



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	462 New Canterbury Road Dulwich Hill NSW
Proposal:	Construction of a 4 storey mixed use development comprising a 21 room boarding house with managers residence, a ground floor commercial tenancy and car parking.
Application No.:	PDA/2023/0013
Meeting Date:	18 April 2023
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Russell Olsson – chair; Jon Johannsen; and Diane Jones
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia; Niall Macken; Ferdinand Dickel and Martin Amy
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Ahmed Al Jamali – Designer 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. At the meeting the applicant expressed that there are financial constraints which currently determine their design outcome for this project. The Panel is mindful of such parameters, however its primary task is to provide independent advice to Council and applicants about whether this application achieves the standards or architectural and urban design quality expected within the Inner West local government area.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. Context & Neighbourhood Character:

- a. The AEDRP typically advises on matters related to architecture, urban design, landscape design and design excellence, however at this instance, the Panel notes that there is an overarching statutory planning matter with the permissibility of the proposed development at the subject site. The Panel understands that the proposal does not comply with the minimum



800m² lot size requirement within the Housing SEPP 2021 legislation [Part 2, Clause 25(1)(g)(ii)].

- b. The applicant should seek separate statutory planning advice from the Inner West Council's development assessment officers regarding the acceptability of the proposal at the subject site which has an area of 411.90m², significantly below the SEPP requirement.
- c. The Panel appreciates a comprehensive set of architectural drawings provided for an early Pre DA discussion. However, the Pre DA drawings did not include urban design analysis, streetscape elevation and details of the adjoining buildings to demonstrate suitability of the proposed built form and massing with the subject site and its immediate context, including potential for amenity impacts on neighbours.

2. Built Form and Scale:

- a. The Panel discussed that the proposed floor space ratio exceeds the maximum permissible floor space ratio for the subject site, and the gross floor area calculation method should be reviewed by Council's assessment officer – whether the common circulation corridor could be entirely (or partially) excluded from the calculations.
- b. The Panel appreciates the constraints of this site in terms of how lot size and orientation limit the potential built form outcomes but must assess the proposal against the relevant and prevailing planning controls.
- c. The overall built form is to be adjusted to comply with development controls. The Development Control Plan requires that the building be 3 storeys addressing New Canterbury Road. The fourth storey is to be set back a minimum of 6m from New Canterbury Road.
- d. The proposed floor-to-floor heights of 3m are insufficient to achieve a ceiling height of 2.7m while complying with the BCA at later project stages. The Panel recommends a minimum floor-to-floor height of 3.15m for residential and 3.6m for the ground floor. The parapet height may need to be adjusted to comply with the 14m height limit. If (as suggested below) a roof terrace for common open space is included with landscaping and improved amenity for residents, then a minor excess in height could be considered under a Cl. 4.6 variation.

3. Building Configuration:

- a. The ground floor configuration needs much greater resolution and refinement. The Panel discussed that boarding rooms addressing Kintore Street at ground floor level have compromised amenity and privacy and recommends street activation should be maximised by replacing the rooms with an active use such as retail or commercial space.
- b. The bicycle parking should be relocated to the rear of the building to create a more generous and amenable entry foyer. The motorcycle parking space M04 should be reconfigured to avoid potential movement conflicts within the lift corridor.
- c. The waste storage (bins and bulky goods) and collection needs a further consideration within the ground floor and the Panel expects the applicant to work with the relevant Council requirements.
- d. The applicant should confirm that all common circulation areas have barrier-free wheelchair access, additionally, floor plans should be further refined to confirm that all boarding rooms are visitable. The applicant should work with a suitably qualified specialist to demonstrate compliance with access requirements. Additionally, a suitably qualified specialist should be engaged to review fire egress distances from the boarding rooms on all floor levels.
- e. The Panel understands that the proposal does not satisfy the minimum carparking requirements for the affordable housing and the commercial components. The Panel could offer its support for reduced car parking if the revised proposal addresses the recommendations offered in this report.



- f. The Panel recommends the applicant engage a suitably qualified landscape architect to work on the communal open space. The design team should apply the ADG guidelines for the design and planning of communal areas.

4. Sustainability:

- a. The Panel recommends that a minimum 3 hour direct solar access at mid-winter be achieved within the communal open space to improve the amenity of residents. The applicant should provide sun eye views at hourly interval to confirm that consistency is achieved with this recommendation.
- b. In order to maximise direct solar access to the communal open space and the common room, the Panel recommends these communal uses should be relocated to the top floor (Level 4 above the 3rd storey) towards the north. The communal open space should be in the 6m setback area, with the common room adjacent. The Panel would support a minor exceedance of the lift shaft and fire stairs beyond the LEP height plane if better solar amenity could be achieved for the residents.
- c. The Panel discussed the DCP requiring 65% boarding rooms and balconies to be provided with a minimum 2 hour direct solar access between 9am to 3pm in mid-winter. Flexibility could be offered for this control if the applicant satisfactorily responds to the recommendations offered in this report.
- d. The Panel expects provision of ceiling fans to all boarding rooms as a low energy alternative.
- e. The applicant is encouraged to include a rooftop photovoltaic system for environmental benefits and for use in power/lighting to common areas. This could be integrated into a pergola structure to provide shade at the roof terrace level. Consideration should also be given to the provision of an 'all electric' power service with no gas appliances.
- f. Provision of a rainwater tank should be considered to allow water collection, storage and reuse within the site.

5. Architectural Expression:

- a. The architectural expression of the proposal was not discussed in detail at the meeting considering there were more fundamental matters that were required to be addressed in this Pre DA meeting.
- b. The Panel recommends that glass balustrades to the balconies should be modified, and an alternative solid or opaque treatment should be considered, to create an appropriate balance between privacy vs outlook achieved within the rooms and balconies.
- c. Revised architectural drawings should confirm location of A/C condenser units and other mechanical equipment. The Panel advises that services equipment should not be located within balconies or anywhere visually apparent from the surrounding public domain.
- d. The street awning is not sufficiently wide to provide shade to the ground floor retail and weather protection to footpath. The width should be 2.5m to 3m, in accordance with Council's awning policy. The awning structure is not deep enough for this proposed width and should be revised accordingly.
- e. Although it was not discussed at the meeting, the Panel notes that the western and southern side party walls will be highly visible until such time as the adjoining properties are redeveloped. These elevations require a more considered resolution in terms of design composition and material selection.
- f. It is recommended that a material and finishes board is included together with cross-referenced 1:20 façade sections to clearly indicate the construction details.



Conclusion:

The Panel thanks the applicant for allowing an early discussion at this Pre DA meeting and recognises that there is a fundamental statutory planning matter regarding the minimum lot size which needs to be addressed to Council's satisfaction as a priority. The Panel has not fully commented on other architectural and landscape design issues considering these will be lower-order issues in comparison.

The Panel recommends the applicant reconsider the proposal with respect to the statutory planning provided by Council and further independent advice provided in this Report. Any revised proposal should return to the Panel for further review.