

Redfern Place – Design Review Panel No. 5 Advice

Meeting Subject:	600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern Design Review Panel Meeting No. 5		
Location:	In person: Ethos Urban - 180 George Street, Sydney Virtual: Teams		
Date:	18 March 2025	Time:	9:30am – 12:30pm

This letter summarises the Design Review Panel's (DRP) commentary on the material presented by Hayball, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller at the fifth DRP session held on 18 March 2025. The meeting was held following the lodgement of the State Significant Development Application (SSDA) in October 2024 and the exhibition period that occurred between 7 November 2024 and 4 December 2024. The focus of the meeting was to present the design changes that had been made in response to the submissions received by government agencies and the City of Sydney during exhibition and also provide an update on how the commentary from the previous DRP had been incorporated within the lodged documentation.

The DRP session was held in person at Ethos Urban's office and was attended by the DRP, a representative from Hayball, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller as well as the Proponent and the Design Excellence Process manager. Representatives from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, Homes NSW and members from each of the respective design teams were present virtually.

The DRP for 600-660 Elizabeth Street comprises five members as set out below.

Panel Member	Role/Position
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair)	Director Design Governance, GANSW
Emily Wombwell FRAIA	Director, SJB
Ingrid Mather FAILA	Director Landscape Architect, JMD Design
Liz Westgarth FRAIA	Managing Director, Hassell
Graham Jahn AM LFRAIA	Executive Director City Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney

Panel Feedback

The advice of the DRP is outlined in the table below. Overall, the DRP were supportive of the material that was presented and that was lodged as part of the SSDA and recognised the concerted effort in the design coordination that had occurred since the previous DRP.

In the meeting, it was confirmed that no further reviews of the proposal by the DRP were considered necessary based on the level of documentation provided. In accordance with the DRP Terms of Reference, it is understood the Panel would be called upon in the following instances:

- Where a condition is imposed as part of the SSDA consent which requires advice from the Panel as a term of approval;
- Significant modifications to the SSDA where changes are proposed to the proposal's design (as deemed necessary by the consent authority); or
- Proponent requests advice from the Panel in relation to any subsequent proposal to modify the approved built form.


Table 1 *General Commentary from the DRP in respect of the SSDA*

Component	Panel Commentary
Site-wide and Basement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that basement EV charging is provided in accordance with the relevant NCC requirements, including location, size and access. • Ensure the design of utilities and servicing, including substations and hydrant fire pump assemblies as may be required for each building by Fire and Rescue NSW etc. are based on the relevant requirements and have been informed by consultation where required.
Building S1 (PCYC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the continual design development and in particular the arrival sequence internally with axially aligned doorways. • The Panel commended the 'design jam' process and the involvement of the community in design development. • The Panel requested further consideration of how the building meets the landscape at its south-eastern edge with the through-site link, acknowledging constraints due to the OSD in that location.
Building S2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel were supportive of the design development and introduction of solid brick on the building's lower levels, considering it a far superior outcome to the use of brick slips and an improvement to what was previously presented, despite the minor encroachments into building setback to Kettle Street. • The balconies and accessways to ground floor dwellings along Walker Street should not erode/ interrupt the connected deep soil zone along Walker Street. Suspended or partially suspended balconies would help to address this. • The Panel noted the potential for objects to fall from the upper breezeways and suggested exploring measures to mitigate damage or injury caused by these objects at Ground Level. • The Panel recommended re-exploring the breakout spaces within the breezeway on the ground level, noting the playfulness of these spaces was appreciated in previous iterations of the scheme. • The Panel recommended that the breezeway breakout spaces throughout the building are retained. • The Panel strongly supports the pitched roof top-of-building motif of Building S2, noting that its material and expression needs to be integral to the materiality of the building and a continuation of the building's character. • The Panel noted there may be poor sound and vibration amenity concerns for the lower two level apartment within the north-eastern corner of Building S2 which is located directly adjacent to the vehicular access on Kettle Street. Ways to mitigate the potentially noisy roller door should be explored, noting the potential impacts to this apartment (particularly to the upper bedroom). • The Panel recommended further exploration into the safety clearance dimensions of fixed seating elements and the balustrades in upper breezeways.
Building S3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The glass line associated with the angled hooded windows is integral to the privacy solution and the glazing needs to be angled with the hood and not brought inwards to align with the external wall. • The Panel recommended the team maximise solar access to the glazing of the hooded windows rather than to the hoods themselves, to ensure quality of light in bedrooms and living spaces. • The Panel queried the inclusion and width of the column/wall (introduced since the last DRP) located vertically along the central portion of the building's eastern façade. It was preferred that the balcony outlook is maximised as much as practically possible. • Confirm requirement for retaining wall that divides deep soil zone along southern portion of Walker Street and eastern section of Phillip Street should be reviewed.

Component	Panel Commentary
Building S4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel commended the proposal's design development, noting the careful attention and consideration given to the building's presentation to the street. The Panel noted the opportunity to further refine the rooftop being the fifth façade which will be viewed from the surrounding apartments on the site. The Panel recommended the project team explore the optimal alignment of the Elizabeth Street bus stop and the through-site link in consultation with the City of Sydney and Transport for NSW. Maximise width and soil volume in planter boxes along Elizabeth Street to ensure maintenance resilience.
Landscaping and Public Domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel strongly support the retention of street trees along Walker Street. The Panel recommended further exploration into opportunities to maximise and connect deep soil across the site, particularly along Walker Street adjacent to the existing street trees. The Panel was supportive of the simplification of the communal courtyard spaces. Further consideration of sightlines, particularly to building entries is recommended. Further consideration of the site's holistic connected living system approach was recommended, ensuring soil, water, biodiversity and resilience for maintenance underpin the landscaping design. The Panel recommended the drainage strategy focuses on feeding groundwater into the swales and reducing reliance on piped stormwater systems for less than 3-month events where possible. The effectiveness of swales as shown on the submitted documents was queried. The Panel encourages greater diversity of landscaping to ensure the mix and quantum of planting increases biodiversity and encourages the pollinators. The Panel recommended the team prepare a coordinated drawing which shows how the street trees, Tree Protection Zones and deep soil are integrated, as well as showing incursions caused by the proposal. The Panel noted the importance of ensuring planter boxes both at ground level and on rooftop terraces are adequately sized and designed for drainage and water access. While the Panel appreciated the difficulties with maintaining real turf on the building rooftops, it was suggested that alternative solutions to the use of synthetic turf be explored, noting it would be subject to direct extended periods of hot sun during warmer months.

Chair of Panel Endorsement

This letter summarising the DRP's commentary from the fifth DRP held on 18 March 2025 relating to 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern on the material presented by Hayball, Aspect, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller has been reviewed by the DRP and has been endorsed by the Panel Chair.

Name	Signature
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair) - Director Design Governance, GANSW	
	26/03/2025