

# 175 – 177 Cleveland Street and 1 - 5 & 6 - 8 Woodburn Street, Redfern

## Design Review Report

On behalf of  
EG Funds Management Pty Ltd  
September 2022



## Project Director

Tom Cook

## Contributors

Harrison Depczynski

Stephanie Wu

Revision	Revision Date	Status	Authorised	
			Name	Signature
1	14 September 2022	Draft 1	HD	TC
2	27 September 2022	Final 1	HD	TC

\* This document is for discussion purposes only unless signed and dated by the persons identified. This document has been reviewed by the Project Director.

## Contact

Mecone

Suite 1204b, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street  
Sydney, New South Wales 2000

info@mecone.com.au  
mecone.com.au

© Mecone

All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language in any form by any means without the written permission of Mecone.

All Rights Reserved. All methods, processes, commercial proposals and other contents described in this document are the confidential intellectual property of Mecone and may not be used or disclosed to any party without the written permission of Mecone.

## Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary .....	1
2	Proposal.....	2
3	Consultation summary with the SDRP.....	2
4	Responses to SDRP Feedback.....	1
5	Conclusion .....	1

# 1 Executive Summary

This Design Review Report has been prepared by Mecone on behalf of EG Funds Management (the Applicant) and details the consultation outcomes with the State Design Review Panel (SDRP) in relation to the proposed Significant Development Application (SSDA) for the site at 175 – 177 Cleveland Street and 1 – 5 & 6 – 8 Woodburn Street, Redfern (the site).

This Design Review Report has been prepared in response to the requirements of the Planning Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) issued on 9 December 2021.

This Design Review Report describes the consultation process with the SDRP, the issues raised during consultation, and how the proposal has addressed those issues.

The consultation process with the SDRP included the following sessions:

- **Session 1: 28 October 2021.** SDRP members included:
  - Emma Kirkman (Chair)
  - Daniele Hromek
  - Julie Lee
  - Matthew Bennet
- **Session 2: 13 April 2022.** SDRP members included:
  - Carol Marra (Chair)
  - Daniele Hromek
  - Jullie Lee
  - Matthew Benner
  - Richard Johnson (Council Nominee)

As provided in the '[NSW State Design Review Panel Terms of Reference](#)' document, *the role of the Panel is advisory only. The advice provided will not fetter the independence of the Consent Authority.* While the need to demonstrate design excellence is acknowledged and accepted, as provided in the ensuing sections of this report, the statutory planning framework governed by the EP&A Act must be acknowledged when determining the parameters for achieving design excellence.

In this respect, many facets of the proposed development far exceed compliance with the development standards of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021* (Housing SEPP) which guides co-living development, including design and amenity benchmarks.

The SDRP have also raised concern that the proposal does not comply with the maximum residential accommodation floor space ratio (FSR) standard under the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Eastern Harbour City) 2021* (Eastern Harbour City SEPP). It is respectfully submitted that this is a planning matter that the project team have consulted with DPE on and is not a matter for consideration by the SDRP in achieving design excellence.

These matters are further discussed below.

## 2 Proposal

This SSDA seeks development consent for the development of a privately-operated co-living mixed use development. The proposal has been designed to offer and support co-working activities for residents as well as the wider community to promote employment and social interaction throughout the development. Specifically, the proposal involves:

- Construction of a mixed use co-living housing development ranging in height from five (5) to seven (7) storeys, comprising:
  - Associated 7,006.4m<sup>2</sup> of GFA (FSR of 3.47:1) comprising 927.7m<sup>2</sup> of retail/commercial and 6,078.7m<sup>2</sup> of residential GFA;
  - Basement containing 19 car parking spaces; 25 motorcycle spaces and 116 bicycle spaces;
  - 216 co-living rooms (67 single and 149 double rooms) for lodgers and a building manager;
  - Ground and first floor co-working and commercial/retail uses fronting Cleveland, Woodburn and Eveleigh Streets;
  - Communal open space areas (1,458.8m<sup>2</sup>) including an open to the sky internal courtyard and rooftop garden;
  - Communal living areas (549.4m<sup>2</sup>) comprising resident amenities; and
- Associated landscape works (697.5m<sup>2</sup> landscaped area) and provision of a through-site link.
- Extension and augmentation of services and infrastructure as required.

## 3 Consultation summary with the SDRP

The project team first consulted with the SDRP on **28 October 2021** following which, written advice was provided by the SDRP. The primary concerns raised by the SDRP in their advice included:

1. The need to undertake additional engagement with local Aboriginal individuals and community groups to deliver a more holistic approach to the design of the development in addressing the Connecting with Country framework.
2. Provide a connectivity and activation at the ground plane with the provision of commercial land use offerings with consideration of Aboriginal enterprise involvement.
3. Undertake building envelope testing to determine the most appropriate building envelope and massing for the site.
4. Consider how the development, and specially the built form, responds to the prevailing and desired future character and context of the locality.
5. Consider potential amenity and environmental impacts within the site as well as to those sites surrounding.

