



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	2B West Street Lewisham
Proposal:	Follow up PDA - Modification of Determination No. DA201800505 dated 2 September 2020 to change the number and mix of Independent Living Units and Residential Aged Care beds across development and built form changes (3rd review).
Application No.:	PDA-2024-0072
Meeting Date:	6 August 2025
Previous Meeting Date:	5 September 2023 (Pre DA 1), 16 July 2024 (Pre DA 2)
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger (chair) Russell Olsson Diane Jones
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Vishal Lakhia Ferdinand Dickel Sinclair Croft
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Tom White and Fitri Wahib (WMK) – Architects for the project, Daniel Jukic, Luis Santeliz and Mahmoud Chatila – Applicant's representatives, Jack Rixon (Mecone) – Urban planner for the project

Background:

1. The Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel reviewed and discussed the proposal with the applicant through an online conference.
2. The Panel acknowledges that the proposal is subject to Chapter 4 – State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) Housing 2021 - Design of residential apartment development - and the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG) applies to the proposal. Additionally, the Panel reviewed the proposal in terms of design excellence as required by the Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022 – Clause 6.9.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. Site Planning and Urban Design:

- a. The Panel notes that a previous pre-DA proposal was reviewed at the AEDRP meeting on 05 September 2023 and subsequently at a second pre-DA at the 16 July 2024 AEDRP meeting. Positive design development has occurred since these previous reviews.
- b. The Panel supports the overall approach to site planning, massing, building separation, and architectural form outcomes, which have thoughtfully responded to earlier concerns raised by the Panel. Some further detailed design resolution is expected as the scheme progresses towards formal lodgement as a modification application.
- c. The amended proposal results in a series of positive site planning changes, mainly associated with the improved arrangement of new building elements and their arrangement aligning with the existing heritage buildings and the site's inherent orthogonal site planning. These key site planning moves achieve increased consistency with the NSW Apartment Design Guide and are supported.
- d. The amended proposal provides an improved interface with the railway corridor by splitting the southern building into separate elements. The improved outlook between and through the new buildings responds positively to concerns raised by the Panel in earlier reviews. Additionally, the overall proposition for height and articulated building form are regarded as positive.
- e. The visual impact analysis provided from the train station and the surrounding streets was reviewed by the Panel and found to be acceptable.

2. Ground Plane Configuration and Landscape Design:

- a. The Panel discussed the landscape design strategies and ground plane pedestrian movement networks within the proposal. Generally, the Panel supports the level of separation achieved between pedestrian and vehicular movements when compared to the existing approval and earlier versions reviewed by the Panel. A detailed pedestrian access and movement strategy and night-time safety strategy should be included as part of the landscape architecture works.
- b. The applicant should ensure that the pedestrian entry from West Street, and any other public address points, are barrier-free to achieve universal access, while the pedestrian paths are legible allowing intuitive way finding and comfortable movement.
- c. The Panel notes that the current strategy of linking the new buildings to the existing heritage gardens through the eastern garden - including 1:14 access-compliant ramp systems - risks diminishing the heritage values of the garden itself. The Panel believes that the final refined pedestrian circulation network should strike an appropriate balance between conserving the heritage character of the gardens and facilitating intuitive, universal access. The applicant is encouraged to investigate augmentation of pedestrian access provided along Charles O'Neill Way as a potential resolution of this concern and to provide a more direct route for apartment residents.
- d. Multiple-use programming should be introduced within the ground plane to support different age groups and a flexible range of uses. The programme should be thoughtfully integrated into the landscape architecture proposal. Additionally, seating and other opportunities for social interaction between residents should be investigated and incorporated as part of the revised scheme.

- e. The Panel encourages the applicant to set ambitious tree canopy cover targets and demonstrate how the proposal meets these targets.
- f. The Panel generally supports the proposal for the central piazza, however the detailed landscape treatment appears unnecessarily 'fragmented' and potentially discordant with the observable heritage landscape patterns evident in the northern and eastern gardens. The Panel is concerned that the current pattern of pathways and residual planter beds appear to diminish the range of uses and flexibility of the piazza, and would benefit from larger, consolidated planting areas to strengthen its identity and maximise flexibility in use. The Panel encourages the introduction of larger trees with the piazza.
- g. The final refined landscape architecture design package should include detailed materials and finishes palette with 1:50 or 1:20 design intent sections.
- h. The Panel recommends that further 3D modelling and architectural renderings should incorporate landscape design elements and accessibility considerations, demonstrating how design excellence can be delivered without compromising the amenity and heritage values of the ground plane configuration.

3. Architectural Resolution:

- a. The Panel notes that the proposed architectural expression appears to be at a relatively early stage of design development. In any case, the architectural expression appears more refined and composed in comparison to earlier pre-DA schemes and is supported in principle. Further resolution is encouraged in terms of construction methodology, materials, finishes, junctions and proportions, with stronger contextual cues potentially being drawn from the Novitiate Building. Opportunities should also be explored to incorporate planting on structures to soften the architecture.
- b. The Panel encourages the applicant to set ambitious sustainability targets, and to exceed minimum BASIX requirements, with measures such as building electrification, ceiling fans to habitable areas, photovoltaic array systems, EV charging facilities and similar initiatives. The current submission does not provide adequate detail on sustainability measures.
- c. Further developed architectural drawings should fully describe the proposed design intent for each primary façade type. This should take the form of 1:20 sections and elevations (including detailed 3D representations) showing materials, construction systems, balustrade types and fixings, balcony edge treatments, window operation, integrated planter beds, construction systems, material junctions, rainwater and balcony drainage systems, and the placement of downpipes or similar elements.
- d. Revised architectural drawings should confirm the location of any AC condenser units. These should not be located within balconies (unless thoughtfully screened for both visual and aural impact) or be visible from the public domain.
- e. The Panel requests further details on the necessary throw screen enclosure to the railway corridor, including materials, systems, degree of enclosure and orientation.

Conclusion:

- 1. Recognising its independent, expert and advisory role, the Panel supports a series of key moves and notes improvement to the overall site planning and urban design of the proposal. In order to obtain the Panel's full endorsement, the matters outlined in this report should be positively addressed by the applicant.
- 2. Given the number of more detailed matters requiring further refinement and resolution, particularly in relation to the overall architectural and landscape design expression and character, the Panel request that further developed design material be submitted for further review as part of the formal modification application stage.