



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	138-152 Victoria Road, 154-156 Victoria Road, 696-699 Darling Street & 1-7 Waterloo Street, Rozelle Former Balmain Leagues Club, Rozelle
Proposal:	Section 4.55(2) Modification of Development Consent D/2018/219 seeking modifications to approved mixed-use development. Changes include modifications to: the commercial club and retail podium; approved building envelopes and facade; public domain landscaped areas; residential unit design and mix resulting in a reduction of units; private and communal open space areas; basement and sub-structure; and incorporation of construction staging
Application No.:	MOD/2022/0447
Meeting Date:	6 July 2023
Previous Meeting Date:	21 Feb 2023
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger – chair; Jocelyn Jackson; and Jon Johannsen
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Niall Macken Eric Wong
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Tom Hansen & Andrew Walsh – Scott Carver architects Kate Bartlett – planner Melanie James – project manager Paul Bermingham – client

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the responses provided to the previous AEDRP report (21 Feb 2023), and discussed these with the applicant in an online conference.

Discussion & Recommendations:

For clarity, each of the previous AEDRP report comments (left hand column) is annotated (right hand column) where relevant:

	AEDRP comment 21 Feb 2023	AEDRP comment 6 July 2023
1	<i>The Panel notes that the Modification Application retains the DA-approved gross floor area, including the floor space ratio mix allocated to each – residential, retail, commercial and club use. The overall building massing and the extent of public domain areas also appear to be consistent with the DA-approved scheme</i>	
2	<i>The Panel understands that while the applicant retains the DA-approved residential floor space ratio, the apartment mix and sizes have been modified by increasing the average apartment size and reducing the overall number of apartments. The proposal reduces the proportion of smaller apartments (studio and 1 bedroom units) to 9% which is significantly below the minimum LLEP 2000 requirement of 25%.</i>	<p>The Panel notes that the amended apartment mix is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studio units 1% • One bedroom 11% • Two bedroom 56% • Three bedroom 32% <p>The Panel is satisfied that the amended unit mix represents an acceptable diversity of dwelling formats and sizes consistent with the guidance provided by the ADG, and notes that larger dwelling sizes increasingly cater for families seeking more affordable accommodation and post-pandemic households seeking additional space to allow work from home flexibility.</p>
3	<i>The Panel noted that this minimum target within the LLEP 2000 is likely in the interest of supporting housing diversity and affordability. Whether a 9% proportion of smaller apartments is acceptable in terms of its impact on Council's housing affordability aspirations, and whether the modification remains 'substantially the same' is a separate statutory planning matter to be discussed with Council's assessment officers.</i>	Given the Panel's support for the final amended dwelling mix, Council is encouraged to satisfy itself that the objective of the LLEP clause has been met despite the numeric non-compliance.
4	<i>The Panel recommends that the residential floor space ratio calculation method undertaken by the applicant should be confirmed with Council's assessment officers to ensure a 'like-for-like' basis of comparison with the method used to calculate the existing approved GFA, in particular the Panel is keen to ensure whether winter gardens as</i>	The Panel supports the final amended proposal and Council should satisfy itself that the FSR can be considered on a 'like-for-like' basis.

	<i>proposed should be included in the gross floor area calculations.</i>	
5	<i>The Panel supports the proposed connection of building entries for Buildings B and C to provide an additional address and presentation for Building C. The Panel encourages any further potential to expand the points of address for Building C to Waterloo Street, or the publicly accessible plaza space.</i>	
6	<i>While the Panel remains supportive of the overall architectural expression described within the proposal, a number of suggestions are offered to improve the expression of the various buildings.</i>	
7	<i>The glassy Building A at the eastern corner of the site includes lower level apartments which are likely to be exposed to visual privacy issues from Victoria Road and the properties to the south east (addressing Darling Street) which are expected to be redeveloped in future. The applicant should consider effective design strategies to improve residential amenity and privacy in the vicinity of the south eastern site interface</i>	<p>The applicant presented a proposal to incorporate privacy film to spandrel areas up to level 6 to address visual privacy concerns, and clarified that the external fins (projecting 300mm beyond the glazing line) will mitigate privacy issues to some extent.</p> <p>The Panel supports the extent of the proposed treatment (assumed to align with balustrade and transom heights at 1m), but considers that a solid spandrel (presenting as a colour-backed glazed facade) would be a more durable, substantial and appropriate way to achieve this outcome.</p>
8	<i>Additionally, the Panel notes the earlier, more prominent horizontal expression provided by the residential slab edges in Buildings B and C on both their northern and southern elevations. Reintroducing some form of stronger horizontal expression would be appropriate to the residential nature of this building and would also assist with the balance of horizontal and vertical elements within the overall building composition. Such a strategy should also consider the management of built form and scale from Victoria Road viewpoints</i>	<p>The applicant has incorporated additional horizontal expression to the rear elevations to enhance the articulation of these facades, while the double height expression to Victoria Road has been retained.</p> <p>The Panel supports these proposed design amendments.</p>

