CUMBERLAND CITY COUNCIL
DESIGN REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE

1A, 1 & 3 MARSDEN STREET AND 2 MARK STREET, LIDCOMBE.

SEPTEMBER 2022

URBAN LINK
ARCHITECTS

1. State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 - Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development and the Apartment Design Guide (ADG):

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. SEPP 65 ADG design criteria 4B-3 - Natural Ventilation - The application indicates that the development achieves 67% natural ventilation. However, only 48% of apartments have been assessed as achieving natural ventilation as the diagrams submitted with the application show ventilation paths through walls and turning corners which is not acceptable for natural ventilation. *The application is to be amended to ensure that a minimum of 60% of apartments achieve natural ventilation. Whilst 60% is the minimum target under the ADG, you are encouraged to provide a greater level of natural ventilation to promote design excellence for the development.*	4B-3 Natural Ventilation: Please refer to DA-1418 Rev: B. The proposed scheme provides 32 cross-ventilated units from levels 4 - 8 and has a percentage rate of 64%, 4% above the ADG requirements. All ventilated paths of travel are taken through doors and turn corners as per Figure 4B.8 in the ADG under section 4B - Natural Ventilation.
b. SEPP 65 ADG design criteria 4D-2 - Open Plan Depths - Unit 8 on levels 5 to 13 is 8.1 metres in depth. Whilst this is a marginal 100mm non-compliance with the 8 metre maximum, this can be considered if suitable justification is provided as part of your application.	4D-2 Open Plan Depths: As per section 4D - Apartment Size and Layout of the ADG, Figure 4D.3 indicates that the floor depth of an apartment is to be no more than 3X with X been the ceiling height. The proposed ceiling height of the scheme is 2.7m, as per section 4C-1 of the ADG and therefore 3 x 2.7m = 8.1m room depth
c. SEPP 65 ADG design criteria 4N-3 - Roof Design - The roof of the development is not shown to incorporate any sustainability features and demonstrate that the development achieves design excellence. There is ample opportunity to provide solar panels for example to improve sustainability of the development and reduce reliance on fossil fuels. The application is to be amended to incorporate sustainability features, particularly on the roof.	4N-3 Roof Design: Please refer to DA-110 Rev: B. The proposed scheme now accommodates a number of solar panels on the roof of each building. Details of how this solar power is distributed will be provided at the CC stage of the design. The client will confirm if this power is provided to accommodate the common areas only or if each unit gets a separately metered solar system or if the solar power can do both.

2. State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021:

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. Section 69(1)(d) - The application indicates that appropriate workspace is provided for the manager within the manager's room for the co-living housing component. However, the manager's room shows no appropriate space and is not of sufficient size to accommodate a workspace. *The application is to be amended to provide an appropriate workspace for the manager. The workspace is to be separate from the living spaces and sleeping area and not within any walkways/hallways of the manager's residence.*	69(1)(d): Please refer to DA-105 Rev: B. A dedicated workspace has been added to the managers room next to the kitchen area.
b. Section 69(1)(h) - The development proposes insufficient motorbike parking spaces for the coliving housing component with 16.8 (17) motorbike parking spaces required under Section 69(2)(e) and the plans only showing 16 spaces. *The application is to be amended to provide a minimum of 17 motorbike parking spaces for the co-living housing component.*	There is no section 69(1)(h), however, please refer to DA-101 - DA 103 Rev: B. The proposed parking layouts accommodate 17 motorbike parking spaces for the co-living housing component.
c. Section 69(2)(c) - The application indicates that at least 3 hours of direct solar access will be achieved between 1pm and 3pm at mid-winter to the communal living area for the co-living housing component. However, the views from the sun diagrams do not indicate compliance is achieved for 3 hours. *Further information is to be provided to clearly demonstrate that the above is achieved. Where this cannot be demonstrated, the application is to be amended to achieve a clear minimum of 3 hours of direct solar access between 1pm and 3pm at mid-winter to the communal living area for the co-living housing component.*	69(2)(C): 4N-3 Roof Design: Please refer to DA-1413 Rev: B. The external wall along the western facade has been moved out towards the boundary to prevent overshadowing from the white frame and to allow more sunlight into the communal living area.
d. Section 69(2)(e) - The co-living housing component requires 17 motorbike parking spaces. The plans only show 16 spaces being provided. *The application is to be amended to provide a minimum of 17 motorbike parking spaces for the co-living housing component.*	69(2)(e): Please refer to DA-101 - DA 103 Rev: B. The proposed parking layouts accommodate 17 motorbike parking spaces for the co-living housing component.

