

Appendix E – Urban Design Consultative Group – Meeting Minutes

URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

Item No:	3
Date of Panel Assessment:	20 th June 2012
Address of Project:	1 King Street, Newcastle
Name of Project (if applicable):	The Esplanade Project
DA Number:	2012/0549
No. of Buildings:	One (separate Hotel and Apartment components)
No. of Units:	48 x 2 Bedroom units, 96 x 1 Bedroom units.
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Philip Pollard noted a non-significant interest with family members owning apartments in the Hannell at the Royal development.
Attendees:	Keith Stronach – Stronach Property Richard Anderson – Stronach Property David Rose – Suters Architects Angus Rose – Suters Architects Andrew Biller – deWitt Consulting Steven Masia – Newcastle City Council Peter Chrystal – Newcastle City Council

This report is based on the ten Design Quality Principles set out in State Environmental Planning Policy No.65 which must be addressed in considering residential flat development in NSW. It is also an appropriate format for applications, which do not include residential flats.

1. Context

This site is the last remaining parcel of land on the former Royal Hospital site. This area was subject of a Master Plan prepared by Landcom and approved by the Department of Planning. The site is surrounded by existing buildings to the North, West and South and has unobstructed views over the ocean to the East. To the North of the site is the recently completed Mirvac development of the Royal Apartments and Sebel Hotel. These buildings vary in height from 8 to 16 storeys. To the West of the site is the former David Maddison Clinical Sciences Building. This building varies in height as it steps up along Watt Street towards the South. This building varies from 2 to 6 storeys. At the South-West corner of the site, it adjoins the recent Arvia Apartment Building. This building is 10 storeys in height.

The placements of the proposed buildings, their height, street setbacks, etc., have all been pre-determined by the Approved Master Plan. This Master Plan took into consideration not only the development potential of the Royal Hospital site, but also critical factors such as the overshadowing of Newcastle Beach, protection from the harsh, ocean-front environment and the opportunity to develop facilities along the

beach front which were largely lacking within Newcastle. Another important consideration of the Master Plan was that the footprint and location of each of the buildings, considered the views so that no individual building, as far as possible, obstructed the views for the other buildings on the site. The only major change from the Approved Master Plan is the proposed retention of the David Maddison Building, which had been intended for demolition and replacement under the Master Plan by a taller building. The Group strongly supports the building's retention as a significant piece of modern architecture in the city.

The site is complicated by the falls from South to North. The Applicants advise that there is approximately 7 metres fall from the highest point at the Southern boundary to the lowest point at the North boundary. These falls are consistent with the gradient in Shortland Esplanade.

The site is further complicated by the need to retain an existing carpark on the site, which was constructed some time ago as part of the Clinical Sciences development. Access to this carpark from King Street and Shortland Esplanade needs to be included in the design, as well as underground linkage to any new carparking provided.

The most significant aspect of the site are the spectacular views over the Ocean and Newcastle Beach. These views range from the Newcastle Baths to the Northeast, over Newcastle Beach directly East and to the headlands to the South. This exposure to the coastline also brings the problem of the harsh environmental conditions, particularly the strong, southerly winds that generally are accompanied by storms and rain.

Part of the context of this Newcastle Beach frontage, is the social aspects of the beach and the many recreational activities associated with the beach and Newcastle Baths. The beach frontage forms part of very popular walkways that link the harbour and the beaches in a continuous line through King Edward Park to Merewether. With the completion of the Mirvac development, there has been further stimulus to the cafes, restaurants and bars that have occupied the lower levels of the new buildings, which have become very popular as a year-round destination beside the beach.

2. Scale

As mentioned previously, the scale for the development on this site has been largely pre-determined by the approved Master Plan. The buildings proposed generally comply with the footprint and heights indicated in the Master Plan.

The exceptions to this compliance are the footprint of the South building, which has been brought forward a short distance to the street line along Shortland Esplanade, rather than adhering to the setback stipulated in the Master Plan. This is a minor variation to the Master Plan, and it was agreed that the proposal sat more comfortably at this point with the Arvia building to its west, which adopts a similar

proximity to the street-front. The height of the South building is one to two storeys above the height approved in the Master Plan. The Applicants have stated that the height and form adopted for the South building better relates to the existing Arvia Apartments and in overall urban design terms, forms suitable massing in relation to the Arvia Apartments, the Royal's Nixon Apartments and McCaffrey Building (including the Sebel Hotel). The Group supported this view. The minor additional height proposed in the south building was considered a better urban outcome in the context of the surrounding development than strict adherence to the approved Master Plan – which was prepared in the absence of a final design for Arvia building site. The Group noted that the minor addition in height to the South building did not significantly impact overshadowing of the beach – which is an important consideration.

