

Appendix AA – Assessment Against Architectural Excellence and Design Review Panel Comments

The following table includes an assessment against Council's Architectural Excellence and Design Review Panel (AEDRP) comments provided as part of their review of the Site-Specific Development Control Plan (SSDCP) on 7 June 2022. It also includes a response as to how the proposal submitted for consent under the Concept Proposal and Detailed (Stage 1) Development Application (DA) addresses each matter raised. For further background regarding this, refer to **Sections 2.1** and **2.2** of the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE).

AEDRP Comment	Commentary/Response
<p><i>As part of the NSW ADG review, the Panel is not convinced about a number of issues, including but not limited to –</i></p> <p><i>a. setting and testing of primary controls (floor space ratio, height and setbacks),</i> <i>b. building configuration due to the proposed 'H' form plan of the main building , and</i> <i>c. excessive building envelope depths (24-29m in some instances).</i></p> <p><i>The Panel considers resultant residential amenity achieved within the Draft DCP envelopes will not be optimum and there will be spatial planning, outlook, overlooking and acoustic privacy issues particularly at the re-entrant corners of the floor plan.</i></p>	<p>The proposal has been refined to maximise occupant amenity and achieve compliance with the Apartment Design Guide (ADG).</p> <p>This includes the appropriate setting back of building forms and elements, in addition to the reorientation of the southern portions of Buildings A and B to maximise views and amenity.</p> <p>Further, the proposal complies with the height and floor space ratio (FSR) development standards prescribed for the Site under the <i>Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022</i> (IWLEP 2022), resultant from the endorsement of the Planning Proposal (PP).</p> <p>Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B, Design Verification Statement at Appendix C and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>The Panel also notes that there will likely be tension between the maximum floor space ratio and maximum building height controls formalised through the planning proposal. The mismatch between the FSR and height will create significant pressure on yield versus residential amenity. The Panel is not sure whether the building envelopes provide the recommended 25-30% allowance for balconies, lifts, stairs and building/architectural articulation, as expected in Part 2B of the NSW ADG.</i></p>	<p>The development appropriately manages the perceived difference between the maximum building height and FSR development standards prescribed for the Site under the IWLEP 2022. This is achieved through appropriate location of building mass within the central portions of the Site, which is suitably setback from the Site's boundaries. Further, all buildings satisfactorily adhered to the requirements of the ADG and are suitably articulated.</p> <p>Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B, Design Verification Statement at Appendix C and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>The Panel is aware that a site-specific DCP does not need to include residential layouts and verification for compliance with the NSW ADG. However, the Panel has been asked specifically to review the proposal for its ability to meet ADG requirements. It is noted that the proposed building envelopes included within the DCP are informed by the proponent's typical floor diagrams, however as a SEPP 65 Design Review Panel, it is suggested that the proponent needs to establish compliance with the primary ADG criteria for solar access, natural cross ventilation, maximum south facing apartments (without solar access), building depths, deep soil areas, communal open areas, as well as demonstrating acceptable inter-unit visual and aural privacy.</i></p>	<p>The development either meets or exceeds the relevant ADG criteria, including with respect to key considerations such as solar access, cross ventilation, maximum south facing apartments, building depths, communal open space (COS) and layout/design of apartments.</p> <p>Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B, Design Verification Statement at Appendix C and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>

<p><i>It is the Panel's view that consistency with the NSW ADG primary controls is not yet evident within proponent's urban design report and the appendices. For example – The Panel reviewed the typical residential level 'diagrams' included in the proponent's urban design study, and it appears that in its current configuration compliance with the minimum requirements of primary ADG controls is problematic in key areas.</i></p>	<p>Typical floor plans are provided within the Detailed Architectural Plans (Appendix B), which demonstrate a high level of amenity and design for all apartments that generally satisfies the relevant ADG considerations. Refer to Design Verification Statement at Appendix C and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>The Panel was advised that based on the LEP provision, a minimum FSR 0.88:1 is to be allocated to employment use. However following the Panel's review of the proponents diagrams in the urban design study, it was evident that the required quantum of employment use may not be achievable since substantial allowances need to be provided for ground floor lobby access, fire exit corridors, vertical movement shafts, residential service shafts, industrial use ventilation and exhaust requirements, vehicular and service access and loading requirements. Excessive depth of the employment footprint and the resultant amenity for occupants is also a concern for the Panel</i></p>	<p>The development sets aside the required amount of future employment floor space, which includes a total of 6,000m² (1,200m² to be used for creative purposes), and complies with Clause 6.25 of the IWLEP 2022. This DA is supported by a Building Code Capability Statement at Appendix W and Fire Engineering Letter at Appendix X, which demonstrate the relevant building and fire engineering design requirements are capable of being satisfied by the proposed design.</p>
<p><i>The Panel does not support a shortfall to NSW ADG criteria in deep soil zone requirements since the increased density on the subject site should be supported by environmental benefits from deep soil zones. The Panel recommends that the DCP framework should ensure consistency with the minimum ADG criteria, which is 15% of the site reserved for genuine deep soil for sites greater than 1,500m², with a minimum 6m dimension.</i></p>	<p>The proposed variation to the deep soil requirement under the ADG is considered acceptable and satisfies its relevant objective as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to provide for a basement to service the parking and servicing requirements of the development has restricted the ability to include additional areas of deep soil; and • The development provides for extensive on structure planting including green walls and roofs, to offset the deep soil variation. Refer to the Landscape Plan at Appendix E. <p>Refer to Design Verification Statement at Appendix C and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>All plans within the DCP should include a north-point. The DCP should include at least 2 schematic cross-sections across the site. All 3D views and cross sections should accurately depict fall of land.</i></p>	<p>The plans submitted as part of this DA, including the Concept Plans, address this matter. Refer to the Concept Plans at Appendix A and Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
<p><i>While the Panel understands a minimum 2.7m floor-to-ceiling height is required by the NSW ADG, floor-to-floor heights need to be reviewed to ensure compliance with the new NCC and building performance requirements. The Panel suggested a minimum 3.2m floor-to-floor height would allow compliance with the NCC and additionally allow for provision of ceiling fans for low energy alternative and for environmental benefits.</i></p>	<p>The floor to ceiling heights provided comply with the ADG and National Construction Code (NCC) requirements. Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B and the Building Code Capability Statement at Appendix W.</p>
<p><i>The Panel notes that in order to improve acoustic amenity the DCP allows for a 400mm thick structural slab above the ground floor, however, this will not resolve structural-borne sound and vibration that could travel through building fabric into the residential buildings.</i></p>	<p>The proposal has been revised to provide a 600mm slab between employment and residential floors where appropriate. Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B and the Noise Impact Assessment Appendix I.</p>
<p><i>The Panel discussed that while good street activation and passive street surveillance are necessary, the DCP framework should facilitate a balance in terms of glazing and masonry elements for all ground level facades, to establish greater consistency of architectural expression with an appropriate inner-city fine grain residential and industrial character.</i></p>	<p>The development strikes an appropriate balance between glazed and masonry elements, to ensure suitable levels of activation, whilst reinforcing the industrial and urban character of the Site and its context.</p> <p>Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>