3. Cumberland Local Environmental Plan 2021:

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. The gross floor area (GFA) and floor space ratio (FSR) plans are inconsistent with the floor plans. Amended GFA calculation plans are required to accurately calculate the GFA/FSR of the development.	The site has an FSR of 5:1 and is 2,441m^2 in size. Therefore the allowable GFA for the site is 12,205m^2 plus an additional 10% uplift for the co-living component of the design which is 2946m^2. This give a total allowable GFA of 12,499m^2. The total GFA for the design is 12,452m^2. Please refer to DA-1401 Rev:B.

4. Cumberland Development Control Plan 2021:

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. The property adjoining the site to the east at 5 Marsden Street is identified as an isolated site given the narrow width and existing/approved developments that adjoin that property. It is acknowledged that the isolation of this property was addressed in the previous development application for 10-12 Railway Street with appropriate building concepts presented for that development. *However given that this is a separate DA for unrelated properties, you are required to address the site isolation for 5 Marsden Street within this DA. Additional information is to be provided for this DA demonstrating how the development satisfies the redevelopment/site isolation planning principle established by the NSW Land and Environment Court in Karavellas v Sutherland Shire Council [2004] NSWLEC 251.*	Please refer to DA-1426 Rev: A - 5 Marsden Street Site Study.

5. General:

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. There appear to be inconsistencies between some of the plans. When submitting amended plans or additional information, please ensure plans are cross-checked for consistency between the relevant consultants.	All plans have been reviewed and updated where required.
b. A dedicated vehicle wash bay with appropriate facilities such as bunding, running water and drainage is required to be provided within the basement level. Given the scale and the mixed use nature of the development, you are encouraged to consider providing a separate vehicle wash bay within each basement level.	Please refer to DA-101 Rev: B, where a car-wash bay has now been added.
c. Commercial tenancies are not provided with any sanitary facilities. Whilst it is understood that this will generally form part of a future fitout of each tenancy, consideration should be given to providing at least 1 unisex accessible sanitary facility for each tenancy, or a bank of shared facilities in the back of house ground floor level to facilitate future uses within the commercial tenancies.	Please refer to DA-104 Rev: B. An indicative location for a disabled unisex sanitary facility is add to each of the commercial tenancy. The size and location of each will be confirmed during the fit-out stage of these units.
d. Sanitary facilities should be provided within the communal open spaces for users, particularly given the location and separation from upper levels. This includes the separate indoor and outdoor communal open spaces.	Please refer to DA-104 Rev:B and DA-108 Rev:B. A disabled unisex toilet and WHB has been added next to the COS.
e. It is unclear how commercial tenants will access the basement levels whilst secure residential access is maintained. The lifts are labelled "Residential" or "Co-Living" on the plans. It appears that commercial tenants would need to enter the residential or co-living lobbies to access the lifts for basement access.	Both sets of residential lifts will provide access to the commercial units. The lifts will be controlled via a swipe card controlled access system, which will limit access to the upper levels for the commercial tenants.
f. The Statement of Environmental Effects is to be amended to correct the description of the development (including any amendments made resulting from the changes being requested), correctly describe the site and context (e.g.: figure 1 shows incorrect site) and provide more comprehensive and constructive compliance tables for the various environmental planning instruments and development control plan that apply to the development.	Please refer to the planners response.

6.1 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Massing & Facade.

