



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	19 Gordon Street PETERSHAM
Proposal:	Demolition of existing structures and construction of residential flat building, including 6 apartments with basement for services
Application No.:	PDA/2025/0136
Meeting Date:	9 September 2025
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Russell Olsson (Chair) Tony Caro Peter Ireland
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Kaitlin Zieme Camille Guyot Sinclair Croft Iain Betts Ferdinand Dickel Zoe Megas
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Stefano Leupusek

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 this is a Pre-DA and this is first time that it has been reviewed by the Panel.
- b. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of 6 apartments, including 4x3 BR, 1x1 BR, 1x2 BR apartments.
- c. The Panel acknowledges the applicant's intention to create a built form which is consistent with the existing approved development at 21, 23 and 25 Gordon Street.
- d. The Panel acknowledges the narrow site (9m). Amalgamation is encouraged by the Panel, though it is acknowledged the applicant has attempted to purchase the adjoining property at No. 17 which the owner does not want to sell.
- e. The Panel recommends that the applicant demonstrate that the site to the north at No. 17 can be successfully developed in the future, which will require the provision of schematic building envelopes at ground and typical upper level, vehicle access point, ramping to basement and parking arrangement.
- f. The Panel advises that normally, the architect presents the proposal to the Panel. The applicant's architect is encouraged to attend the following meeting to ensure they are across all of the detail discussed and advice provided by the Panel.

2. Ground Plane Configuration and Car Park:

- a. The Panel considers that the ground level entry sequence from Gordon Street is poor, particularly for visitors, as they need to traverse the carpark to access the lift.
- b. The design of the car parking was of a concern to the Panel with access to the lift directly off the driveway. A redesign is recommended, to avoid pedestrians having to wait in the driveway for access to the lift.
- c. The Panel acknowledge the neighbour at No. 21 – 23 does not want to share access because they will lose 2 car parking spaces. Therefore car parking provision and design will need to be resolved on the subject site. Reducing the number of required car parking spaces from 8 car parking spaces may assist in the design.
- d. A number of design solutions may be possible, including having 3 spaces accessed directly off Gordon Lane at ground level or the inclusion of a car lift to a basement parking level. Any design solution should allay safety concerns by separating pedestrians and cars in the car park at ground and/or basement levels.
- e. The Panel advises a swept path analysis will be required to be provided by the applicant. The applicant may need to consider alternatives and potentially negotiate with council on the provision of fewer spaces than current Council parking rates. The applicant's traffic consultant will need to demonstrate that any redesign of the car parking area will function to the satisfaction of Council's traffic engineers. Though not Council policy, the Panel recommends discussion between the applicant and Council if a car lift can be considered.

3. Architectural Resolution:

INNER WEST

- a. The Panel acknowledge the effort of the applicant's architect to align the design of the proposal with the facade approved on the adjoining property at Nos. 21 – 23, which included amalgamation and construction of an apartment building. The Panel also acknowledges the good design of the northern terraces concealing ac and storage cupboards.
- b. The Panel suggests that with the replanning of the ground floor, the location of lift and stairs may need to be adjusted. The planning of upper floor levels should be considered concurrently to address the following design issues.
- c. The Panel notes that the balcony of U1 on the first floor is not set back 6m from the boundary on Gordon Lane. It is recommended that the windows of the house at 21 Sadlier Crescent that address Gordon Lane be located and that any balcony or window on first floor level of proposed development be separated from those windows by 12m. Any balcony should have a minimum depth of 2.5m.
- d. The Panel noted that for the single apartment floor plans a foyer is not required. Direct keyed access from the lift is acceptable and more amenable.
- e. No accessible units are shown in the drawings. At least one of the apartments will need to be accessible and shown in the revised drawings.
- f. The Panel advise the applicant that a parking diagram and usage will need to demonstrate how it is possible to get in and out of the carpark to the lift to access the accessible apartment.
- g. The Panel raised concern with regard to the layout of the basement. From a residential amenity point of view, there are concerns with the useability of the proposed uses and spaces.
- h. The Panel encourages reconfiguration of the placement of the W.C. in the bath to U1 on Level 1 because this will be visible from the dining.
- i. The Panel raised concern with the depths of balconies, which are proposed to be 2.1m deep whereas the ADG requires a depth of 2.5m.
- j. The Panel observed the fire door located at the half landing on the roof terrace level. The doorway is encouraged to become part of the roof terrace.
- k. Placement of the pergola is questioned by the Panel. It should be located where it is most likely needed.
- l. The Panel raised concern about waste management. It is not clear how waste will be managed within the building and where it is proposed to be collected from. The Panel would prefer that it be collected from Gordon Lane. The applicant should resolve this with Council's waste planners.
- m. Further clarification will need to be provided for type of, and application of, proposed materials.
- n. The facades elevations and plans are inconsistent. The elevations show stepped brick reveals to window openings, the Plans do not. The Panel recommends the former, and that the plans are amended to reflect the elevations.

Conclusion:

1. Recognising its independent, expert and advisory role, the Panel supports the applicant's overall approach to complementing the built form, architectural resolution and materiality of the existing approval at 21-25 Gordon Crescent with this proposal. It is noted, however that the proposed design contains shortcomings, primarily related to site size and width, which need to be resolved. These shortcomings may necessitate a reduction in car parking and GFA. 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.