



CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN ADVICE LETTER

Pre- DA 20-2024 - 171 Weston St & 2-6 Hinemoa St, Panania

DRP session 1: 11 July 2024

CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

DESIGN ADVICE LETTER

Proposal: 171 Weston Street & 2-6 Hinemoa Street, Panania	
Pre-DA 20-2024	
DRP session	11 July 2024 - First review
Panel members	Gabrielle Pelletier (Chairperson) Paul Walter
Council resources	Bruno Pelucca (DRP Project Manager) Giuseppina Rossi (Panel Secretariat) Daniel Bushby (Team Leader Planning West) Rui Liu (Senior Landscape Architect)
Observers	-
Declarations of Interest	Gabrielle Pelletier declared that NSW Land & Housing Corporation (LAHC) , owner of the sites, are past clients of the practice where she is employed - Sam Crawford Architects. The practice has one current project with LAHC which has been submitted for DA. She is not working on any LAHC projects at present.
Site visit	Site inspections were undertaken by the Panel members and Council resources prior to the session
Applicant or their representatives that addressed Panel	<p>In person:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Morson, Director and Architect, Morson Group • Carolyn Howell, A/Director, Portfolio Services, Homes NSW • Karl Harb, Senior Planner, Homes NSW • Van Huynh, Senior Development Manager, Homes NSW • Yudhi Setiawan, Project Design Manager, Homes NSW • Frances Beasley, Senior Planner, Homes NSW (observer) <p>Via Teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lara Huckstepp, A/Manager, Homes NSW • Sonny Naamo, Senior Development Manager, Homes NSW • Paul Scrivener, Landscape Architect, Morson Group • Joshua West, Graduate of Architecture, Morson Group
Design Advice Letter issue	23 July 2024

To Applicant

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above project at this pre-Development Approval Stage. Below is a summary of advice and recommendations arising from the Design Review Panel session held on 11 July 2024.

PANEL REVIEW

The Panel understands that the applicant has undertaken a pre-development application process prior to submitting to DRP for review, that has resulted in amendments to planning, landscape and architectural expression. The proposal is compliant under the Canterbury Bankstown LEP 2023 with the adopted special provisions for height and FSR under the Housing SEPP 2021.

In assessing this proposal under the CBLEP Design Excellence clause 6.15, the Panel commends the applicant team for achieving a positive and contextually appropriate solution to increase the availability of quality social housing in Panania. Through the break down in massing, approach to the corner site, articulation of façade elements, and provision of communal open space, this project will provide a good precedent for future development within the Panania area.

The Panel does however have some relatively minor recommendations for improvement to adjust the proposal prior to submitting the Development Application. These recommendations have been broken down in response to the CBLEP Design Excellence clause 6.15 subclauses below.

1. Form and external appearance in context and Impacts to public domain

Subclause 4(b): Whether the form and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain.

Subclause 4(d)(viii): How the development addresses the impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain.

Subclause 4(c): Whether the development detrimentally impacts on view corridors.

- 1.1 Generally, the Panel believes the form and external appearance of the proposal is contextually appropriate and sensitive to the surrounding single dwellings. In particular, the larger 5-storey development addressing the corner, and primarily facing the rail corridor before stepping down to 4-storeys, demonstrates a positive transition in scale from the busier Weston Street to Hinemoa St, and from multi to single residential dwellings. The Panel has included some further recommendations on massing and materiality under items 3 and 5.

In terms of landscaping and site infrastructure, the Panel also commends the proposal on providing a landscaped edge to the public domain, and minimising the impacts of site infrastructure through the set back of substation and bin store. In the event of future design development, the Panel recommends maintaining these principles.

2. Designing with Country and Heritage

Subclause 4(d)(i): How the development addresses heritage issues.

- 2.1 The Panel understands that the GANSW Connecting with Country framework is new and that practical approaches are emerging that are appropriately scaled to the architectural project. Homes NSW is well-placed to show practical and effective leadership for other affordable and social housing providers, through the formulation of briefs for its design teams. The design process should allow the architects, and landscape architects to create a scheme, through its spatial configuration, street presentation, materials, planting and function, that responds to and enriches the spirit of the place.

