



Architectural Excellence & Design Review Panel

Meeting Minutes & Recommendations

Site Address:	50-52 Warren Road MARRICKVILLE
Proposal:	Demolition of existing structures and construction of a nine (9) storey residential flat building, including three levels of basement, removal of eight (8) trees, and associated works. Integrated development under Water Management Act 2000
Application No.:	DA/2025/0816
Meeting Date:	7 November 2025
Previous Meeting Date:	16 March 2021 (DA/2021/0066)
Panel Members:	Matthew Pullinger (Chair) Jocelyn Jackson Peter McGregor
Apologies:	-
Council staff:	Felicity Hannan Tom Irons Zoe Van Druten Sinclair Croft
Guests:	-
Declarations of Interest:	None
Applicant or applicant's representatives to address the panel:	Martin Bednarczyk: Architect, Archispectrum Madeline Maric - Corona Projects Anthony Boskovitz Jennie Askin: aSquare Planning Lauren: Corona Projects



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.
3. The Panel is an independent, expert advisory body, which provides advice to Council in respect to the LEP design excellence clause, and offers feedback to improve the quality of proposals. The Panel's advice seeks to ensure that adequate amenity is available within the subject site's boundaries (for future residents), and that proposed development does not unreasonably diminish the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties. This requires design judgment to assess the development capacity of the site, sensitive to immediate neighbours and to delivering good quality residential amenity.

Discussion & Recommendations:

1. Site Planning and Urban Design:

- a. In its current form, the proposal does not respond positively to its context. The tightly cropped set of DA drawings do not adequately represent the immediate context, nor provide any meaningful analysis of how a building of the proposed scale can sit comfortably within its urban setting or mitigate against the impacts of building bulk and scale.
- b. Understanding the proposal seeks to access development incentives made available due to the site's location within an identified Transit Oriented Development area, and will be the largest building within the immediate environment, the Panel notes the Applicant's strategy has been to reflect these maximum building height and density controls, often in contradiction to other development controls and setbacks.
- c. The proposed site planning and building design indicates that in order to accommodate the maximum building height and density, unreasonable development pressure arises within the site and across site boundaries.
- d. The Panel recommends the Applicant studies the site and its context more fully, and redesigns the building to respond more sensitively to this context. Such a redesign is likely to result in a reduction in building scale and density, and should achieve greater conformity with ADG targets for building separation, setbacks, provision of deep soil, provision of communal open space and the achievement of acceptable levels of residential amenity.
- e. In its current form, the Panel raises concern with the significant number of inconsistencies with key ADG targets, including building separation and solar access. For the Panel to offer endorsement of a redesigned proposal, the number and nature of impacts to neighbouring properties must be reduced to preserve an acceptable level of amenity.
- f. The Panel further notes the proposal does not comply with site coverage controls, and considers there to be an opportunity to improve solar access to apartments.

2. Ground Plane Configuration and Landscape Design:

- a. The central common circulation space and ground floor communal open space are disconnected. The Panel encourages redesign so these spaces are better connected and so that communal open space receives acceptable solar access.
- b. The building address and arrival sequence at the foyer is concealed from view and compromised by proximity to the adjacent basement ramp. The Panel recommends the



building entry be more prominent, inviting and centrally located, positioned away from the driveway and clearly legible as the primary building address.

- c. Communal open spaces are inadequate, distributed around the site perimeter, receiving inadequate solar access and are not consolidated. These areas do not provide an acceptable level of amenity and appear to result from design decisions to maximise site coverage and density, pushing development and built form too close to the site boundaries.
- d. The Applicant is encouraged to adopt alternative design strategies that better locate and consolidate communal open space at the ground floor in a format that coincides with deep soil and good solar access. The relocation of some communal open space to the rooftop (overlooking the street) may be considered where requirements cannot be met solely at ground floor level. The most suitable area of the site will be to the west to take advantage of better solar access and the afternoon sun.
- e. Access to common open space is currently via a convoluted fire-isolated passageway. The Panel encourages redesign of circulation to these spaces, to be direct and easily accessible, ideally with a direct line of site.
- f. The Panel notes that balconies do not have minimum depths or areas and encourages redesign to meet ADG targets.
- g. The Panel notes the driveway entry dominates too great an extent of the site's frontage and encourages redesign to minimise driveway width.
- h. The proposed three-level basement car park is located along the boundary of 54 Warren Road. The Applicant will need to demonstrate how the older neighbouring brick building will be retained and protected given the proximity of excavation.
- i. The Panel notes that bicycle parking is proposed in basement levels and encourages some be relocated to the ground floor in more accessible locations.

3. Architectural Resolution:

- a. The Panel is concerned with the proposed building form and general arrangement. There appears to be little rationalisation of structure, with transfers between the basement and ground floor, and between level 3 and the typical floors above, resulting in planning inefficiencies at each level, which contributes to greater building bulk and likely increased construction cost.
- b. The Panel encourages redesign to improve the amenity available to apartments.
- c. The Panel notes that apartment sizes vary with some appearing to be unnecessarily large and inefficient in planning. There may be an opportunity to reduce the apparent scale of the building by planning apartments more efficiently.
- d. The depth of some of the kitchens is inconsistent with ADG targets. The kitchen to Apartment 3 on ground floor is 'snorkeled' behind the laundry. Kitchens are habitable spaces and depths should not be more than 8 metres from a glass line.
- e. Two fire stairs are proposed for this scale of development, however these exits would typically need to be situated 9m apart. Adequate separation between stairs should be provided.
- f. The Panel recommends planning for the accommodation of building services (including air-conditioning condenser units) and indicating their location on the drawings.
- g. Almost every balcony extends into the typical ADG setback, compromising amenity for neighbours and future residents. This is apparent on both the north where each balcony is too close to the neighbouring property, and on the west, (Apartments 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39). Balconies are defined as habitable rooms in the ADG.
- h. A single lift serving 42 apartments over 10 floors falls short of the relevant ADG target.



- i. The carpark appears to be inefficiently laid out, with few cars accommodated at each level, and no structural set out for the levels above. The driveway entry should be consolidated within the building footprint to ensure a more compact site plan.

Conclusion:

1. Recognising its independent, expert and advisory role, the Panel does not support the proposal in its current form. The proposal seeks to accommodate too much development on the site, resulting in inadequate amenity within the site, and unreasonably impairing the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal needs to be comprehensively redesigned with reduced impacts - likely achieved only by reducing the scale, form and density of the proposal.
2. Given the number of detailed matters requiring further refinement and resolution, particularly in relation to the site planning strategies, built form, overall architectural and landscape design expression and character, the Panel requests that further developed design material be submitted for the Panel's review as part of the development assessment stage.