According to the Applicant's submission, the proposal complies with the gross floor area requirements as set out in the Master Plan. We understand Council will review these calculations in consultation with the Applicants to finalise these figures.

The Group suggested that a physical model of the development be included in the model previously prepared by the Mirvac Group for the Royal Development. The provision of the model will be of great assistance in assessing the impact of the proposal. The Group also requested realistic, street level photomontages so that the proposal can be seen in relation to the adjoining buildings and with more accurate images of the materials and colours proposed. The Applicants agreed to provide this additional presentation material.

Generally, the Group had no objection to the massing and scale proposed by the Applicants.

3. Built Form

The Approved Master Plan stipulated requirements for the built-form of any development on this site. The Applicants have generally complied with the Master Plan. There is a setback to Shortland Esplanade on the East side of the hotel component of the project (Northeast corner of the site). This setback is intended to be landscaped as a roof garden above the restaurant facilities. The difficulty of establishing satisfactory landscaping in this harsh environment will be discussed elsewhere in this report. The setback proposed is an opportunity to provide some public amenity from Shortland Esplanade, as well as maintaining the view corridor for the McCaffrey Wing located to the North of the development. The South building is aligned to Shortland Esplanade with zero setbacks.

The North building steps back from Shortland Esplanade forming a right angle with the McCaffrey Wing.

The building has varied facade treatments to express the different internal accommodation. The hotel portion on the lower floors has been given a different façade treatment to the residential areas on the upper floor. Above the seventh storey, two levels of the building have been given a more glazed treatment, to form a visual break between the lower section of the building and the upper storeys. Above this two-storey portion, the residential component of the North building extends to its full height.

While the design strategy of expressing the different functions of the building is supported, the images show that the South building containing only residential

functions has been given much the same treatment as the hotel. The Applicants are encouraged to give further consideration to the South building, with a façade more consistent with this strategy of giving unique expression to distinguish the residential and hotel uses.

The Applicants stated that the final selection and detailing of materials and colours for the external of the building is still on going. Various options are being explored and tested within the overall budgeting of the project. The building is likely to be a mixture of pre-cast concrete elements, sandstone cladding, glass louvres and glass balustrades for the Decks. The Group requested the final selections of colour and materials be presented at the same time as the updated photomontages, etc., to enable proper consideration of the built form.

4. Density

As previously noted the Approved Master Plan set the controls for gross floor areas and building heights. We understand from the Applicant's submission that this proposal complies with these Master Plan controls. Council will review the documentation submitted in further detail in due course for compliance with these controls.

The design submitted illustrating the controls set under the Master Plan, confirms that the scale, height and massing is appropriate for this location.

5. Resource, Energy and Water Efficiency

The Applicants have advised that 70% of the units achieve the required exposure to sunlight in accordance with SEPP 65. This has been achieved despite the difficulties of the orientation-facing majority of units East and South. The Applicants have provided a number of "through" apartments, so that there is frontage to both the West and East sides of the building. The Applicants have also included other measures such as provision of sunscreens to the Western façade, promotion of cross-ventilation, control of the harsh, strong winds with glass louvres to balconies. In their submission, the Applicants have also stated that the units will be fitted with energy efficient appliances and light fittings, etc., in accordance with the normal Basix requirements.

6. Landscape

As noted elsewhere in this report, further montage images are required of the courtyards and entry spaces, which will allow a better understanding and appreciation of the proposed open landscaped spaces. The inclusion of proposed landscaped spaces on the existing Mirvac scale model would be very helpful in this regard.

It was acknowledged by the Group that the site and its orientation are very exposed to salt-laden winds, which severely limit the capacity of even the most salt tolerant species to thrive. Wind studies for the courtyard and entry spaces are desirable to facilitate and inform design development. The species selection was generally supported, and the strategy of providing a secluded garden entry on the western side of the North building where larger trees are more capable of viability.

It was also suggested that an assessment of wind loads be made on the two proposed Cook Island Pines to ensure that soil depths are sufficient to retain the mature trees in extreme wind events.

