



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	269 Marrickville Road Marrickville
Proposal:	
Application No.:	PDA-2025-0084
Meeting Date:	3 June 2025
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Jon Johannsen Diane Jones Vishal Lakhia (chair)
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Kaitlyn Attard Kaitlin Zieme
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	AS Architecture – Architects for the project Willow Tree Planning (Asher Richardson) – Urban Planners for the project

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed the architectural drawings and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference. The Panel reviewed the proposal in terms of design excellence, as required by the Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022 – Clause 6.9. Additionally, the proposal meets the threshold established within the AEDRP Terms of Reference to be nominated for this review.
2. The AEDRP typically advises on matters related to architecture, urban design, landscape design and design excellence. In this instance, there is an overarching statutory planning concern about 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 3, Clause 69(1)(b)(ii)]. The applicant should seek separate statutory planning advice from the Inner West Council's development assessment officers regarding the permissibility of the proposal at the subject site which has an area of 398m², significantly below the SEPP requirement.

3. While supporting the overall intentions of the project to adaptively re-use existing fabric, the Panel raised concerns regarding the design quality and residential amenity. On the ground floor, street activation is significantly compromised, with the frontage largely occupied by car parking and large garage doors, resulting in poor engagement with and impact on the public domain.
4. The location of the accessible toilet—directly across from the lift foyer—detracts from the quality of residential amenity. The Panel also notes that amenity will likely be further reduced when realistically scaled building services elements are incorporated into the layout, such as a fire hydrant booster assembly, mailboxes, meter cupboards, fire indicator panels, and possibly a substation.
5. The amenity within the co-living rooms is considered poor and is not supported by the Panel. Many rooms have 'snorkelled' configurations, which suggest overdevelopment of the site. Some kitchen areas are internalised, lacking natural outlook and clear connections to co-living spaces. Garbage chutes on Level 2 are accessed via the 'Library' space and are not conveniently located for residents, who must traverse 1:14 ramp through the communal area to reach them. Reconfiguration of this area should provide separate chute access.
6. The proposed built form massing and architectural expression are not supported. The adaptive reuse strategy adds two upper levels above a three-storey base, resulting in a built form that appears monolithic and lacking in sympathetic articulation, modulation, and façade depth. The curvilinear forms of the planter boxes appear disconnected from the architectural language and should be rationalised. The use of dark metal cladding raises concerns related to thermal performance and is considered out of character with the immediate Marrickville context.
7. The applicant should verify that floor-to-floor heights enable a minimum 2.7m floor-to-ceiling height in the co-living rooms, in accordance with amenity expectations and the compliance requirements of the NSW Design and Building Practitioners Act. The floor to floor height between the third and fourth floors is 2880mm only.

Conclusion:

1. The adaptive reuse strategy requires substantial reworking to address the fundamental issues found in the current design- in built form, architectural planning and internal amenity and resultant sub-optimal design quality. Therefore, the Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.