

DEP Key Issues	Response:
<p>Basement Key issues and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of bike parking is a positive – may be better defined in a secure room/area noting that there is a shared lift between commercial and residential areas and to maintain a tidy appearance. <p>NOTE: Updates to AS 2890:1 are imminent - minimum parking space size 2.4m x 5.6m</p>	<p>Applicant's response: <i>Secured cage now provided and parking spaces provided and indicated on basement plans.</i></p> <hr/> <p>Council's response: The bicycle storage is located in a secured space/room in the basement. The car spaces have been nominated as 2.4mx5.6m.</p>
<p>Ground Floor Key issues and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire stair location at the southeast corner impacts lines of sight to park beyond and creates safety in design issues (CPTED). Also, outside of the setback required by Council Waste management to be reviewed – size of bins / frequency of collection, bin collection from the upper floors to be re-considered. Last ramp accessing the bin storage area to be checked. Privacy of COS terrace to be maintained – impacted by COMM/RETAIL 06. 	<p>Applicant's response: <i>The fire escape stairs have been moved to a position behind the hydrant booster, which is also situated behind the 4-meter setback from the southern boundary.</i></p> <p><i>Waste management plan prepared by specialist and waste room reconfigured.</i></p> <p><i>The ramp has been designed to ensure accessibility with a 7% gradient and is complying.</i></p> <p><i>This ground floor COS is no longer designated for residential purposes and is now available for all commercial tenancies. The loading bay, basement ramp, and fire stairwell serve to separate the COS from the bin storage room.</i></p> <hr/> <p>Council's response:</p> <p>The fire stair has been setback 4 metres from Marsden Street. Council's Waste Management Officer has reviewed the revised drawings and did not raise any objections to the proposal.</p> <p>Ramps are complaint. The ground floor COS will be for the commercial tenants.</p>

Upper Levels

Key issues and recommendations:

- The panel is unsupportive of the lack of diversity in the proposed residential mix and see this as a missed opportunity to provide greater diversity in higher density living in the LGA.
- 107 apartments over Level 1-3 are provided access from only 2 lifts – this seems low and would likely lead to congestion. Review with input from a Vertical Transport consultant.
- Extensive fire egress travel distances – to be checked by BCA / Fire engineer.
- All doors opening from the communal living area and COS terrace should open in the direction of fire egress travel.
- Bin rooms and laundry tubs on each floor are undersized. 2 tubs and 4 bins for approximately 30 apartments. Recommend increase and relocation away from apartments.
- For safety and ease of escape position accessible apartments lower in the tower.
- The attempt to get some natural light into hallways is encouraged.
- Solar access and cross ventilation to apartments are basic amenities to improve the lives of future residents and is therefore best practice for residential design. of future Only a handful of apartments receive cross ventilation. Seek opportunities to improve this.
- Balconies add great amenity to the apartments. Balconies have been arbitrarily provided to some apartments and not others. The amenity to proposed residential uses extremely poor, recommend that all residential units receive balconies, this will improve the space available as well as ventilation.
- Building separation is not compliant. Internal “courtyard” facade opening configuration should be better arranged to avoid privacy issues, to resolve non-compliance, and to have better architectural articulation.

Applicant's response:

The integration of boarding houses and co-living above commercial premises in Lidcombe introduces a nuanced and inclusive housing mix that enhances social and economic diversity in high-density environments. By accommodating various income levels, life stages, and household structures, the proposal aligns with the LGA's objectives for sustainable, accessible, and resilient urban communities.

All six elevators will now be operational and will provide service to each floor. Residents will receive a swipe key for access to their designated floor or unit.

As recommended by our BCA consultant, the travel distance at the northern end of the corridor has been minimised. Fire separation doors have been installed in the centre of the corridor on levels L1-4 to segment the extended corridor.

Temporary bin cupboard on L1-14 – have been relocated away from residential entry doors. Communal tub is no longer required, each unit is now provided with dryer in the bathroom, with tub/vanity next to it. Four general waste bins & four recycle bins are provided each floor to serve up to 37 units.

