



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	280-282 Illawarra Road MARRICKVILLE
Proposal:	Demolition of all existing structures and construction of a 7-storey mixed-use development comprising ground floor commercial with 37 co-living rooms above
Application No.:	PDA/2025/0142
Meeting Date:	9 September 2025
Previous Meeting Date:	-
Panel Members:	Russell Olsson (Chair) Tony Caro Peter Ireland
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Iain Betts Katerina Lianos Sinclair Croft
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Sam Tadros, Architectural Designer Sean Riddell, Town Planner, Think Planners Jonathon Woods, Director, Think Planners Rosie: Client representative

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 and MDCP 2011 - Masterplan Area MA 40.5.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. Site Planning and Urban Design:

- a. The Panel notes that the site is constrained by its size and the planning controls that apply to it. The proposed development contains a number of non-compliances with the proposed co-living Housing SEPP 21 development that need to be addressed and considered by going back to first principles. These include consideration of the site constraints, potential lot amalgamation, minimum lot size, building separation requirements in accordance with the ADG, vehicular and pedestrian access, amenity for future inhabitants, architectural character within the context, architectural appearance and materiality.
- b. It is understood by the Panel that the applicant has made enquiries to purchase the adjoining lots, however negotiations with adjoining owners have been unsuccessful. This will need to be demonstrated as part of a future DA.
- c. The Panel recommends that consideration be given to the constraints of the subject site and to take into account the development potential of surrounding sites to the north, south and west of the site.
- d. The applicant is encouraged by the Panel to examine the permissible building envelope on the site in MDCP 2011 - Masterplan Area MA 40.5 and address the interface issues with surrounding sites, in particular in relation to building separation.
- e. Detailed contextual analysis should be made of the surrounding built form and architectural character to assist resolution of the proposed the architectural character.
- f. The Panel recommends re-design and refinement of the architectural articulation and materials of the building.

2. Pedestrian and Vehicular Access:

- a. The Panel notes that car access is proposed via Tuohy Lane. This lane contains high level traffic because it provides vehicular access to the car park to the north of the site. There is no footpath to the lane. Pedestrian access to the entry is proposed from the narrow lane, which is not a shared lane. There is an issue for pedestrians walking from Illawarra Road to the entry. A footpath may need to be provided on the subject site to gain access to the lobby from Illawarra Road.

3. Non-Compliance Issues:

- a. The Panel understands that ADG building separation requirements apply to the proposal. There is significant non-compliance of setbacks to habitable rooms addressing Tuohy Lane. The ADG requires 12m separation between buildings up to 4 storeys and 18m for 5 storeys and above with habitable rooms.
- b. The 6m building separation distance across the central void and the proposed single, narrow window to each of U-104, U-105, U-204, U-205, U-304, U-305, U-404 and U-504 severely diminish the amenity of these units. Any amenity that the single, narrow windows may provide would be further reduced were a future building to be built on the adjacent site to the south.

INNER WEST

- c. The current DCP requires the laneway to be widened. The Panel notes this will affect all levels of the proposal and needs to be resolved in the future redesign.
- d. The Panel notes the architectural appearance of the building does not relate to, or respond to, the surrounding context and architecture. The mansard roof form is not characteristic of roof forms in the vicinity. Windows shown in the northeast elevation must be depicted on the relevant floor plans, along with all other detail. Further developed architectural drawings will need to be provided as part of a future DA.
- e. The Panel notes the internal planning needs work. There are some poorly planned apartment layouts that need to be revisited.
- f. The Panel acknowledges the non-compliances will severely impact the amenity of the inhabitants of those rooms.
- g. The Panel notes that there is no means of egress from the roof top via fire stairs. This does not comply with the BCA.
- h. It is not clear how the restaurant as ground level will be serviced as there is no loading dock or exhaust provisions proposed. This will impact deliveries to the restaurant and to the building and needs to be addressed along with waste storage. Also the toilets require access through the residential lift lobby

Conclusion:

- 1. Recognising its independent, expert and advisory role, the Panel cannot support the proposal in its current form at this Pre-DA stage. The proposal needs to be comprehensively re-designed.
- 2. Given the number of more detailed matters requiring further refinement and resolution, particularly in relation to the site context and the non-compliances, the Panel request that further developed design be submitted for further review as part of a future Pre-DA.