9	<p><i>The Panel appreciates the applicant is seeking more, larger apartments as part of their modification, however further resolution and refinement of the following internal layouts is encouraged to resolve various concerns:</i></p>	
	<p><i>a. ‘Snorkelled’ bedrooms within typical apartments B101, C104, A202, A602, A604 (and all other apartments with similar layouts) should be carefully justified to ensure the full extent of the window is visible from all points within the room;</i></p>	<p>The applicant has reviewed the Panel’s comments, made some adjustments to the proposed apartment planning and has sought to leave a number of units unchanged (given they perform to some degree and are approved in the existing consent).</p> <p>The Panel remains concerned about the adequacy of the ventilation and light provided by the newly proposed ‘blinker’ windows, eg. apartments C105, C205, A202, A204 (and those similarly laid out apartments to the floors above).</p> <p>These windows appear to be too narrow to offer acceptable outlook, and acoustic performance may be compromised if windows are open for natural ventilation in some cases.</p>
	<p><i>b. Combined living, dining and kitchen areas with depths greater than 8m should be avoided to ensure consistency with the guidance offered within the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG) Part 4D-2; Inner West AEDRP – Meeting Minutes & Recommendations Page 3 of 3</i></p>	<p>The final amended proposal is acceptable.</p>
	<p><i>c. Potential inter-tenancy privacy issues between the master bedrooms of typical apartment B102 and the balconies of typical apartment B103 should be resolved. The Panel is concerned that privacy screens alone are unlikely to resolve acoustic privacy issues due to the adjacencies</i></p>	<p>The visual privacy concerns between typical apartments B102 and B103 have been largely ameliorated through the provision of additional landscaping and directional louvres between them.</p> <p>The Panel understands that acoustic privacy between these apartments is being addressed via double glazing, but may be compromised if opened for natural ventilation.</p>
	<p><i>d. Although not specifically discussed at the meeting, residential storage volumes for all apartments should be confirmed in terms of consistency with Part 4G of the NSW ADG.</i></p>	<p>Not discussed at Panel meeting. Council should satisfy itself that the targets for storage established by the ADG have been met or maintained.</p>

	<p><i>e. There are potential privacy issues at the re-entrant corner where typical apartment C107 is located. The bedrooms and balconies are in close proximity to the common corridors and reconfiguration is recommended to avoid visual and acoustic privacy issues. The outlook of bedrooms from typical apartment C207 into a blank wall should also be reconsidered</i></p>	<p>The privacy, outlook and amenity issues identified by the Panel have not been fully addressed (noting the relevant apartment is now numbered C102). Although the number of bedrooms affected has reduced, the master bedroom particularly, enjoys little outlook.</p> <p>The identified issue of the outlook from the bedroom to the blank wall has not been addressed (noting the relevant apartment is now numbered C202). The second bedroom particularly, enjoys little outlook.</p>
	<p><i>f. The Panel expects the proposal to be broadly consistent with the targets set out in the NSW ADG, and Council's assessment officers should satisfy themselves of the suitability of any detailed SEPP 65 assessment – including mid-winter solar access, natural cross ventilation, maximum proportion of south-facing apartments, targets for communal open space, deep soil and other requirements. The overall amenity of the proposal should be 'substantially the same', or greater, than in the previous approval.</i></p>	
<p>10</p>	<p><i>The Panel recommends that each communal open space within the proposal should be provided with an outdoor kitchenette or a barbeque, a sink, and a unisex accessible toilet</i></p>	<p>The applicant noted that a unisex accessible toilet is to be provided on levels 1 & 11, and a unisex toilet at L10.</p> <p>The Panel maintains its view that a kitchen sink is capable of being provided at each of the communal open spaces which also provide a BBQ and outdoor kitchen, and should be provided for the amenity of the occupants.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p><i>The Panel suggested that the width and proportion of central stair off Victoria Avenue linking into Tigers Lane be reviewed</i></p>	<p>The Panel supports the amendments indicated to the reconfigured Tigers Lane stair to increase the width to 3m.</p>

12	<p><i>Developed architectural documentation should include details of each primary facade type setting out the design intent with 1:20 or 1:50 sections indicating materials, balustrade types and fixing, junctions, rainwater drainage including any downpipes, A/C condenser unit enclosures, any acoustic plenums and similar details in line with the Department of Planning and Environment Application requirements March 2022 1.2(k).</i></p>	<p>The applicant showed examples of the design development drawings that have been developed for the project, including the corbeled brickwork detailing proposed for the podium and sectional details through each primary facade type. The Panel is satisfied that due consideration of architectural detailing has been given and that the proposed architectural expression is capable of being executed with the design intent preserved or improved.</p> <p>The applicant noted that downpipes are to be cast into columns and that condenser units are centralised and not located on balconies.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that indicative samples of these drawings describing the resolved design intent for primary façade types (at 1:20 scale) be included in the documents submitted as part of the MOD to provide the maximum description of design intent, and to ensure the design quality is not diminished in the design development and for ongoing construction documentation.</p>
----	---	--

In addition, the Panel considers that:

- Ceiling fans should be indicated in all living rooms and bedrooms
- The Panel supports the full electrification of the building and the elimination of gas.

Conclusion:

The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel thanks the applicant for providing a comprehensive response to the previous AEDRP report.

The Panel is of the view that, subject to the further design amendments recommended above, the proposal is capable of delivering a high level of design quality.