The project team consulted again with the SDRP on **13 April 2022**. While an earlier date was available to meet with the SDRP, EG Funds Management Pty Ltd decided to

dedicate additional time to consider, and provide a meaningful response to, the matters previously raised by the SDRP. This response resulted in the appointment of WSP to undertake further engagement with Aboriginal groups as well as provide Indigenous design input resulting in significant design changes.

In summary, the process undertaken between the two SDRP sessions included:

1. Appointment of WSP as Aboriginal design and engagement consultants to undertake further community engagement (in addition to the engagement previously carried out by Cox Inall Ridgeway) and provide design collaboration with the design team to translate the messaging from Aboriginal groups and the Connecting with Country principles.
2. Integration of additional Aboriginal design elements as well as dedication of part-time use of ground floor room by an Aboriginal enterprise as directed by WSP following further community engagement and design collaboration.
3. Development and testing of five (5) building envelopes to consider an array of built form massing options for the site including their efficiency and response to the prevailing and desired future character of the area.
4. Consideration of the present context and anticipated evolution of the area based on current planning approvals and analysis of those sites susceptible to change.
5. Increase of approximately 200m<sup>2</sup> in ground and first floor commercial/co-working floor space to activate the street and provide increased public benefits.
6. Solar access analysis to demonstrate compliant solar access for within the site as well as those surrounding.

In response to some of the matters raised by the SDRP pertaining to internal amenity of residents, it is important to acknowledge the planning framework and instruments which govern these outcomes and the role of the consent authority.

In this respect, the SDRP advised that compliance with a non-discretionary development standard within the Housing SEPP does not translate into that design component being acceptable. For example, it has been requested by the SDRP that the proposed communal open space and communal living areas (which comply with the relevant non-discretionary development standards of the Housing SEPP) be further increased – and by not doing so, the proposal cannot be supported on design excellence grounds.

While it is acknowledged that compliance with non-discretionary development standards does not necessarily mean design excellence is achieved, the ability for the SDRP or the consent authority to request compliance beyond that already achieved does not accord with the EP&A Act and therefore must be brought into question.

The EP&A Act is clear in that pursuant to section 4.15(2), where compliance with a non-discretionary development standard is complied with, the consent authority:

- (a) *is not entitled to take those standards into further consideration in determining the development application, and*
- (b) *must not refuse the application on the ground that the development does not comply with those standards, and*
- (c) *must not impose a condition of consent that has the same, or substantially the same, effect as those standards but is more onerous than those standards,*

In accordance with section 4.15(2) of the EP&A Act, the consent authority would be in legal error if a non-discretionary development standard was satisfied and they, be it through the SDRP or on their own accord, refused the application on the grounds that a more onerous standard or requirement should be imposed.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the SDRP's role and influence does not extend to prevail over the general planning practices and the role of the consent authority as established under the EP&A Act. This matter is discussed further below specifically against the non-discretionary development standards.