The current proposed layout enables even distribution of accessible units across all floors, which also improves construction efficiency.

A 3-meter setback/recess has been established at the eastern end of the corridor, facilitating the installation of full-height windows, which in turn enhances passive surveillance of the adjacent park.

The highlight window is positioned on the internal east and west facades that face the internal courtyard at level 8 (rooftop terrace). Although single-aspect units located on higher levels experience

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of building at 45m to be compliant (that is, western tower to be reduced by a level) • Floor to floor heights will result in 2.6m restricting future use and further contributing to cramped units. The panel Questions the achievability of 2.6m clear once structure and services are coordinated. The panel is unsupportive of this compressed floor to floor, particularly considering the proposed height variation. Council should consider this a focus point for further engagement. • Floor-to-floor heights to be compliant to ADG as a Design Excellence measure, to provide better amenity for occupants and to provide future flexibility. • There is no sufficient Structural and Services transfer zone provided throughout building. • Revised drawings should be coordinated with services an structural input as proof of concept for proposed floor to floor heights and clearances. • Floor to floor height of the commercial area is also not sufficient and should be increased. • Roof terrace floor / landscaping structural buildup is not addressed. Addition of structural depth will challenge proposed floor to floor heights. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This building proposes a poor level of residential amenity that is far from an example of Design Excellence. The Panel recommends revision of the proposed design in accordance with the above issues. 	<p><i>restricted cross ventilation, their elevated location may still facilitate sufficient natural airflow owing to fewer obstructions and increased wind exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Balconies have now been incorporated into as many units as feasible; except for the cornerpositioned units (southwest) on levels L4 to the top, in accordance with the recommendations of the Wind Report.</i></p> <p><i>The windows have been modified to consist of elevated windows featuring obscure glass, and the building separation has been adjusted to 16.235m and 12.45m, thereby fulfilling the ADG requirement of a "minimum separation of 12 between non-habitable rooms" for the full height of both towers.</i></p> <p><i>The western tower has been reduced by a level as suggested.</i></p> <p><i>The internal configuration of boarding and co-living is not intended for later conversion to apartments, so concerns about long-term adaptability are not a relevant planning test.</i></p> <p><i>These units are purpose-designed for efficient, short- or medium-term living, and meeting their functional and regulatory requirements is the correct performance benchmark.</i></p> <p><i>A minimum of 3m floor-to-floor height typically allows for a finished ceiling height of 2.6m, which exceeds the minimum 2.4m ceiling height required by the BCA (Building Code of Australia) for Class 3 buildings (including boarding houses and co-living).</i></p> <p><i>Please consult page #29 for the detailed section used in previously executed projects.</i></p> <p><i>The height from floor to floor has been raised at the Ground Floor/commercial level and on level 7 (which is situated beneath the rooftop terrace).</i></p>
--	--

	<p><i>The height from floor to floor has been raised at the Ground Floor/commercial level and on level 7 (which is situated beneath the rooftop terrace).</i></p> <p><i>The layouts have been adjusted based on the recommendations where feasible to enhance residential amenity.</i></p>
--	--

	<p>Council's Response: Council concurs with the applicant's response to the upper levels.</p>
--	---