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. The proposed grid design approach is generally successful for the west façade and coliving podium expression, providing building identity and opportunities for solar control.	Point a. - Noted.
b. Corner balconies on west expressed as part of grid are similarly successful.	Point b. - Noted.
c. Reconsider the 14-storey presentation of the building's western façade to the street, with the façade setback at level 4 to articulate and visually separate the tower, consistent with the other elevations. *d. Breaking up the potential maximum building envelope into two separate towers is generally supported for providing a better urban outcome for the street and neighbours to the south.*	Points c. & d. - Please refer to DA-1427 Rev: A. We explored the option of setting back level 4 on the western facade and from this exercise we discovered a number of issues with this approach: • A setback on level 4 on the western facade is inconsistent with the language on northern and southern facades. • Any setback on level 4 will impact the proposed layouts of the 2bed and 3 bed units facing Mark Street resulting in inferior unit layouts. • Some of the white vertical elements, especially the corner ones, are identified as been structural elements and removing them will cause potential issues to the structural strategy for the design. • We feel that a setback on level 4 along the western facade weakens the identity of the building and it's connection to the podium element, which has the same language. • Any setback on the western facade weakens the grounding of the two volumes and their connection to the surrounding streets.
e. Use of brickwork at low level is supported as a robust, low maintenance finish.	Point e. - Noted
f. Painted Hebel at upper levels is not supported from a long-term maintenance point of view - paint will fade and look shabby quickly, a higher quality and more articulated cladding should be explored.	Point f. - Painted hebel will be replaced with a Rockcote coloured rendered finish or similar.
g. Reconsider blank facades at courtyard between towers from Level 4 up – facades here should have more openings and be defensively designed to articulate the façade and improve natural ventilation. Considered openings on this façade will provide the opportunity to replan the apartments to provide better cross ventilation and light, noting cross-viewing and privacy should also be managed. Openings should be appropriately sized to work with prevailing summer breezes.	Point g. - Please refer to DA-302 Rev:B. Vertical openings are added to wet areas and both facades are articulated to break the overall massing down.
h. Consider an eastern boundary setback to achieve a similar outcome on the east tower façade with opportunities for outlook to the neighbouring park. The current proposed blank façade is detrimental to the site to the east with little expression and a domineering scale. Setbacks and openings will provide better amenity to the apartment occupants and will offer a better and more appropriate urban outcome.	Point h. - Any openings or opportunities for an outlook to the park along the eastern facade is not possible, due to any potential/future development on 5 Marsden Street. Please refer to DA-1426 Rev: A for the potential future development of 5 Marsden Street.
i. Street tree planting around the site is strongly supported to provide shade and reduce the heat island effect. The proponent should demonstrate that adequately sized street trees are able to be accommodated by the proposal, particularly adjacent to basement construction..	Point i. - Please refer to the landscape architects design. 4 x Angophora Costata type trees are proposed along Marsden Street, which can grow to 20m in height and have 10m wide crowns, and 3 x Angophara Floribunda type trees are proposed along Mark Street, which can also grow to 20m in height and have 10m wide crowns.

6.2 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Communal Open Space.

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. Landscape design was not presented at the meeting – Landscape design input should be co-ordinated with the architectural design to ensure the landscape proposed is viable.	Point a. - Please refer to the landscape architects package of information.
b. The design intent for communal space, particularly to level 1 and 2 of the building, should be developed further to achieve high quality communal spaces that will be comfortable, attractive and useable for residents. Opportunities for common vertical circulation within these areas to provide shorter travel distances should be explored.	Point b. - Please refer to DA-105, 106 & 107 Rev. B. Vertical circulation has been added to both of the new double height external communal areas and proposed layouts as to how each of the internal and external communal areas could be used.
c. Further information to confirm compliant solar access to communal open space is required.	Point c. - Please refer to DA-1413, which indicates the extend of sunlight to the main outdoor communal area. As per Part 3 - Co-Living Housing - of the State Environmental Planning Policy 2021, there is no timeframe or requirement on the amount of sunlight to the outdoor communal area, therefore the proposed layout and communal open space location is compliant.
d. Ground floor communal open space would be better served by a community facility, instead of two office space/ apartments currently shown. This community space could be useable by the co-living population and accessed from their lobby too – to overcome social segregation issues. Office/ commercial or retail space in this location will be difficult to lease. Apartments here will have poor amenity and are inappropriate.	Point d. - It is the client's preferred direction to locate commercial spaces on the ground floor. No residential units will be provided to the ground floor level.
e. An activation strategy/shared zone access for David Place should be incorporated, with the relationship between the laneway and communal open space to east, and commercial tenancy to west developed.	Point e. - Additional glazing has been added to the side of the commercial unit G.01 to add a form of activation to Marsden Lane. However the main use of Marsden Lane is to accommodate vehicle movement and not attract pedestrians down to a dead-end, which could be a potential safety issue, especially at night time.
f. Windows overlooking David Place from the western commercial tenancy should be included to maintain passive surveillance whilst taking into account quality of outlook.	Point f. - Windows have been added to the side of the commercial unit G.01. Please refer to DA-104 Rev:B.
g. Achievement of the ADG deep soil provision is commended.	Point g. - Noted.

6.3 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Co-Living Space.