## 4 Responses to SDRP Feedback

**Tables 1 and 2** below summaries the comments received from the SDRP and the applicant's responses to each.

Table 1. SDRP Review Received 8 November 2021	
Comment	Response
<b>Connecting with Country</b>	
1. Adopt a more comprehensive and integrated approach to connecting with Country beyond the proposed range of initiatives. This includes an increased understanding and response to Gadigal Country and the cultural context of Redfern to influence built form and landscape outcomes more meaningfully. The approach should be founded in consultation and guided by the GANSW <a href="#">Draft Connecting with Country</a> framework.	<p>The design has adopted a number of initiatives and design elements as informed by the community engagement outcomes carried initially out by <b>Cox Inall Ridgeway</b> throughout <b>August 2021</b>. Following the initial community engagement and preparation of the concept design, further engagement with Indigenous community groups throughout <b>March 2022</b> as commissioned by <b>WSP</b>. This process is discussed further against item 2 below.</p> <p>Through the engagement process, a number of Indigenous initiative and design themes have been considered and adopted. These includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Welcoming and Inclusivity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Connecting to landscape through the provision of generous landscaping at the ground level and rooftop.</li> <li>○ Social benefit – providing the ground plane with a sense of openness and inclusiveness, not closed off to the public. This is encouraged through active uses fronts the street, open and spacious entrances and appropriate signage, both wayfinding and educational. This is further facilitated through the co-living/working model adopted which provides opportunity for the public to use and work from the co-working spaces at the ground level.</li> <li>○ Large spaces and the ground plane and upper levels for gathering and smaller spaces for quiet reflection.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Healing and Restoring Country</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Restoring endemic plants to repair natural ecosystems. 'Coastal Heath' rooftop.</li> <li>○ Sustainability – smart water management and natural ventilation</li> <li>○ Drawing inspiration from waterways on the ground level, utilising a majority of endemic tree, mid-canopy and wetlands plant spaces to represent a successional landscape interpretation of the (original) locality.</li> <li>○ Materials that reflect native flora</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cultural Safety</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Integration of existing and additional aboriginal artwork. Local indigenous artists/designers to be engaged with to provide further input and direction.</li> <li>○ First languages signage and acknowledgement of country – providing both wayfinding and educational elements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Movement, permeability and activation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Accessibility and inclusiveness at the ground level and throughout the building.</li> <li>○ Permeable connections to landscape and building program.</li> <li>○ Cultural education – meandering through the site.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The outcomes of the community consultation and design response is detailed further below.</p> <p>The response to the community engagement outcomes and the GANSW Draft Connecting with Country framework is summarised in the SDRP presentation.</p>
<p>2. Provide details on the Cox Inall Ridgeway Aboriginal community engagement report, including the commissioner and key outcomes. Demonstrate how this engagement has and will inform the design.</p>	<p>Details of the Cox Inall Ridgeway Aboriginal community engagement report and how this engagement has informed the design is provided below and within the design presentation. Throughout August 2021, the following stakeholders made themselves available for initial consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Gadigal Elder,</li> <li>• 2 local Aboriginal residents (aged 30-45),</li> <li>• The National Centre of Indigenous Excellence (NCIE),</li> <li>• Youth Action, and</li> <li>• Homelessness NSW (note: 2 separate consults were undertaken throughout August).</li> </ul> <p>The key themes and outcomes of the initial engagement process include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing</li> <li>• Gentrification</li> <li>• Creating social benefits and outcomes</li> <li>• Supporting Aboriginal enterprises</li> <li>• Restoring/healing Country</li> <li>• Stories of Country, nature and landscape</li> <li>• Cultural learning and expression</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culturally safe places</li> <li>• Celebrating a Gadigal Identity</li> </ul> <p>The abovementioned outcomes were considered by the project team and adopted for the development of the concept design.</p> <p>Following this, WSP were engaged to undertake further community engagement with local Indigenous groups and provide design input. Consultation was carried out with the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walk on Country with Aboriginal elders, Uncle Chicka and Allan Madden.</li> <li>• Tribal Warrior and Redfern Youth Connect.</li> </ul> <p>This consultation yielded the following feedback and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was emphasised how impactful the Cleveland Street environment is and stressed how critical it was to protect the residents and visitors internally.</li> <li>• There should be a strong emphasis on the role and presence of Indigenous women, particularly around the water elements of the design in the ground floor courtyard.</li> <li>• Support was shown for the ground floor uses and how these opened to the public domain. Tribal Warrior suggested a part-time use (once or twice a month) of one of the ground floor rooms for Indigenous groups/workshops.</li> <li>• Suggested that the ground floor rooms be given Gadigal names.</li> <li>• There would need to be further consultation in relation to the reproduction of existing mural/s.</li> <li>• There should be diversity in the types of communal living/open space areas.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant is committed to carrying out ongoing engagement with local Indigenous groups and artists/design experts to assist in the interpretation of these outcomes and guide the design development.</p>
<p>3. Expand the proposed level of consultation to understand the specific cultural requirements and considerations for the dedicated space for Aboriginal enterprises, which are often distinct from non-Aboriginal enterprises. Considerations include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. approaches to working</li> <li>b. value and role of family and community relationships in working life</li> </ol>	<p>A thorough understanding of the specific cultural requirements and desired outcomes has been obtained through the engagement carried out to date. Specifically, this includes consultation with Tribal Warrior and Redfern Youth Connect where the potential use of the ground floor spaces was discussed at length.</p> <p>While there is not currently an intent to dedicate a space for full-time use by an Aboriginal Enterprise, it was proposed by Tribal Warrior and Redfern Youth Connect to dedicate part-time use of a space for community and educational activities. As such, a multipurpose space on the ground floor has been provided as a part-time dedicated space for these purposes.</p>

how understandings of and relationships to Country inform workspaces	<p>The use of this space will be coordinated with Tribal Warrior and Redfern Youth Connect.</p> <p>The balance of the ground floor, and some first floor, space will be used for co-working and commercial purposes which will serve to activate all street frontages as well as provide community offerings and public benefit as open and inviting areas.</p>
4. Consult with Gadigal language Knowledge Holders to inform First Nations wayfinding and signage and ensure the use of language and symbols is culturally appropriate.	First Nations wayfinding and signage to be adopted and be culturally appropriate and educations. As discussed above, ongoing consultation has been held with Aboriginal community groups and elders to inform culturally appropriate First Nations wayfinding and signage. Ongoing engagement is to be undertaken to inform these design outcomes as detailed in the Public Art Strategy.
<p>5. Address the following recommendations for the artwork strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. offer opportunities to Gadigal people (ideally people raised in or with relationships to Redfern) as a first preference</li> <li>b. Aboriginal artists from other nations/areas are not to be excluded; however, the artwork is to be strongly influenced by the Redfern Aboriginal community</li> <li>c. ensure the brief for the artwork includes the above recommendations.</li> </ul>	Further engagement with local Indigenous artists/designers is to be undertaken to not only collaborate with the project team to inform the design, but also provide opportunities to deliver artworks for the development. These initiatives have been detailed in the Public Art Strategy accompanying the EIS.
<p>6. Address the following concerns for the strategy for endemic planting and ecology as the foundation for healing and restoring Country (refer to the Site response and landscape section for further detail):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. long term viability of the landscape design generally</li> <li>b. appropriateness of the overshadowed courtyard location for vitality and resilience of plants.</li> </ul>	<p>The revised architectural design allows for concentrated usage by occupants and guests, that is, it will be highly visible and is intended for healing and restoring Country. Proposed use of 'Heath' endemic planting, particularly on much of Level 6, will mainly comprise species adapted to full sun and wind exposure. The 'Forest Floor' and 'Watercourse Surrounds' at the Ground Floor Courtyard will have mainly endemic species selected to suit expected low levels of sunlight, that will achieve design goals of medium canopy trees and tree ferns, as well as ground covers that can survive little light exposure (for example, reflected light from windows and balcony balustrades as well as the inclusion of Uv lighting).</p> <p>The long-term viability, vitality and resilience of planting will require monitoring and maintenance whereby outcomes will evolve as (for example) tree canopies can be thinned, tree fern fronds selectively removed and ground covers and surface treatments being replaced and modified as usage of the external spaces changes at the ground floor in particular.</p>
7. Explore how the project will balance affordability and gentrification in Redfern with the needs of its residents (including Aboriginal people and members of the existing Redfern community). For example,	The proposed residential accommodation being provided, co-living, is for a type of affordable housing, as opposed to traditional residential housing and will deliver additional affordable housing

