minor breaches which do not cause significant visual bulk or amenity impacts to neighbours. The Panel recommends that an envelope study be undertaken to demonstrate the amount of breach proposed to assist in the assessment of the application.
5. The Panel notes the large blank brickwork panel to the Handley Street façade. The Panel considers that this aspect is unresolved and requires further design attention. One approach may be to consider a public artwork in keeping with other artworks in the immediate context forming an outdoor gallery and/or provision of ventilation to car park spaces behind.

Principle 3 – Density

“Good design achieves a high level of amenity for residents and each apartment, resulting in a density appropriate to the site and its context.”

Appropriate densities are consistent with the area’s existing or projected population. Appropriate densities can be sustained by existing or proposed infrastructure, public transport, access to jobs, community facilities and the environment.”

1. The Panel notes that the application appears to be compliant with the maximum floor space ratio.

Principle 4 – Sustainability

“Good design combines positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.

Good sustainable design includes use of natural cross ventilation and sunlight for the amenity and liveability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling reducing reliance on technology and operation costs. Other elements include recycling and reuse of materials and waste, use of sustainable materials, and deep soil zones for groundwater recharge and vegetation.”

1. The Panel encourages that ceiling fans and natural ventilation should be provided to all habitable rooms.
2. The Panel encourages the inclusion of an appropriate rooftop photovoltaic system.
3. The Panel encourages the inclusion of a rainwater tank to allow collection, storage and reuse within the subject site.
4. The Panel encourages the salvage of materials from the existing building for reuse on site or for other projects.
5. The Panel recommends the inclusion of well-located screened outdoor areas for clothes drying in line with ADG 4U-1 2.

Principle 5 – Landscape

“Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in attractive developments with good amenity. A positive image and contextual fit of well designed developments is achieved by contributing to the landscape character of the streetscape and neighbourhood

Good landscape design enhances the development’s environmental performance by retaining positive natural features which contribute to the local context, co-ordinating water and soil management, solar access, micro-climate, tree canopy, habitat values, and preserving green networks.

Good landscape design optimises usability, privacy and opportunities for social interaction, equitable access, respect for neighbours’ amenity, provides for practical establishment and long term management.”

1. The Panel generally commends the communal open space location and dimension. The Panel considers that the rooftop communal open space will provide good amenity for the residents above the busy mixed use street below, whilst the ground level communal open space has the potential to create an attractive entry sequence and provide planting on structure for medium canopy trees within the building separation.
2. The Panel recommends the involvement of registered landscape architect in the design of the communal open spaces. Selection of suitable species will be important to the success of the outcome. Communal open space facilities should be provided in line with objective ADG 3D-2. The Panel considers that the residential entry sequence is relatively circuitous and would benefit from landscape consideration to draw visitors around the corner.
3. The Panel notes the presence of a frangipani tree within the front setback that has been the subject of previous Design Review Panel discussion. The Panel recommends that this tree be relocated, potentially within the proposal.

Principle 6 – Amenity

“Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive living environments and resident well being.

Good amenity combines appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas, and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.”

1. The Panel commends the building separation between the northern and southern portions of the building which will allow for adequate light, air and privacy between opposing habitable rooms.
2. The Panel notes that 4 of 15 units (27%) (units 101, 102, 201 and 202) do not appear to receive any direct sunlight to their living room windows which is not in line with ADG 4A-1 3. The Panel recommends that with minor readjustment of the internal planning, that the living rooms to these units could incorporate a window to the courtyard side to gain sunlight (particularly units 102 and 202).
3. The Panel notes that many bathrooms, kitchens and studies are located on external walls but are not shown as having windows. The Panel recommends that windows be incorporated into these rooms for daylight and natural ventilation, particularly studies which are considered habitable rooms under the ADG.
4. The Panel notes that the common circulation spaces appear to be enclosed on residential levels. The Panel recommends that all corridors be open to daylight and ventilation. The Panel supports the initiative of an open fire stair that engages with the courtyard space.
5. The Panel notes that the site is located within an ANEF contour of 30. The Panel notes that objective ADG 4B-1 requires that all habitable rooms are naturally ventilated. The Panel recommends that consideration be given to appropriate noise shielding or attenuation techniques as suggested by objective ADG 4J-2.

Principle 7 – Safety

“Good design optimises safety and security, within the development and the public domain. It provides for quality public and private spaces that are clearly defined and fit for the intended purpose. Opportunities to maximise passive surveillance of public and communal areas promote safety.

A positive relationship between public and private spaces is achieved through clearly defined secure access points and well lit and visible areas that are easily maintained and appropriate to the location and purpose.”

1. The Panel notes that the basement fire stairs do not appear to be enclosed and that storage may be contained beneath the stairs. The Panel recommends that the fire stairs be designed in line with the NCC requirements.

Principle 8 – Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

“Good design achieves a mix of apartment sizes, providing housing choice for different demographics, living needs and household budgets.

Well designed apartment developments respond to social context by providing housing and facilities to suit the existing and future social mix.

Good design involves practical and flexible features, including different types of communal spaces for a broad range of people, providing opportunities for social interaction amongst residents.”

1. The Panel notes that accessibility to the main entrance to the Addison Road street frontage is provided via a ‘hoist’ adjacent to the front stairs. The Panel support the approach to use one hoist to service the residential components of the building as well as the retail spaces (rather than duplicate the hoist in multiple locations). The Panel recommends that the ‘hoist’ be better integrated within the front setback so as not to be a dominant feature whilst still remaining legible. The Panel recommends that further design consideration could be given to making the secondary doors to the retail spaces more ‘equal’ particularly the northern retail space which could have a door onto the lobby area.
2. The Panel notes that the accessible visitor car space provided at the ground level does not appear to be able to reach the lift accessibly. The Panel recommends further consideration of the location and accessibility of parking spaces.

Principle 9 – Aesthetics

“Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the internal layout and structure. Good design uses a variety of materials, colours and textures.

The visual appearance of well designed apartment development responds to the existing or future local context, particularly desirable elements and repetitions of the streetscape.”



1. The Panel notes that air conditioning has not been included on the plans. The Panel recommends that, if they are used, any air conditioning units should be screened from public view and integrated with the built form in line objective ADG 4E-3.

Conclusion:

The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel notes the applicant seeks a variation to the permissible height control, and front and rear massing controls.

The Panel notes that the proposal is greater than 14m in height and triggers design excellence provisions under MLEP including consideration of: a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing; whether the form and external appearance will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain; the MDCP requirements; and the bulk, massing and modulation of buildings.

The Panel recommends the proposal should only be supported once it satisfactorily demonstrates improved design quality in line with the recommendations provided in this AEDRP Report.