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. Consider social aspects and CPTED issues with respect to the proposed co-living component – consider dividing large floorplate into two neighbourhoods separated by multilevel open void space. This needs consideration as it will be the first approved coliving development in this Council jurisdiction. Options should be presented that demonstrate pros and cons of different approaches (segregation vs integration and options in between).	Point a. - Dividing the floorplates into two "neighbourhoods" would prove to be unconventional. If this approach was adopted, it would mean we would have to provide two separate entries, two sets of lifts, two indoor communal areas - which would be directly separated - and two outdoor communal areas - which would also be directly separated. However, the floorplates are divided into various sections with large double-height voids, which connect the floors above and below with vertical circulation. Also, by doing the latter, it provides the opportunity to integrate the entire co-living community yet separate sections of the floor plates with a singular entry point and singular vertical circulation.
b. The Housing SEPP requires 30m2 communal living area + 2m2 per room (more than 6 rooms). To achieve design excellence this living space (or spaces) should provide genuine flexibility with opportunities for gathering in different sized groups, with facilities to cater for a range of living needs. Connectivity between internal living space and communal open space is supported. The panel questions whether a single large internal communal living space which is remote from many of the rooms is the best solution – further details of how this space would operate including precedents should be developed. Consider communal shared internal space for each neighbourhood instead of just one large shared space.	Point b. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev: B & DA-106 Rev: B. These drawings indicate various outdoor communal areas and a singular indoor communal area, which can be sub-divided into various sizes and provide various uses. However, it is also extremely flexible in the variety of sizes it can provide - ranging from a series of smaller spaces to one large single space.
c. The scale of communal spaces should be broken up even if they remain in a cluster. Spaces should be designed to allow smaller groups to gather with the possibility of coming together if desired. Care should be taken to avoid a dominant group from taking ownership over the communal spaces.	Point c. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev: B & DA-106 Rev: B. These drawings indicate various outdoor communal areas and a singular indoor communal area, which can be sub-divided into various sizes and provide various uses. However, it is also extremely flexible in the variety of sizes it can provide - ranging from a series of smaller spaces to one large single space.
d. Confirmation that (at least 1) Communal Living area will receive 3 hours winter sun between 9am and 3pm is required.	Point d. - Please refer to DA-1413 Rev: B., which indicates the extend of sunlight to the indoor communal area. The proposed indoor communal area receives min 3 hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm.
e. Co-living communal open space should remain greater than 20% of the site area.	Point e. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev: B & DA-106 Rev: B. These drawings indicate various outdoor communal areas which give a total area of 489m^2. The site area is 2,441m^2 and 20% of the site is on 488m^2. The outdoor communal areas are compliant.
f. Communal open space should be accessible from shared circulation, not only through communal shared internal space. Access to communal open space when communal shared internal space is occupied needs to be considered.	Point f. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev: B & DA-106 Rev: B. Two out of the three outdoor communal areas are accessed from shared circulation areas,
g. Acoustic issues should be further considered as the large communal space (internal and external) that will serve 85 residents plus guests may get noisy and is directly under residential apartments above.	Point g. - The residential apartments in this location are not directly above the outdoor communal area. The outdoor communal area is located on level 01 and the first level of apartments are located on level 04 - 3 levels above the outdoor communal area.

6.3 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Co-Living Space.