consider partnering with an NGO to provide opportunities for reduced rent or allocate a percentage of housing for Indigenous Australians.	<p>opportunities for the area without removing any. Affordable housing offerings such as that proposed also eases pressure on housing market.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Housing SEPP specifically acknowledges that this form of affordable housing being a rental housing product.</p> <p>There has been extensive co-design with an established and award winning co-living provider who successfully manages a large portfolio of co-living communities across Sydney.</p> <p>There have been preliminary discussions with NGO's and affordable housing operators on potential opportunities to deliver appropriately positioned housing commensurate to the area. While there cannot be any firm commitment until the project has progressed further, it is intended to undertake ongoing discussions with these organisations.</p>
8. Given the high number of units proposed and their small size, ensure social, cultural and built form considerations are elevated beyond 'business as usual' to improve the overall resident and visitor experience.	<p>The proposed room sizes have been guided by, and designed in accordance with, the Housing SEPP requirements for co-living housing. Further, the smaller room sizes encourage greater housing affordability and therefore a social benefit.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the overall resident and visitor experience has been carefully considered to ensure an array of expansive and smaller areas which adopt the Connecting with Country principles.</p> <p>As guided by the Aboriginal elders consulted with, the communal living and open spaces have been designed to be generous in area but also provided a diversity of spaces for different purposes and for residents to find their 'preferred' space for meeting, work, break-out or contemplation.</p>
<b>Site response and landscape</b>	
<p>9. Provide alternative design options supported by context analysis to explore different massing distribution within the site constraints, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shadow studies on the 21 June from 9 am to 3 pm</li> <li>axonometric massing, showing the site and surrounding buildings</li> <li>elevations, showing the neighbouring buildings and ground plane</li> <li>circulation and activation diagrams</li> <li>mapping and response to noise and air pollution</li> <li>eye-level perspectives, showing the building in context, including views looking down both streets.</li> </ol>	<p>As detailed in the Urban Design Report which appends the EIS, a range of design options and envelopes have been tested by AE Design Studio to determine the most appropriate design outcomes for the site. This is supported by a context analysis of the site and locality, including existing, approved and expected development in the area.</p> <p>The envelope testing has resulted in some design changes to the development, presenting a number of urban design and amenity benefits.</p>

10. Prioritise quality open space that has access to sunlight throughout the year. Test massing options that increase sunlight to the courtyard, including removing the central bridges.

The **Housing SEPP** requires an amount of communal open space equivalent to 20% of the site area which equates to a **minimum of 403m<sup>2</sup> of communal open space required**. The Housing SEPP does not prescribe a minimum amount of sunlight access to communal open space.

The **Sydney Development Control Plan 2012** (SDCP 2012) requires a **minimum of 20m<sup>2</sup> of communal open space**. The SDCP 2012 requires that communal open space be generally north facing with a minimum 2hrs solar access to at least 50% of the area.

The proposed scheme provides a **total 1,458.8m<sup>2</sup> of communal open space** between ground, level 5 and level 6. **903m<sup>2</sup> of this area is provided on levels 5 and 6** and receives nearly full solar access throughout the day.

As outlined above, the proposed scheme far exceeds the required communal open space requirements under both the Housing SEPP and SDCP 2012.

Given the site context and conditions, particularly from Cleveland Street, providing increased solar access to the courtyard is extremely challenging and would ultimately be at the detriment of the internal amenity of the building. Accordingly, to achieve the minimum communal open space and solar access requirements under the guiding policies identified above, generous opens space areas have been provided on the upper levels to deliver on the necessary amenity requirements for residents.