<p><i>The Panel discussed that co-location of residential and light industrial uses create potential acoustic and other amenity issues for the residents and industrial occupants, nevertheless, natural ventilation and daylight should be maximised to all habitable areas. Appropriate guidance and controls for noise mitigation are available within Parts 4B and 4J of the NSW ADG.</i></p>	<p>The proposal has been revised to provide a 600mm slab between employment and residential floors where appropriate. Furthermore, as per the light industrial definition within the IWLEP 2022, light industrial uses by their nature do not interfere the amenity of their contexts, including by way of noise, as their operations are typically less machinery focused or intensive. As such, these types of uses are suitable to be located near and adjacent to residential uses. All apartments have been designed to maximise natural ventilation and solar access in accordance with the ADG.</p> <p>Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B, the Urban Design Report at Appendix D and the Noise Impact Assessment at Appendix I.</p>
<p><i>The Panel discussed alternative site planning strategies, and if the proponent had considered residential and light industrial in separate buildings rather than in the proposed configuration. The panel considered that the DCP should allow alternate envelopes to be proposed if better residential amenity and light industrial viability and operability can be achieved.</i></p>	<p>Refer to the comment above.</p>
<p><i>The proposed residential envelopes are a pragmatic response to external factors, principally being the need to minimise impacts on existing low density residential to the southwest through southeast of the subject site. Whilst this is an important consideration, the resultant residential envelopes described by the DCP are not optimised for a high quality contemporary residential amenity outcome.</i></p>	<p>The refined envelopes submitted as part of this proposal successfully manage building height and bulk transitions to surrounding residential development, whilst achieving high levels of amenity for future occupants. Refer to the Concept Architectural Plans at Appendix A, Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>Viable continuation of light industrial uses on the ground floor must be co-ordinated with adequate provision for a range of spatial requirements arising from its co-location with the residential development above, and the need for active frontages to streets and the proposed new public square is not sufficiently embedded into the DCP. The panel is concerned that the viability of the light industrial uses may be compromised by the requirements of the residential component.</i></p>	<p>The light industrial tenancies have been designed to maximise flexibility and amenity, which will ensure their viability. They will provide high levels of activation and connection to the street, through their orientations and expanses of glazing that service their edges. A central and generously sized public square is provided as a key attractor to the development, which will also support the viability of the tenancies. Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>The ground floor plan is too deep for provision of good natural light and ventilation to the parts of the internalised industrial and creative spaces. It is likely that large penetrations for lighting and ventilation would be required through the first floor slab into the residential level, thereby creating a range of probable compliance and amenity tensions between the two uses.</i></p>	<p>Suitable levels of natural light and ventilation are provided through provision of a large, central atrium that services the employment uses within Buildings A and B. The remaining employment uses are serviced by other sources of light and ventilation, via windows or by mechanical means in accordance with the NCC. Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B, the Urban Design Report at Appendix D and the Building Code Capability Statement at Appendix W</p>
<p><i>As a consequence of these issues, the Panel is concerned that the allowable maximum FSR allocated to the site will be difficult to achieve successfully within the proposed envelope controls, and particularly the proposed maximum height. Additional height should be investigated in parts of this large site where there are acceptable impacts on existing residential neighbourhoods, For instance within the north-western portion the site (opposite the park), where the scale of the urban setting could accommodate this (excluding retained heritage buildings).</i></p>	<p>The massing of the proposal has been refined to adopt a considered and balanced approach including providing suitable transitions within the Site and to nearby residential development, whilst protecting and enhancing the amenity of surrounding and future occupiers. The development complies with the building height and FSR development standards under the IWLEP 2022.</p> <p>Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B and the Urban Design Report at Appendix D</p>
<p><i>The Panel acknowledges that site specific DCPs generally do not include a requirement for detailed internal floor plans. In this specific case however, the Panel found that the lack of</i></p>	<p>Detailed internal floor plans have been provided by the proposal. Refer to the Detailed Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>

<p><i>information in relation to planning constraints arising from intended uses within the nonresidential ground floor plan results in a significant lack of certainty as to how the residential development above would integrate successfully with the intended light industrial uses in the ground floor below.</i></p>	
---	--