While the proposed “whistle screen” was considered to be a potentially interesting inclusion, testing on site would need to be undertaken to ensure the prevailing strong winds do not produce noise levels that can become an annoyance.

Once further information is provided by way of the above, a more detailed analysis of the proposed landscape can be undertaken.

7. Amenity

Generally, the majority of the units provide satisfactory amenity. As many units as possible have been located to obtain the attractive views over the beach and ocean. The Group had concerns with the units located on the lowest level of the South building, particularly at the Southern end of the site. These units appear to be at, or very close to, footpath level in Shortland Esplanade, and have been set forward to the street boundary. This creates obvious problems of security, privacy, etc. It was suggested that these units be reviewed and appropriate measures provided to ensure satisfactory living conditions. Consideration could also be given to commercial uses for these at-grade spaces, given their attractive aspect and proximity to the street.

A number of units on the West side of the building may require further consideration of the amenity provided (Unit 6, South Building and Units 9, 10, 11 and 12, North Building). The floor plans of these units are irregular, making furnishing difficult and with Kitchen and laundry facilities quite limited. Consideration might be given to possibly amalgamating Units 11 and 12 into a single, two Bedroom units or single Bedroom unit with Studio, which would have much better opportunity for functional living arrangements.

The Group also expressed concern regarding the Entrances to both apartment buildings, in particular the South Building. Greater consideration needs to be given to security, weather protection and definition of the Entrances to enable visitors to find individual apartments. The Entrances are not highly visible from the drawings provided and protection from the elements appears less than can be achieved.

The Group suggested that a wind study for the Entrances to the apartments, the landscaped forecourt and Hotel entry would be highly beneficial. A wind study could indicate subtle, but significant improvements in the control and deflection of winds, to improve the access to buildings and protection from the elements for both the occupants and the surrounding spaces.

The Group also raised the issue of circulation alternatives available to residents when the lifts are being serviced. Opportunities should be explored so that a link at upper levels can be provided for alternative lift services for the residents. The Applicants are currently considering the possibility of making the hotel lift available for residents during these circumstances.

Storage for larger bulky items of the residents such as sporting equipment, etc., has been provided in the basement. The extent of storage in relation to the number of units has not been advised.

Consideration should be given to vehicle set-down area at the Entrance to the South building. The use of the Hotel Porte Cochere for this purpose may prove unsatisfactory due to the distance involved.

8. Safety and Security

The Group understood the rationale for the location of the apartment building Entrances on the Western side of both the North and South buildings.

While this location gives better weather protection, it also raises the issue of security with the absence of the usual street surveillance. The Applicants undertook to consider the entrance sequence for both buildings in more detail.

As previously mentioned the Group questioned the security and amenity of the Ground Floor units of the South building and requires further design refinement.

9. Social Dimensions

The development comprises a mixture of 1 Bedroom and 2 Bedroom apartments. We understand that during the marketing phase, buyers will be given the option of consolidating apartments to create 3 Bedroom apartments. The Group was advised that the apartments will vary in price depending on the location within the building (East or West side) and the height within the building, so that a range of pricing is available.

The access to facilities in this location is considered excellent. The residents of this development will have access to the beach and ocean baths, the cafes and parks in the immediate surroundings. The Applicants have also advised that the residents will most likely be offered membership to use the hotel facilities. Due to the beachside location, the design includes outdoor shower facilities for use in conjunction with the beach, surfing, etc.

10. Aesthetics

The Group was generally supportive of the design approach in terms of concept materials, colours, etc. This support is subject to further details being provided by the Applicants of the final selections for these items.

While it is difficult to be precise given the relatively preliminary nature of the drawings submitted, the articulation of the buildings, particularly where the North and South building change alignment, should be given further consideration. At present, the building simply “bends or folds” in Elevation as the façade angle changes to the street alignment. There is an opportunity to create a richer and more interesting expression or articulation of this change in alignment.

Also, as was noted earlier, if the different functions of the building are to be given differing visual expressions, the duplication of the hotel treatment for the residential portion of the South building is questionable. The Group suggests that further consideration be given to the Shortland Esplanade Elevation of the South building.

The residential Entrances as mentioned previously, also require further refinement and definition so that there is clear indication of the Entrances to these, significant residential developments. As there are two separate residential components within the one development, the distinction between the two entrances is important.