Cleveland Street is an extremely harsh environment and therefore it is imperative to the internal amenity of the residents and visitors that the courtyard is shielded from Cleveland Street noise impacts. For this reason, the building envelope purposefully has been designed to acoustically sleeve the courtyard from road and rail impacts.

This approach has been emphatically supported by the Aboriginal elders consulted with who emphasised the need to protect residents and visitors and ensure the ground floor space was peaceful and a place for reflection as opposed to a harsh and disruption environment.

The primary function of the ground floor courtyard is to introduce greater activation and permeability throughout the site's ground floor plane and suitably connect the array of ground floor co-living and commercial offerings which are open to the public. Accordingly, it has been deemed more appropriate to locate the resident's communal open space areas on the upper levels where these uses can remain largely separate and provide a higher level of amenity for residents.

Further to the above, while the ground floor courtyard receives minimal solar access during winter months, it is important to note that during the majority of the year, this area will benefit from increased solar access.

<p>11. A public through-site link is a good outcome for the wider area and the project; however, the link should be purposeful and provide a clear route between destinations that feels public and safe. For example, refer to the mixed-use development Casba in Waterloo, NSW by SJB. Provide built precedents of through-site links that are similar in scale and function to the proposed link.</p>	<p>Given the location of the site fronting Cleveland Street where pedestrian movement is provided and encouraged, the actual need and purpose of a through-site link provided on site is not critical at this location.</p> <p>The site is only ~56m deep. With the majority of pedestrian thoroughfare coming down from Redfern station along Cleveland Street, and there being limited need to walk down Woodburn Street. Seldom would pedestrians have the need to use a through-site link to access Everleigh Street when this would not provide any greater convenience compared to accessing via Cleveland Street.</p> <p>A public through-site link is provided at the end of Woodburn Street through the Everleigh Street should pedestrian using Woodburn Street need to access. Providing a second link from Woodburn Street in close proximity to Cleveland Street would not deliver a meaningful benefit to the public.</p> <p>It is also important to note the level changes across the site, making it difficult to relocate the through-site link closer to Cleveland Street. Notwithstanding these constraints, the project team are still eager to explore and provide opportunities for a through-site link which is commensurate to the scale of the development and site context.</p> <p>The site context is vastly different to that of the Casba development in Waterloo where there is a more apparent need to provide pedestrian links between the two street frontages. The site is located on a corner, with three frontages, one being a classified road (Cleveland Street). For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the provision of a through-site link similar to that of the Casba development is not warranted.</p>
<p>11. A public through-site link is a good outcome for the wider area and the project; however, the link should be purposeful and provide a clear route between destinations that feels public and safe. For example, refer to the mixed-use development Casba in Waterloo, NSW by SJB. Provide built precedents of through-site links that are similar in scale and function to the proposed link.</p>	<p>Given the location of the site fronting Cleveland Street where pedestrian movement is provided and encouraged, the actual need and purpose of a through-site link provided on site is not critical at this location.</p> <p>The site is only ~56m deep. With the majority of pedestrian thoroughfare coming down from Redfern station along Cleveland Street, and there being limited need to walk down Woodburn Street. Seldom would pedestrians have the need to use a through-site link to access Everleigh Street when this would not provide any greater convenience compared to accessing via Cleveland Street.</p> <p>A public through-site link is provided at the end of Woodburn Street through the Everleigh Street should pedestrian using Woodburn Street need to access. Providing a second link from Woodburn Street in close proximity to Cleveland Street would not deliver a meaningful benefit to the public.</p> <p>It is also important to note the level changes across the site, making it difficult to relocate the through-site link closer to Cleveland Street. Notwithstanding these constraints, the project team are still eager to explore and provide opportunities for a through-site link which is commensurate to the scale of the development and site context.</p>

	<p>The site context is vastly different to that of the Casba development in Waterloo where there is a more apparent need to provide pedestrian links between the two street frontages. The site is located on a corner, with three frontages, one being a classified road (Cleveland Street). For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the provision of a through-site link similar to that of the Casba development is not warranted.</p>
<b>Architecture</b>	
<p>15. The ambition to reduce the bulk and scale of the development through articulation and permeability is lost with the introduction of the façade bridges. Test alternative options for breaking down the massing, for example, creating a series of smaller buildings that form a courtyard.</p>	<p>Envelope testing has been undertaken for 5 different envelope options – refer to presentation slides. The preferred building massing has been amended to read as a series of building forms from all site boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Cleveland Street:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Full height building indentation to read as 2 building elements</li> <li>○ Increased upper-level setback above 5 storey podium from 3m to 6m</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Eveleigh Street:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Full height building break retained between 5 storey building forms</li> <li>○ Increased upper level setback above 5 storey building form at the intersection with Cleveland Street from 2.5m to 9m</li> <li>○ Increased upper level setback above 5 storey building from 2.5m to 3m</li> <li>○ Reduction of 1 storey for upper levels</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Woodburn Street:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Full height building indentation to read as 2 building elements</li> <li>○ Upper level setback of 1.5m retained</li> <li>○ Upper levels amended to 7 storeys for the southern end of this interface</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Southern Interface to adjacent terraces:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building form setback for greater than 50% of the southern boundary</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Upper-level setback above 5 storey podium of 2m (previously 0m) adjacent neighbouring terraces.</p>
<p>16. Develop a nuanced response to the scale of the neighbouring terrace houses on Woodburn Street, including an alternative option to the glass wall for the southern façade that faces the backyards.</p>	<p>The current built form consists of a 5-storey blank sheer wall along the entire length of the terrace houses at 5-11 Woodburn Street and sets back from the terrace houses at the upper levels, so as to provide the same perceived bulk and same shadow impacts.</p>