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
h. Consider solar access, view to sky for south void space through north void space – explore void spaces in section. Void spaces should be used for waiting areas for the lifts to take residents out of the relatively narrow corridor and away from the front doors of units.	Point h. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev: B & DA-106 Rev: B. These drawings indicate various outdoor communal areas or voids which provide views to the sky when you exit the lifts and are partially connected, allowing light to filter through from the north facade to the south facade.
i. Further development of the long corridor and the entry to each room is recommended to provide better amenity for residents moving about within their living environment. *Consider entry door recesses, finishes and/ or expression to avoid potentially relentless corridors. Develop a language for common spaces to enhance legibility and identity. Corridors should continue to be broken up with communal open spaces with access to natural light.*	Point i. - Please refer to DA-105, 106 & 107 Rev. B. Vertical circulation has been added to both of the new double height external communal areas and proposed layouts as to how each of the internal and external communal areas could be used, are added.
j. Consider greenery, landscape design solutions and function for these communal spaces and express their presence on grid façade – general comment is that these spaces need to be designed further as they are shown as blank spaces (literally voids) at the moment. How do they become activated, consider seating, post rooms/ deliveries, community notices etc.	Point j. - Please refer to DA-105 & DA-106 Rev:B. These drawings indicate a layer of green planting around the perimeter of level 01 with additional planters within the communal outdoor areas. Similarly, planter boxes are added to the outdoor communal area on level 02.
k. Consider a stair linking the co-living environment to its ground floor lobby and the ground floor community facility to encourage usage and to alleviate congestion at lifts for early morning/evening rush hour – this really should happen, remove reliance on lifts for lower floors.	Point k. - For security reasons, the client would prefer to limit access to the co-living areas. Similar to the residential entries, lift access to the upper levels is the preferred method of entry and vertical movement and accommodating an addition open staircase would be a potential safety issue.
l. The hidden "dogleg" corridor access to units at southwest part of floorplate should be replanned to avoid the current CPTED issue and reduced amenity.	Point i. - Please refer to DA-105, 106 & 107 Rev. B. The "dogleg" corridor is now removed.
m. Provide a workstation/study to manager's unit.	Point m. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev:B. A work-station has been added to the manager's office.
n. Adequate bicycle/motorcycle parking for the co-living component of the development should be provided. Bicycle parking should be secure and in a location that appropriately reflects the approach to co-living integration. The current bicycle parking arrangements where some co-living residents do not appear to be able to access their bicycle parking by lift is not supported.	Point n. - Please refer to DA-103 Rev:B. All co-living parking requirements are located on basement 01.

6.4 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Planning.

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. Improve lobby design/address with mail-rooms and waiting areas – lobbies are too deep by comparison to their width and require better visual access from the street.	Point a. - Please refer to DA-104 Rev: B & DA-106 Rev: B. The residential lobby next to Mark Street has increased in width and waiting areas and mail-boxes have been added to each lobby area.
b. The westernmost lobby and escape stair arrangement at ground level and the co-living levels would benefit from replanning to achieve vertical expression directly below the vertical slot in the southern façade of the western tower.	Point b. - Please refer to DA-202 Rev. B. The planning of the co-living levels and the overall design/relationship between the upper levels and ground floor level accommodates a modular design. All spacings are equal with double height vertical openings / slots to express the entry locations.
c. The panel is concerned that awnings will need to be provided over entry points to manage wind impacts in this environment of tall towers built to the street alignment. Reconsider the current arrangement in conjunction with lobby redesign, maintaining appropriate lobby height and width for the scale of the building.	Point c. - The entry doors to all lobbies will be recessed and setback from the external face of the white frame by 1.5m. This design approach creates a natural awning within the proposed building form. Also, the entry points are identified with double height openings. If awnings are located above the residential and co-living lobby entries, it will start to water-down there presence and identity.
d. Show neighbouring context on plans, especially. ground floor.	Point d. - Please refer to DA-111 Rev: A. This drawing shows the ground floor plan and neighbouring context.
e. Improve east entry lobby access to lifts around corner at end of corridor.	Point e. - Please refer to DA-105 Rev. B. The lobby area to the side of the lifts is widened as you turn the corner, to create a more inviting and open space.
f. Improve cross ventilation – particularly where windows in bathroom showers are currently shown.	Point f. - Please refer to DA-1418 Rev: B. The proposed scheme provides 32 cross-ventilated units from levels 4 - 8 and has a percentage rate of 64%, 4% above the ADG requirements. All ventilated paths of travel are taken through doors and turn corners as per Figure 4B.8 in the ADG under section 4B - Natural Ventilation.
g. Reconsider deep balconies or demonstrate that sufficient light and ventilation is maintained with the proposed design.	Point g. - The deepest balconies in the design are located within units 06 and 07 on each level. However these balconies are located on the northern facade and are flooded with natural sunlight. Please refer to DA-1402 - DA-1408 Rev:B. These sun-eye diagrams demonstrate that the balconies receive natural sunlight all day long.
h. Ceiling heights have been designed to the minimum 2.7m – can this be increased without impacting surrounding amenity?	Point h. - Increasing the ceiling heights would push the overall design up and breech the LEP height controls for the site.
i. Co-living ceiling heights are likely to be insufficient and should be increased if possible.	Point i. - The floor to floor height for the co-living levels is either 3.5m or 3m. This will provide a clear head height of 3.3m and 2.8m within the rooms below. Increasing the head-heights would push the overall design up and breech the LEP height controls for the site.
j. Waste management provisions do not currently appear to be adequately addressed for a building of this scale and replanning should avoid on floor bins in corridor cupboards.	Point j. - Please refer to section 7.1 - Waste.
k. Egress arrangements should be reviewed to avoid risk associated with converging exits.	Point k. - Please refer to DA-104 Rev: B. The egress arrangement has been updated.