- 2.2 For a relatively simple infill housing project such as 171 Weston Street & 2-6 Hinemoa Street, Panania, Connecting with Country should not add extra consultants and time-consuming compliance requirements to an already procedurally complex design process. Rather, the design brief should be enriched through careful listening and analysis of the landscape, ecology, built environment, drainage, geology, and plant communities. The design presented is on track to be such a scheme.

3. Bulk, massing and modulation

Subclause 4(d)(iii): How the development addresses bulk, massing, and modulation of buildings.

Subclause 4(d)(iv): How the development addresses street frontage heights.

- 3.1 As mentioned above, the stepping down of the building bulk from corner to side boundaries is a positive contextual response. As are the extrusions of slab edges to create variation across the facade, whilst providing weather protection to openings. Whilst the Panel supports the current approach to utilising the stairwell to separate massing, they recommend testing whether opening the stair to the east and removing the curtain wall, would further improve this dynamic. Further improvements to massing and perceived bulk are covered under item 5.

4. Relationship with neighbouring sites

Subclause 4(d)(ii): How the development addresses the relationship of the development with other existing or proposed development on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form.

The Panel supports the current site layout and landscaping with respect to the minimisation of likely impacts to neighbouring properties. Positioning the driveway to the south to increase setbacks and further reduce overshadowing to 8 Hinemoa St is particularly supported, as is locating the communal open space near the rear of the property to align with the private open spaces of neighbouring blocks. The Panel recommends the below relating to privacy between apartments and neighbours:

- 4.1 The Panel is concerned with the current balustrade design to balconies generally. Although open balusters are a positive solution for solar access and day light, they do pose an issue of privacy from the public domain, neighbouring properties, and the communal open space. The Panel therefore recommends considering an alternative solution such as denser balusters or angled flats that promote some solar entry, but restrict views from key directions of concern.
- 4.2 The Panel understands that the proposal has since developed to include screens to west facing windows for privacy and solar shading. Vertical bars or angled louvres hard up to windows can have a negative perception, and as such the Panel recommends exploring ways to angle screens away from the façade to improve outlook and amenity.
- 4.3 It has been assumed that whilst designing for privacy, the Applicant has excluded west and south-facing windows in a number of units where the Panel feels they could feasibly be included whilst still protecting privacy. These units include 06, 10, 17, 37, 39, and 42.

5. Architectural design and materiality

Subclause 4(a): Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved.

- 5.1 The approach to materiality within this proposal is contextually appropriate and of a good level of quality. However, at this scale, a single brick type across the entire building may have the effect of over-emphasising mass. It is recommended that the applicant test applying the darker brick to the ground floor entirely, to assist in breaking down the building's mass. Alternatively, or in addition to this, it is also recommended to consider using a slightly different brick tone in the southern building, which will settle the building further into its single dwelling context.

6. Site layout and circulation

Subclause 4(d)(vi): How the development addresses pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements.

- 6.1 The Panel note that both stairwells are inaccessible from inside the building at ground level, which will have the effect of disincentivising use by residents. The Panel recommends exploring ways to provide internal access to promote stair use and decongest lift use.
- 6.2 Further to the recommendation to open the southern stairwell to the east, the Panel recommends considering opening the east-west corridor to the south. Should this free up additional GFA, the Panel would recommend maintaining at a minimum, the 4-storey building to the south, and focus any 5th-storey extension to Weston Street.
- 6.3 The Panel recommends reviewing the basement storage design areas to facilitate safe egress by removing dead ends. Where possible, passive surveillance through open mesh is also supported.

7. Site infrastructure

Subclause 4(d)(ix): How the development addresses the integration of utilities, building services and waste management infrastructure in the site layout and building design.

The Panel support the current integration of utilities and waste management infrastructure noting that whilst it is not ideal, future accessible occupants of adaptable apartment 08 will need to travel via lift across half a floor to access this bin store.