	<p>Furthermore, along the length of the corridors a concept will be further developed with the landscape architect, acoustic and fire engineers, through a combination of planter boxes and fire engineered opening solutions so as to soften the interface with the rear private open spaces of terraces.</p> <p>This should be a more positive outcome for the terrace houses than the glass block wall previously envisioned in the SDRP1 conceptual scheme.</p> <p>It should be noted that the whilst the intention is to soften the interface through glazing and landscaping, the eventual solution will need to involve numerous consultants at the next stage of design development in order to balance fire engineering, acoustic, maintenance and privacy concerns.</p>
<p>17. Following the review session, the ventilation strategy was discussed as a key concern for resident amenity. This site has requirements under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 that requires a residential building on a major road and railway corridor to refer to the <a href="#">Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guideline</a> NSW, 2008. Provide details of the ventilation strategy that considers noise and air pollution and adopts a design-based approach as an alternative to plenums which require regular maintenance and cleaning to ensure adequate ventilation and noise attenuation. For example, locate single-loaded corridors along Cleveland Street and Woodburn Street to create a circulation and service buffer, where units receive natural ventilation from the courtyard. If plenums are used, consider vertical plenums rather than horizontal as they provide an internal stack effect. A vertical plenum is approximately 300mm W x 2500mm H x 3300mm L.</p>	<p>The ESD consultant has proposed a combination of cross-flow and stack flow ventilation to all residential units. Occupant control provided to allow management of individual comfort outcomes.</p> <p>Optimal stack flow locations have been identified in diagrams which rely on thermal chimneys which draw air through the stacks utilising air temperature differential. Airflow goes directly into the corridors and then individual rooms can control airflow in the same way as the open corridors.</p>
<b>Sustainability and Climate Change</b>	
<p>18. Aiming for a net-zero building is highly encouraged to reach NSW's Net Zero emissions goal by 2050. Refer to '<a href="#">NSW, DPIE, Net Zero Plan, Stage 1: 2020-2030</a>' for further information.</p>	<p>The sustainability strategy is as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove reliance on fossil fuel usage.</li> <li>2. No gas fired appliances be specified.</li> </ol> <p>Future commitment to renewable energy purchasing of green power.</p>

Table 2. SDRP Review Received 27 April 2022

Comment	Response
<b>Key Issues</b>	
Privacy for the residents versus the requirement for public spaces, including a proposed through-site link. The proposal does not demonstrate how conflicts around safety, overlooking, loss of privacy etc have been resolved or mitigated through design solutions.	<p><u>Safety</u> – The through-site link and courtyard will be open to the public during daytime hours and closed to the public between 9pm – 7am. During these hours, the courtyard will only be accessible via a fob key which will be possessed by residents and staff. Security gates and fencing have been strategically located to ensure after hours public and private areas are clearly defined. Fob keys will also be required for access to upper levels which are dedicated to private resident use. These safety measures are further detailed within the Plan of Management appended to the EIS and the architectural plans.</p> <p><u>Overlooking and privacy</u> – With the exception of the ground floor communal laundry/games room, resident rooms; living areas; and communal open space areas will not be accessible to, or visible by, the public who visit the site. The courtyard will act as a shared space between public and private during daytime hours when it is open to the public.</p>
Amenity for the residents versus the scheme's proposed density. The proposal does not demonstrate how appropriate amenity for residential units, including access to sunlight and natural ventilation, have been resolved or mitigated through design solutions.	<p><u>Resident amenity</u> – The proposal has demonstrated how solar access and natural cross ventilation have been achieved for the development as a whole. It is important to note that amenity outcomes for co-living developments are governed by the Housing SEPP. Specifically for co-living rooms, there are no standards that apply in relation to natural ventilation or solar access (to residential rooms). As such, it is no appropriate to apply such a requirement on this type of residential accommodation in accordance with the EP&amp;A Act.</p>
Access to ventilation and use of exterior spaces versus the site's inherent noise and pollution levels have not been resolved or mitigated in the proposal.	<p><u>Ventilation</u> – The architectural plans demonstrate how natural cross ventilation is achieved through the development and rooms. This is further addressed within the ESD and Acoustic Reports.</p> <p><u>Amenity of communal open space use</u> – The proposal has been design to shield residents and visitors from the harsh environment of Cleveland Street. The built form on Cleveland Street acts as a shield to the ground floor courtyard area to mitigate any potential amenity impacts. Further, the rooftop communal area is provided at a height, and largely setback from Cleveland Street, so that would be subject to this environment. These outcomes are further addressed in the Acoustic Report that appends the EIS and concludes that both communal areas and resident rooms achieve the industry noise level requirements.</p>
Provision of and access to communal spaces at each level of the building appears wholly inadequate for the number and density of proposed residential units.	<p><u>Access to communal living areas</u> – The provision of communal living and open space areas comply with the standards of the Housing SEPP. Living areas and break out areas are provided on multiple levels of the building easily accessible from all levels.</p>

