



# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	36-42 May Street St Peters
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a 4 storey mixed use development comprising sound recording and production studios (creative industry), a food and drink premises (cafe), 2 dwellings and associated carparking
Application No.:	DA/2022/0869
Meeting Date:	13 December 2022
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Russell Olsson; Diane Jones; Jean Rice; and Vishal Lakhia - chair
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Ferdinand Dickel; Sinclair Croft; Martin Amy; and Rachel Josey
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Jack Huynh (John Greenwood Associates) – Architect for the project; Damian Hadley – Cantilever Engineers; Richie Belkner – Applicant; Jason Perica; and Frank Daniele.

### Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.

### Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Panel was informed at the meeting that the proposed floor ratio is approximately 6% below the maximum permissible control. The Panel supports, in principle, the overall site planning strategy, including a minor non-compliance beyond the LEP height control.

# INNER WEST

2. The applicant should provide a bird's eye isometric view of the proposal with its surrounding context, to understand the built form relationship of the proposed building to existing and future buildings and open spaces on the adjoining properties.
3. The applicant should consider the planting of large canopy trees, deep soil planting, within the rear setback. Additionally, planting of new street tree/s is strongly encouraged along the May Street footpath. Appropriate tree species should be nominated in the revised landscape plan.
4. The current configuration of living and dining areas in both apartments appears to be 'internalised' and further resolution is recommended to improve the outlook from the apartments. The study located at the southern end of the apartment should be reconfigured as it currently blocks natural light into living area.
5. The Panel discussed the southern building interface with the adjoining properties. The balconies to living areas (on Level 2) and terraces to the studios (on Levels 2 and 3) should be provided with appropriate screening devices, incorporated with planter boxes, to avoid potential visual privacy issues with future development anticipated on the adjoining properties to the south.
6. The Panel notes that the architectural expression of the two building components – the recording studio and the residential apartments - needs to be more cohesive. Further refinement of the residential façade is recommended to create a more unified building front. The Panel suggested introduction of solid elements such as concrete balconies as one possible solution. The design approach taken should minimise potential noise issues from May Street.
7. The use of 'alucobond' or similar cladding materials should be reviewed by a suitably qualified specialist in terms of its fire rating. The Panel recommends use of self-finished materials with an integral finish. Rendered and painted surfaces should be avoided, considering maintenance and longevity.
8. The Panel queried the use of 'store room' on Level 2 and whether it could be offered with better access and connectivity with other functions. Fire egress from the store room should be reviewed by/with a suitably qualified specialist.
9. The applicant should minimise potential privacy issues across the southern boundary. The terrace should be maximum 2m deep and a screen at least 1.8m high should be provided 2m from the boundary along the southern edge of the outdoor area, with dense planting provided in the planter box.
10. The Panel notes that the side party walls would be highly visible from the adjoining properties to the east (from the rear garden of the future hotel building) and west (from the central courtyard of the existing residential flat building). The side elevations require a more considered resolution in terms of design composition, textural and colour treatment.

## **Conclusion:**

With consideration of the recommendations made in this report, the Panel is of the view that the proposal, subject to its further development, could be capable of delivering an acceptable level of design quality. The Panel would like a second opportunity to review the proposal again as part of this Development Application stage.