<p>Common Amenities Revision of plans to address inadequate residential amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Common area at ground floor has non-compliant solar amenity and poor ventilation. Communal open spaces back onto the bin room. Redesign and relocation would be required to achieve compliance and improve amenity. • Level 1 roof slab adjacent to the Communal Living Area #02, consider making this space trafficable communal terrace. • No diversity of proposed uses for communal spaces provided, with all rooms showing couches. Recommend variety in the spaces provided for example communal kitchen, study area, TV area. • Insufficient communal open space 20% of site area required, however only 8.7% is provided. Requires revision to achieve compliance. • Mailboxes and parcel room to be provided. 	<p>Applicant's response:</p> <p><i>The issue regarding the bin room has been addressed as mentioned above. The ground floor COS is now designated solely for the exclusive use of the commercial level. An additional Co-Living area has been assigned to the current space on Level 1.</i></p> <p><i>Level 1 communal terrace added.</i></p> <p><i>A total of 492 square meters of communal open space has now been achieved, representing 20.1% of the total site area (Level 1, Level 8 and Level 14 west tower roof).</i> <i>Mailboxes provided. Parcels room provided.</i></p> <p>Council's Response:</p> <p>The Co-Living housing is now provided with a communal terrace on level 1.</p> <p>A total of 492 sqm of communal open space has now been achieved, representing 20.1% of the total site area (Level 1, Level 8 and Level 14 west tower roof). However, separately the co-living and boarding house do not achieve compliance. This has been addressed in the main body of the report under the Clause 4.6 provisions. Mailboxes and a parcels room provided.</p>
<p>Relationship to Context & Street Interface Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The podium of this building has a poor relationship due to unresolved ground floor levels • which rely on landscape elements, retaining walls and ramps. These will become are barriers to • the public domain. • Approach to level entry points on the ground floor needs work. Appreciate the attempt at 	<p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p><i>The retaining walls, ramps, and stairs have been minimized to ensure accessible levels between commercial areas and the public domain. Landscaping beneath the awning has been limited to minimal planter boxes, with provisions made for street trees.</i></p> <p><i>The development includes a generous 4m-wide colonnade within the private property boundary along the retail frontage. The colonnade has been provided to meet the required 4m setback as well as to provide generous weather protection, enhance pedestrian comfort,</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing access for all abilities with ramps, however the inclusion of ramps, stairs, landscaping • and colonnade makes for a very confusing, cluttered space. Are the stairs required? • A seamless space for people to walk / wheel along Marsden Street rather than a narrow • footpath and cluttered building frontage would be a better outcome should a solution be • possible that caters for level change. • The awning provides no protection to the pedestrian function of the street. • Trees under awning may not work well • Some ramps are not well located in close to proximity to planters making it difficult for a • person in a wheelchair to move around • Landscaping under awnings will not grow • Fire stair protruding from the building line at the southeast of the plan. • <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater contextual study of vernacular high street typologies would guide an improved result. Spaces which house successful small business within the town centre and contribute to the vibrancy of the neighbourhood there are common qualities about them that contribute to the Character. These are focused on the street amenity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Awnings covering foot paths for sun and rain ○ Space and level ground for seating ○ Allowance for street planting ○ Finer grain and hard-working tenancies with levels which relate the street ○ The above resulting in minimal retaining being required in the public domain to resolve level difference between tenancies, and entries and the public domain 	<p><i>and activate the retail frontage. Introducing an awning into the public domain would unnecessarily duplicate this function, diminish architectural clarity, and add regulatory and maintenance complexity, without delivering additional public benefit and enabling the planting of street trees along a narrow footpath frontage. This approach delivers a greater long-term benefit to the community and the urban environment.</i></p> <p><i>Awnings have been removed from public spaces since a 4-meter-wide colonnade has already been established.</i></p> <p><i>The individual ramps have been removed and are now incorporated into the 4-meter-wide walkway beneath the colonnade.</i></p> <p><i>The planters on the southern side have been taken out and are now only placed along the Mark Street boundary, where there is a height difference between the public area and the colonnade within the property.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal draws directly from successful high street typologies within Lidcombe and surrounding town centres. Through fine-grain retail interfaces, a generous sheltered colonnade, active and transparent shopfronts, and adaptable commercial layouts, the design enables small business success and contributes to the long-term vibrancy, walkability, and character of the neighbourhood.</i></p> <p><i>The use of three separate entries and lift foyers for boarding and co-living units—strategically spaced between active ground-floor shops—supports functional efficiency, fire safety, and residential amenity, while ensuring a continuous and vibrant retail edge to the street. This fine-grain approach enhances the building's integration into the local urban fabric and contributes to a more walkable and welcoming public domain.</i></p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transparency to the street, contributing to vibrancy and providing passive activation – ○ Shop top housing with articulated address to the street that is private yet connected. • The ground floor of this project should be developed with consideration for these principles to have improve amenity and relationship to the existing neighbourhood and eliminate the dominant reliance of ramping and retaining while providing accessible access. 	<p><i>The design significantly improves amenity and strengthens the relationship with the existing neighbourhood by removing excessive ramping and reducing the retaining walls, and instead providing a generous, fully accessible colonnade integrated at street level. Bulky columns have been replaced by slender pilotis, resulting in a lighter, more transparent and accessible ground plane. This change enhances the relationship with the public domain, supports retail activation, and delivers a more refined and contextually sensitive architectural outcome.</i></p> <p>Council's Response:</p> <p>Council concurs with the changes made to the relationship to context and street interface.</p>
<p>Contextual setting Key issues and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider development potential (or lack of) of the adjacent site to the east. Unlikely to be redeveloped due to the narrow 11 m frontage. This may allow for windows on the eastern façade to improve natural light and passive surveillance over Friends Park. To be developed in consultation with council. 	<p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p><i>Windows in a vertical slot now included in the east façade.</i></p> <p>Council's Response:</p> <p>The vertical windows (residential levels) in the east face of the building and satisfies this requirement.</p>

