



# Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

## Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	504 Darling Street Rozelle
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings and site remediation for the construction of a residential flat building comprising 16 units over four levels, basement carparking, storage and plant, landscaping driveway access and associated services
Application No.:	DA/2023/0265
Meeting Date:	13 June 2023
Previous Meeting Date:	25 January 2022 (Pre DA)
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger (chair); Russell Olsson; and Jon Johannsen
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia; Sinclair Croft; and Christian Hemsley
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Steve Zappia, Alex Klein (Marchese Partners) – Architects for the project; Dan Brindle – Urban Planner 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 providing a comprehensive set of drawings and 3D views for the formal development application assessment, and appreciates that recommendations made at the Panel's previous meeting during the Pre DA stage have been addressed, mainly including:

- Consideration of a 9m setback to the eastern boundary to improve built form transition to the adjoining dwelling houses;
  - Reconfiguration of the vehicular access to create a one way ramp for the vehicular entry, provided with partially landscaped edge to the eastern boundary;
  - Reconfiguration of the internal apartment layouts to improve natural ventilation and natural cross ventilation within the proposal;
  - Resolution and refinement of the overall architectural expression of the proposal, particularly the elevation addressing Darling Street;
  - Sustainability measures, including provision of ceiling fans to habitable areas, rooftop photovoltaic system and an on-site detention tank.
3. 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 9 Design Quality Principles set out in the SEPP 65 and against the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG).

## Discussion & Recommendations:

### Principle 1 – Context and Neighbourhood Character

1. The Panel notes that the site is not governed by a maximum height of building control. A maximum permissible floor space ratio of 0.7:1 (including 0.5:1 base control plus 0.2:1 bonus provision) applies to the subject site, and the applicant is proposing a 1.49:1 floor space ratio supported by a cl 4.6 written request to vary the FSR control. Due to this significant exceedance, the Panel notes that there are statutory planning considerations which may impact both the planning pathway (e.g. a concept development application or a planning proposal) and the development outcome. The applicant should have separate discussions with Council's assessment officers to address this statutory planning matter.

### Principle 2 – Built Form and Scale

1. Regardless of the planning pathway to be resolved by the applicant and Council, the Panel supports a maximum 4-storey form where the top floor is redesigned to be contained entirely within a roof form. This will require some further resolution to determine how the top floor unit, lift overrun, services and PV panels can be best integrated within a coherent mansard roof form that does not create any unreasonable visual or amenity concerns relative to the site's immediate context.
2. The Panel notes that in its current configuration the vehicular ramp appears visually prominent close to the adjacent site boundary and recommends the ramp structure be well-integrated with the building and landscape design. A suggested strategy is to create a pergola structure with vegetation screening the ramp and possibly encompassing the adjacent bin storage area to mitigate their visual impacts. The height of the pergola should broadly align with the first floor balcony level and should also allow for a Council waste truck to access the site (at ground level) to the satisfaction of Council's resource recovery officers.
3. The applicant should confirm with the relevant energy authorities whether a substation is required and allow early design coordination of all building services (including water meter, fire hydrant booster valve, pump room, fire indicator panel, meters, panels, main switch board, communications, letter boxes and other requirements) particularly within the ground floor configuration. The intention is to minimise any impacts on the surrounding public realm and immediate neighbours, and to ensure that a desirable amenity is achievable within the ground floor.
4. The Panel supports the direct and individual street entries proposed for the ground floor apartments and recommends the applicant should further review whether landing areas are required for the entry stairs and gates addressing Darling Street.
5. The Panel recommends some reconfiguration of the internal layouts of typical apartment L1.1 (on Levels 1 and 2) to create a better address to Wisbeach Street. The living room and balcony should (if possible) address the street, and bedrooms as quieter spaces, should then be

relocated away from the street addressing the rear garden. This will also serve to reduce opportunities for cross viewing into the neighbouring property's back yard.

6. The Panel notes that a 6m to 9m setback is provided along the eastern boundary, which meets the separation distances recommended by the NSW Apartment Design Guide (Part 3F Visual privacy). There are some potential visual privacy and cross viewing impacts from apartments L1.5 and L3.1 with the adjoining dwelling houses to east. Sections should indicate how this could be managed through addition of privacy screens at appropriate locations within the balconies or with integrated landscape elements on balconies. The Panel appreciates the desirability of easterly views, but this must be balanced with the maintenance of privacy for lower density neighbouring dwellings.

### **Principle 3 – Density**

1. The Panel is aware that the proposal significantly exceeds the maximum floor space ratio control, and offers in principle support for the cl 4.6 variation provided that the applicant establishes consistency with the recommendations offered within this AEDRP Report.

### **Principle 4 – Sustainability**

1. The Panel supports full building electrification (including elimination of any gas services) and encourages this strategy to be incorporated within the finalised proposal together with EV charging facilities within the basement.

### **Principle 5 – Landscape**

1. The Panel recommends further consolidation and maximisation of the proposed deep soil area, which may be achieved by relocating the on-site detention tank within the building footprint, or alternatively under the vehicular ramp.
2. Street views with CGI perspectives showing extensive landscape treatment to balustrades are supported but need to be fully coordinated across landscape and architectural documentation. This should include clear design intent drawings describing how the planters will be constructed and maintained to ensure the visual and privacy benefits will not be compromised for either residents, neighbours or from the public domain.
3. As noted above, some landscape treatment should be integrated within a pergola structure over the carpark ramp and bin storage if this is to remain.
4. Relocation of the water meter to be integrated within the building and west of the driveway would allow for additional landscape adjacent to the existing neighbouring house.

### **Principle 6 – Amenity**

1. The Panel remains concerned for the applicant's strategy of storing bins along the eastern boundary considering potential odour and amenity impacts on the neighbouring dwelling house and on the Wisbeach Street public domain. Consideration should be given to possible relocation of the bin storage area away from the side boundary, or further enclosure with airlocks and mechanical ventilation.

### **Principle 7 – Safety**

1. The Panel supports the proposal for its clear building address, legible entries and individual ground floor units which directly engage with the street.

### **Principle 8 – Housing Diversity and Social Interaction**



1. The Panel supports the proposed mix of units and the proposed communal open space configuration.

### **Principle 9 – Aesthetics**

1. Revised architectural drawings should confirm location of A/C condenser units and other mechanical equipment within the roof form. The Panel advises that these should not be located within balconies (unless thoughtfully designed with screens) or anywhere visually apparent from the surrounding public domain.
2. The Panel appreciates 1:20 design intent sections provided by the applicant and recommends further integration of the landscape design elements into the scheme. Appropriate planter boxes should be added to establish consistency across both the architectural and landscape design objectives.

### **Non SEPP 65 Matters:**

None

### **Conclusion:**

With consideration of the recommendations made in this report, the Panel is of the view that the proposal, subject to further refinement, is capable of delivering an acceptable level of design quality. If it assists the assessing officer, the Panel would be happy to informally review any further amended proposal as part of the Development Application assessment.

### **Attachment:**

Previous AEDRP Report from 25 January 2022 meeting