

# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	77 Glassop Street Balmain
Proposal:	A part 4 to 5 storey residential flat building over a basement carpark
Application No.:	PDA 2021 0472
Meeting Date:	25 January 2022
Previous Meeting Date:	None
Panel Members:	Peter Ireland – chair; Russell Olsson; and Garth Paterson
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia; Niall Macken; and Iain Watt
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant’s representatives to address the panel:	Nicholas Day Architects – 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 thanks the applicant for seeking early feedback at the Pre DA stage.

### Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Panel expressed concern regarding the extent of floor space ratio proposed on the site as it creates principal amenity issues for the residents on the subject site and the residents within existing adjoining buildings. It is also the Panel’s view that the building appears excessively tall and is not compatible with the character of the area.
2. In summary, the applicant needs to apply the primary controls from the NSW Apartment Design Guide including but not limited to – setbacks, building separation, communal open space, deep soil area, solar access and natural cross ventilation to determine an acceptable built form and floor space ratio outcome for the subject site.
3. The Panel also notes that application of 6m setbacks from the side boundaries, as required by Part 3F of the ADG will demand substantial redesign of the proposal. The Panel is concerned as to whether a residential flat building (as defined by the NSW SEPP 65 – a proposal with 4 or

# INNER WEST

more apartments and more than 3 storeys) could be achieved on a constrained site with approximately 15m frontage and 37m depth, whilst ensuring consistency with the principal controls of the ADG.

4. The Panel expressed concern that potential habitable areas labelled 'gym, theatre and home office' within the apartments lack provision of windows. The proposed internal configuration of the layouts is problematic as these habitable areas could potentially qualify as bedrooms. The Panel considers a lack of window provision to these habitable areas is not consistent with the guidance offered within Part 4D-1.2 of the ADG, and raises potential issues with NCC compliance.
5. Although it is not a matter of the ADG, the front setback needs to be consistent with alignment of the adjoining buildings and the applicant should refer the Inner West Development Control Plan for further guidance.
6. The Panel discussed that there are habitable areas (bedrooms 2 and 3) within Apartment 1 located below the natural ground level, which raises outlook and amenity concerns for these apartments.
7. The Panel understands that the proposed carparking configuration is to be reviewed by Council's engineering section. It is the Panel's view that the car parking strategy is problematic as it relies on 2 sets of mechanical devices – a car lift + car stackers.
8. The Panel also discussed discrepancies noted on the mid-winter shadow diagrams. These need to be clarified and or corrected.
9. As concluding remarks (offered in paragraphs 9 and 10), the applicant should consider a substantial redesign of the proposal and engage with the Panel through a second more formalised Pre DA meeting. The Panel expects the revised proposal to be consistent with the guidance offered by the NSW ADG. At a more formalised Pre DA, the Panel will review and offer recommendations for the revised proposal against the 9 Design Quality Principles set out in the ADG – *Context & Neighbourhood Character, Built Form & Scale, Density, Sustainability, Landscape, Amenity, Safety, Housing Diversity and Social Interaction, and Aesthetics.*
10. The Panel also suggested that the applicant could consider an alternative residential typology such as a dual occupancy, manor houses or multi unit housing (a residential development other than a SEPP 65 residential flat building) that may be more appropriate to the subject site. A less intense proposal would also alleviate Panel's primary concerns regarding excessive FSR + height, built form compatibility, residential amenity, deep soil area and carparking.