<p>Waste Management / Operations Key issues and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste management strategy to be revised with input from speciality consultant. • Waste collection rooms located near apartment entries is not ideal. Should be relocated to minimise impact. • Ventilation shaft for bin storages on floors to be provided. Bin collection through long corridors not ideal. • Ground floor bin room is undersized. Review and redesign required. • Movement of the entire buildings waste through the residential lifts which have questionable capacity to service residential need alone is not supported. • Lifts and lift lobbies to be enlarged to stretcher compliant, seek input from access consultant. • Manager room to have sufficient work area. 	<p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p><i>It has been confirmed that the space is adequate to accommodate the necessary bins. The quantity of bins has been verified by the Cumberland Council Waste division; please refer to the Waste Management Plan (WMP) for additional information.</i></p> <p><i>WMP updated to reflect changes.</i></p> <p><i>Confirmation has been made that the lift stretcher and lobby can be adjusted to accommodate the stretcher, which requires a minimum depth of 2000mm – plans have been modified.</i></p> <p><i>Two manager rooms, along with an office annex, are now available. One is designated for Co-Living on Level 1, while the other is intended for Boarding on Level 4.</i></p> <p>Council's Response:</p> <p>Council's Waste Management officer has reviewed the amended plans and raise no issues. A manager's space has been included.</p>
<p>Sustainability Key issues and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vast improvement in the buildings energy consumption and thermal comfort could be achieved through optimisation of the façade design to mitigate solar loading. Detail of how the façade design has been developed to respond to the solar aspect to be provided. • Supportive of the deep soil zone added. • Level 1 Non-trafficable concrete roof – green roof would be more attractive, and would help reducing urban heat. • Solar arrays proposed greater detail of generation and storage should be provided. 	<p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p><i>The façade design thoughtfully integrates balconies for every room to provide shading and outdoor amenity, while southwest corner rooms from Level 4 upwards are setback 1.5m to reduce solar heat gain and enhance comfort. This approach aligns with passive solar principles, balancing solar access with thermal performance for a sustainable and comfortable living environment.</i></p> <p><i>Green roofs provided on L1 & L8.</i></p> <p><i>Solar photovoltaic panels are indicated on the roof of each tower. Additional details and sustainability strategy will be provided during the construction documentation stage.</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend a wholistic sustainability strategy for the development 	<p>Council's Response:</p> <p>The façade integrates balconies for the majority of the rooms to provide shading and outdoor amenity, the applicant has setback the southwest corner rooms from Level and up by 1.5m to reduce solar heat gain.</p> <p>Green roofs are shown on L1 & L8.</p> <p>Solar photovoltaic panels are provided to the roof area of each tower.</p>
---	--