Proposed ground floor spaces are not adequate for street activation due to the requirements of the brief, creating large expanses of blank facades and spaces which are sunken and/or without a clear connection to the street, lacking permeability and active frontages.	<p><u>Street activation</u> – The proposal provides street activation to the majority of the total street frontages. Due to the slope of the site, a commercial tenancy has been introduced on Level 1 which stretches along almost two-thirds the length of Cleveland Street and around the Cleveland and Woodburn Street corner. This facilitates true activation and the ground plane between both corners of the site.</p> <p>It is important to acknowledge however that Woodburn Street does not experience high levels of pedestrian movement and its amenity adjacent to the rail corridor does not lend itself to providing activation at ground level.</p> <p>Due to the pedestrian activity and interface with aligned uses, activation has been focussed along Everleigh Street which comprises a café on the corner and retail premises. With the exception of the pedestrian entry and driveway entry, Everleigh Street is proposed to be fully activated at the ground floor.</p>
Demonstrate the proposal's merit, how Design Excellence is achieved, and how the design conflicts or issues are resolved successfully.	<u>Design excellence</u> – Refer to the EIS and Design Excellence Strategy.
<b>Site Strategy</b>	
Review the proposed land use ratio to enable greater street activation and amenity. The proposed land use deviation of approximately 90% residential and 10% commercial results in very high residential density and lack of amenity.	<p><u>Activation</u> – Refer to above on street activation.</p> <p><u>Amenity</u> – The proposed residential GFA and variation to this standard is not a design consideration and has been addressed within the Clause 16A variation request and EIS. Similar residential GFA has previously been approved for the site where it has demonstrated that an acceptable level of amenity can be achieved. In this respect, the proposal satisfies all amenity development standards relevant to the proposed development to ensure residents and visitors are not adversely impacted by either built form or existing site conditions. The amount of residential GFA proposed as no bearing on the amenity of residents as they would benefit from the provision of living areas and communal open space which exceed those requirements of the Housing SEPP.</p>
Create improvements to the public realm and amenity of Everleigh Street and Woodburn Street in response to the harsh environment of Cleveland Street. Consider pedestrian and bicycle safety.	<p><u>Public realm and pedestrian/bicycle safety</u> – The proposal represents a significant improvement to the streetscape and public realm through the introduction of a design that appropriately responds to the prevailing character of the area and introduces street trees and landscaping which softens the views to the site and building.</p> <p>Internal areas and pedestrian/bicycle entrances are appropriately shielded and setback from the harsh environment of Cleveland Street.</p>

<p>Increase street activation with commercial spaces that are clearly and directly accessible from the street. Review the street frontage to provide further prominence and street activity. Provide a setback for outdoor seating as appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Activation</u> – Refer to above on street activation.</p> <p><u>Outdoor seating</u> – not appropriate due to harsh environment of Cleveland Street and setbacks from street are consistent with prevailing building lines.</p>
<p>Clarify areas open to the public and the location of the secure line. A completely open public courtyard poses security and privacy concerns.</p>	<p><u>Public/Private open space areas</u> – The through-site link and courtyard will be open to the public during daytime hours and closed to the public between 9pm – 7am. During these hours, the courtyard will only be accessible via a fob key which will be possessed by residents and staff. Security gates and fencing have been strategically located to ensure after hours public and private areas are clearly defined. Fob keys will also be required for access to upper levels which are dedicated to private resident use. These safety measures are further detailed within the Plan of Management appended to the EIS and the architectural plans.</p>
<p>Review the purpose of the through-site link. The link should provide a clear line of sight to be successful and must resolve privacy and security concerns.</p>	<p><u>Through-site link</u> – While a through-site link has been provided, due to the location and context of the site, this is not intended to act as a major thoroughfare for pedestrians. In this respect, the site is located at the end of the block (not mid-block) and pedestrians moving from the station or along Everleigh Street are more inclined to use Cleveland Street as a route as providing a connection from the site would not provide any measurable benefit to commuting times/distance.</p> <p>Further, Woodburn Street is not frequently used by pedestrians as it leads to a dead-end. A pedestrian link is provided at the end of Woodburn Street linking to Everleigh Street, which further reduces the need for another through-site link at the site's location.</p> <p>See above regarding safety and security.</p>
<p>Provide additional communal open space on each level as the residential units are minimal in size. Communal space is essential in preventing social isolation.</p>	<p><u>Communal open space</u> – The proposal exceeds the required communal open space (403.38m<sup>2</sup>) of the Housing SEPP by approximately 1,055.4m<sup>2</sup> (or 260%) through the provision of open space on the ground floor; Level 5 and Level 6. These areas are easily accessible from all levels. The room sizes have been designed in accordance with the Housing SEPP.</p>
<p>Provide details of the ventilation strategy that resolves noise and air pollution through design solutions.</p>	<p><u>Ventilation strategy</u> – The architectural plans demonstrate how natural cross ventilation is achieved through the development and rooms. This is further addressed within the ESD and Acoustic Reports.</p>
<p>Provide adequate separation within the courtyard for ventilation, privacy and solar access.</p>	<p><u>Building separation</u> – Adequate separation within the courtyard has been provided to achieve appropriate and compliance ventilation and solar access outcomes. While strict compliance with the building separation distances of the ADG are not achieved, the rooms across the courtyard will experience high levels of privacy and by providing Juliette balconies at these locations, a greater level of amenity is achieved. These balconies have been included following advice from the SDRP and while these could be removed to enable the adoption of privacy elements at windows, the balconies are considered to represent a superior design and amenity outcome for residents.</p>