8. Sustainability

Subclause 4(d)(v): How the development addresses the environmental impacts, including sustainable design, overshadowing, wind, and reflectivity

Subclause 4(d)(vi): How the development addresses the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

- 8.1 The Panel acknowledges that steps have been taken to reduce impacts of overshadowing, wind and reflectivity, as well as the integration of native species into the landscape. The Panel recommends the following items for consideration for further design development:
- Reducing the heat island impact by greening roof tops

- Exploring opportunities for solar PV arrays to assist residents with cost of electricity
- Future install of EV charges to basement parking
- Cumberland Plain ecological context, and plant community for bird and pollinator-attracting plants

9. Landscape design

Subclause 4(e): Whether the development integrates high-quality landscape design in the site layout and building design

9.1 The Panel understands that the landscape design is still undergoing design development. Some important considerations for consideration during this process include:

- Greening of the street frontages.
- Green screening between the project and the mid-block i.e. substantial tree(s) in the southwest corner.
- Green screening between the proposal and neighbours.
- Reviewing the need to relocate the Cabbage Palm.
- Ensuring soft planting abuts ground floor private open space, as opposed to communal open space hard paved areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In assessing this proposal under the CBLEP Design Excellence clause 6.15, the Panel commends the applicant team for achieving a positive and contextually appropriate solution to increase the availability of quality social housing in Panania. In light of this, the Panel have relatively minor items for consideration to further improve the design excellence of the proposal. The key recommendations to focus on are improvements for bulk and massing, privacy and access to private open spaces, and improved access to natural light within apartments. Once implemented, the Panel does not feel that this application needs be brought before the DRP again.

Sincerely,



Gabrielle Pelletier
Chairperson - Canterbury Bankstown Design Review Panel



Paul Walter
Panellist - Canterbury Bankstown Design Review Panel

Distribution: Canterbury Bankstown Design Review Panel Members - Gabrielle Pelletier, Paul Walter; Canterbury Bankstown Council.

DESIGN REVIEW REPORT

As part of the submission for any subsequent DRP sessions and/or the formal lodgment of the Development Application, the Applicant is required to submit a Design Review Report (DRR).

The Design Review Report should summarise the design development process undertaken in response to the recommendations outlined in the Design Advice Letter to streamline the assessment process.

Purpose of the DRR

- To ensure that the proposed developments align with the design excellence principles and address the recommendations of the Design Review Panel, ultimately contributing to better urban design outcomes.
- To provide a summary of the design development process undertaken by the Applicant team to incorporate the DRP feedback and recommendations.
- To explain any deviations from the panel's advice and provide justifications on why these changes are beneficial and still achieve the design excellence principles.
- To serve as evidence of compliance with the panel recommendations and strengthen the application for Council approval.
- Conversely, the DRR also justifies the refusal of a development application if the Applicant fails to incorporate the Design Review Panel's advice adequately.

Content of the DRR

The DRR should clearly outline how the panel's advice has been integrated into the proposed development and effectively communicate the responses to the Design Advice Letter recommendations.

It may include the following:

- Diagrams and illustrations to aid in the explanation of design decisions.
- Highlight areas where the design remains consistent with the panel's recommendations.
- In cases where the design deviates from the panel's advice, provide a detailed rationale for these departures, and demonstrate how the alternative solutions are superior and still meet the design excellence standards.

Please note that the Applicant has the flexibility to customize the design review report to align with their specific proposal, provided that the report effectively communicates the responses to the Design Advice Letter recommendations.

For additional information about the Design Review Panel, please visit the [DRP web page](#). If you have any further questions about the Design Review Report, please email DesignReviewPanel@cbc.city.nsw.gov.au

DESIGN REVIEW REPORT

The Design Review Report must be submitted by the Applicant as part of the submission for any subsequent DRP sessions and/or the formal lodgment of the Development Application. It should summarise the design development process undertaken in response to the recommendations outlined in the Design Advice Letter to streamline the assessment process.

Summary table

Proposal: 171 Weston Street & 2-6 Hinemoa Street, Panania		
Pre-DA20-2024		
Design Review Panel session 1	11 July 2024	Gabrielle Pelletier (Chairperson) Paul Walter
Design Review Panel session 2	date	Panel members

Design Review Panel session 1

Advice No.	Design Review Panel Advice	Design Response
1.1	Copy the exact advice from the Design Advice Letter here.	The design response should aim to be as brief as possible. Refer to diagrams and drawings wherever possible.
1.2		
1.3		

Design Review Panel session 2 (as required)

Advice No.	Design Review Panel Advice	Design Response
2.1	It is recommended that the session number is used as the first digit in the numbering to make sure each piece of advice is identifiable.	
2.2		
2.3		