6.5 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Sustainability.

Council's Comment:	Urban Link Architects Response:
a. Limited documentation regarding sustainability was provided at the meeting. A sustainability report that commits to a suitable sustainability target with the design principles and initiatives pursued should be provided, noting that 5/6-star Greenstar (or equivalent) should be considered the minimum for design excellence.	Point a. - Please refer to the attached sustainability report.
b. Integrate sustainability measures into design including:	Point b. - Please refer to the attached sustainability report.
i. Passive solar design, with shading/screens, controlled natural ventilation and the like including technical studies or expert input as appropriate.	i. - awnings and trees are provided for at ground level to cool pedestrian movement. 64% natural ventilation is achieved. 80% solar compliance is achieved.
ii. Water capture and reuse.	ii. - Bioretention tree pits will be incorporated to assist with treating runoff through filtration and reduce stormwater runoff volumes along pedestrian pathways in rainfall events.
iii. Maximising levels of insulation.	iii.- High levels of insulation will be installed. Please refer to the attached sustainability report.
iv. Choosing appropriate colours to avoid overheating/glare.	iv. - Bright coloured finishes are proposed to prevent excessive heat gain.
v. Maximising glazing performance/reducing glazed extents.	v. - Glazing is reduced were possible and total glazed walls are avoided. All glazing will be double glazed and have high u-value ratings.
vi. Optimised HVAC including recovery systems and mixed-use efficiencies (with commercial component).	vi. - Automatically controlling HVAC systems will be installed to deliver the required heating and cooling at energy-efficient levels.
vii. Maximising air-tightness (with appropriate levels of ventilation).	vii. - A air-tightness test will be carried out when the project is complete.
c. Consider energy harvesting with PV cells on roof and/or green roofs for cooler environments.	Point c. - Please refer to DA-110 Rev. B. Solar panels have been added to the roof area.
d. Reconsider use of gas – consider future proofing development by implementing electric systems now.	Point d. - This point will be reviewed and discussed with the client and the various consultants during the CC stage of the project.
e. AC is currently only proposed in Living Spaces. This suggests that owners will retrofit AC into bedrooms and Study with machines on balconies. This should be designed out, provide possibility of AC in bedrooms, oversize the plant to accommodate this. Provide ceiling fans in bedrooms and consider ceiling fans in living areas.	Point e. - A multi-split air conditioning system is proposed for each apartment. The size and location of the required plant room will be confirmed during the CC stage of the project with the various consultants. No AC unit will be retrofitted on the balcony area.

6.6 Cumberland Design Excellence Panel: - Designing For Country.

Council's Comment:

a. How is this being addressed.

Urban Link Architects Response:

Point a. - The starting point of this process was to consider the potential impact of the development on the Aboriginal Country, to establish a cultural context for the project and to understand how local themes, stories and Country can inform the design of the project.

1. Aboriginal Country

"Country" is not a individual or static entity and Lidcombe, now a new key suburb on the fringes of Sydney's CBD, has had significant waves of evolution over time. But as "Country" changes and evolves, it retains its own enduring spirit, a spirit that lives on now and into the future. With this in mind, the design considers not only how the Country would be impacted but how the design might celebrate and honour the areas ancestors, stories, lore and knowledge yet coincide with the areas evolution over time. It aims to create a binary relationship between nature, people and design yet prioritise people and their needs and assert its place within Lidcombe with a robust street presence.

The design will offer views of the surrounding lands, landscaped insertions, along with a green colonnade at ground level, which also defines the space. It also allows the natural sunlight to access Marsden Street.

2. Cultural Context

The proposed rezoning provides the opportunity for future development within the Lidcombe area. Whilst the rezoning will not impact upon Aboriginal cultural heritage values the subsequent development will require appropriate management strategies.

3. Local Themes

Darug designs can help theme the wayfinding elements of the precinct with pavement and signage at different scales, which can guide people around the site. Additional to this, the landscape design can implemend patterns of "Country" with the layout of plants, pathways, and plant selections.