

BRIEFING DETAILS

BRIEFING DATE / TIME	Monday, 2 June 2025, 2:00pm to 3:00pm
LOCATION	Ms teams

BRIEFING MATTER(S)

PPSSWC-541 – Fairfield – MA 384.3/2021- 2 Kamira Avenue, Villawood - Crown - S4.33 referral - Section 4.55(1A) modification to amend Development Consent No. 384.1/2021 for the purpose of internal and external modifications to the approved 8-10 Storey Mixed Use Development.

PANEL MEMBERS

IN ATTENDANCE	Justin Doyle (Chair), David Kitto, Greg Woodhams, Kevin Lam, Ninos Khoshaba
APOLOGIES	NIL
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	NIL

OTHER ATTENDEES

COUNCIL ASSESSMENT STAFF	Sunnee Cullen
APPLICANT	Michael Teoh
OTHER	Sharon Edwards, Tim Mahoney

KEY ISSUES DISCUSSED

The modifications sought in this application as described in the Statement of Environmental Effects are:

CAR PARKING

- Reconfiguration to the Ground Floor parking area and loading dock
- Removal of 3 visitor car parking spaces and minor carpark configuration amendments.
- Amendment to Level 1 & Level 2 parking areas to accommodate circulating swept paths.

PODIUM

- Brick Façade in Podium – Removed Stepped brick detailing.
- Brick Balconies in Podium – Amended to metal balustrade with solid backing sheeting applied at the rear. Same colour as the approved in original application. Same colour as the metal balustrade.
- All dark brick in the podium is converted to Hebel panel with dark colour finish to match the former brick.
- Parapet of the podium is aligned to be a consistent datum across the entire podium.

- The horizontal brick banding has been amended to align with the slab edge thickness. The change assists in emphasizing the vertical brick banding in the podium.
- The balustrades adjacent the carparking on the south west side of the podium colour to be amended from grey to match the earthy colours of the ground floor finishes. Amended from grey to match the dark colour finish of the podium.

TOWER

- North and East Elevation – Brick Tower Portion has been amended to Hebel Power Pattern in a light cream colour finish.

FLOOR PLAN

- Floor plans are shown to be amended to illustrate minor changes to apartments comprising – Removal of bath tubs to meet the operational requirements of Hume Housing;
- Improved bathroom layouts to give greater efficiency and accessibility; and
- Minor adjustments to kitchen furnishing to improve efficiency and workability.

The Statement of Environmental Effects advises further that there are no changes to the overall unit yield of 112 dwellings, and the building envelope including the setback and building separation, landscaping and vehicular access arrangements will remain unchanged.

The Applicant advised that the modifications were sought in the context of changed circumstances for the development, and specifically:

- a) Stage 1 of the Villawood development would now proceed as a 100% social housing development for the Department of Housing.
- b) Funding for the development is intended to include Commonwealth funding, which (for reasons which were not explained in detail) was tied to a prompt determination of this modification application.
- c) The Application was concerned that the anticipated construction cost of the detailed brickwork included in the approved development including the design changes it had agreed to had drastically increased since the development consent was granted.
- d) In addition to the additional construction cost the Applicant was concerned about work, health and safety issues said to be associated with constructing brickwork above ground level.
- e) The Applicant referred to a recent development in Wollongong in relation to which it said it had experienced costs overruns.
- f) Issues associated with the longevity of painted masonry could be addressed by a higher specification for the construction approach.

The Council expressed a strong opposition to the design changes which it advised it saw as essential to maintaining the integrity of the scheme, and pointed to what it thought had been a negotiated outcome.

The Panel accepted that public interest in delivering social housing was relevant to assessing issues of cost efficient design, particularly if there was evidence that Federal funding for the project was contingent on changes to the design.

At the same time the present conditions represented a negotiated outcome arrived at through the investment of substantial time and resources from the Council (which had been opposing the grant of consent) and the Panel. The design achieved a degree of excellence that should not be reduced lightly.

Mr Jury representing Homes NSW supported the Applicant's case for urgency and advised that the budget for such buildings would affect the ability of Homes NSW to provide such housing.

The Panel Chair advised that in view of the urgency he would personally attempt to arrange for independent design advice from an architectural expert as soon as it could be arranged in the interests of expediting a determination. Conferral of the expert directly with the Applicant's architect may assist.

Determination of the DA should be expedited as soon that the independent architectural advice is available, preferably after the Applicant's architect and the Panel's advisor have conferred.