Connecting with Country	
Adopt a more comprehensive approach to Connecting with Country beyond the use of motifs, colour and the landscape that responds to the amenity concerns and context of Redfern. For example, include economic opportunities for Indigenous businesses.	<u>Aboriginal enterprise/community use</u> – A 'multipurpose' room on the ground floor has been dedicated for the purpose of part time community use/events. Size and function of this space has been provided in consultation with Tribal Warrior who advised of the need for such a space. It was learnt during engagement with Tribal Warrior that use of such a space would only be needed on a part time basis.
Simplify the building forms to respond to the urban design and context issues in the first instance. Integrate Country narratives into the project in ways that reinforce rather than detract from existing urban patterns.  Indigenous patterns should be embedded into the architecture instead of as superficial treatments. For example, the corner artwork could be created through brickwork patterning.	<u>Building form and Country narratives that reinforce existing urban patterns</u> – The design of the building has been re-visited to introduce Country narratives to the façade and form. In this respect, Indigenous patterns in architecture have been introduced into the brickwork on both Cleveland Street corners of the site.
Demonstrate how Connecting with Country initiatives can be guaranteed in the project's subsequent phases.	<u>Connecting with Country commitments</u> – As provided in the Public Art Strategy which appends the EIS, there is a commitment by the proponent to continue engagement with local groups and artists to ensure the local artists are commissioned to provide artwork to dedicated spaces.
Continue the local Indigenous engagement throughout the project life cycle. Engage a female Indigenous representative (ideally a female Gadigal representative) as the Cox Inall Ridgeway Aboriginal community engagement report emphasises women should be consulted on the design, particularly around water elements.	<u>Continued engagement</u> – As provided in the Public Art Strategy, it is the intension to commission a female Indigenous artists to provide art work to those dedicated spaces. This is particularly the case for the ground floor courtyard water elements.
Clarify what area will be accessible to the community and when will they be invited to these spaces, such as the Indigenous rooftop farm.	<u>Community accessible spaces</u> – Refer to above comments on safety and security.
Develop a strategy and budget for the Indigenous rooftop farm and the general landscaping maintenance. This is an opportunity to employ a First Nations person trained in horticulture. Refer to the South Eveleigh Community Rooftop Garden case study by Landscape Performance Series as a reference.	The ongoing use and maintenance of the proposed rooftop garden has been considered by the project team and considered to be a valuable and viable design and amenity element for the development.

Landscape	
The landscape proposition lacks sufficient detail to be properly evaluated. The landscape design needs to be integrated with the architectural spaces and demonstrate a cohesive proposition.	The Landscape Plans which accompany the EIS provide sufficient detail.
The area of deep soil has not been maximised for the provision of trees but rather is largely occupied by service and back of house areas.	
Planting should have access to sunlight. Access to sunlight remains an issue within the courtyard and the southern walkway planters.	<u>Sunlight access to planting and courtyard</u> – With the exception of some areas within the courtyard, all planting have access to adequate sunlight. The plant species provided within the courtyard have been chosen as they do not require high levels of sunlight.
The vast majority of communal spaces are provided on rooftops. Demonstrate how these will provide year-round amenity, including protection from sun, wind, inclement weather, heat and cold.	<u>Amenity of rooftop open space</u> – The open rooftop areas include trees and shading devices (where appropriate) to ensure these spaces can be used during summer months. These areas also adjoin internal communal living areas which can be used as refuge in the event of inclement weather.
Sustainability	
The proposal has not demonstrated any sustainability propositions, metrics or outcomes.	Refer to the ESD Report that accompanies the EIS.

## 5 Conclusion

This Design Review Report provides a succinct overview of the feedback received from the SDRP and the Applicant's responses to the matters raised through this process.

The project team have, where possibly, provided meaningful and considered responses to the matters raised by the SDRP as detailed in the responses in this report.

We acknowledge that the SSDA will be referred back to the SDRP for review during the assessment phase and we welcome the opportunity to discuss the proposal further.



Suite 1204B, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street  
Sydney, New South Wales 2000

[info@mecone.com.au](mailto:info@mecone.com.au)  
[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)