The Group suggests that these matters of refinement are included in the further submission from the Applicants, which will include the model and the photomontages, with more accurate depictions of the actual building and materials.

Recommendation:

The Group was generally quite supportive of this proposal, apart from the matters noted above which require further consideration. This proposal, which substantially complies with the Approved Master Plan, validates the principles expressed in this document. With satisfactory resolution of the matters noted, this proposal would represent an attractive addition to the city, and could be supported by the Group for Development Approval.

URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING

Item No:	2
Date of Panel Assessment:	1 May 2013
Address of Project:	1 King Street, Newcastle
Name of Project (if applicable):	The Esplanade Project
DA Number:	2012/0549
No. of Buildings:	One (separate Hotel and Apartment components)
No. of Units:	48 x 2 Bedroom units, 96 x 1 Bedroom units.
Declaration of Conflict of Interest:	Philip Pollard noted a non-significant interest with family members owning apartments in the Hannell at the Royal development.
Attendees:	Keith Stronach – Stronach Property Richard Anderson – Stronach Property David Rose – Suters Architects Steven Masia – Newcastle City Council Geoff Douglass – Newcastle City Council

This report is based on the ten Design Quality Principles set out in State Environmental Planning Policy No.65 which must be addressed in considering residential flat development in NSW. It is also an appropriate format for applications, which do not include residential flats.

Introduction:

This is the second occasion on which the UDCG has considered the subject proposal, the first being in June 1012. At that stage the Group was broadly supportive of the proposal, which it viewed as largely compliant with the intent of the previously approved Master Plan for the site. Since that time, the Planning Assessment Commission has approved variations to the Master Plan which essentially accommodate the principal departures of the proposal from the earlier plan. In particular the Group welcomed the applicant's decision to retain the former David Maddison Building in Watt Street.

As is generally the case with projects of this complexity and significance, the Group identified at its initial consideration of the proposal in June 1012, a range of issues which required design resolution, further design development, and more comprehensive documentation. By comparison, in the case of the nearby Stage 1 of the Royal development by Mirvac, as well as Stronach's ARVIA building and the North Wing and York developments, in each instance the Group met on multiple occasions with the proponents and their consultants as designs were progressed, and it was anticipated that the proposal for the subject site would be similarly approached. It was also anticipated that a substantially greater level of visual representation of the proposal would be provided by way of a contextual model and

photomontage images, prior to a recommendation being made by the Group to the Consent Authority.

The Group had in late April 2013 been electronically circulated with four sketches of options for the eastern façade treatment of the proposal. In response it was noted on 24 April 2013: *“The architects have provided preliminary sketch designs of four options for the east/south-facing facades, accompanied by photographic images of various materials and finishes. Although the earlier submission had also included computer-generated three-dimensional images of the development, these have not been provided with the current submission. For such a large and important building these are essential...”* Further, the Group commented: *“As with all of the options this is illustrated only at ‘schematic’ level and could not be endorsed unless further developed.”* In respect to previously raised planning and amenity issues it was noted that *“It is assumed that other concerns as such as the proximity of the ground floor units to the road and footpath, and problems with the southern entry will also be addressed.”*

The meeting of 1 May 2013 was presented with two perspective renderings of the “4th option” eastern façade of the building which represent its appearance from the east and the south east. In these 3D representations, the surrounding buildings are shown only as grey forms, and no landscaping is shown. The corresponding east elevation was also presented. The only other documentation provided to the Group was four hand sketched plans indicating suggested alterations to the apartment floor plans to slightly increase the area of decks. As the information in respect to the development provided to the Group was essentially limited to the treatment of one major façade, the majority of this report focuses upon that aspect. For clarity, where other issues had previously been raised by the Group and remained in its view in need of further design resolution, these are touched upon below by way of reference to extracts from the June 2012 report.

11. Context

This site is the last remaining parcel of land on the former Royal Hospital site. This area is subject of a revised Master Plan recently approved by the Planning Assessment Commission. The site is surrounded by existing buildings to the North, West and South and has unobstructed views over the ocean to the East. To the North of the site is the previously completed Mirvac development of the Royal Apartments and Novotel Hotel. These buildings vary in height from 8 to 15 storeys. To the West of the site is the former David Maddison Clinical Sciences Building. This building varies in height as it steps up along Watt Street towards the South. This building varies from 2 to 6 storeys. At the South-West corner of the site, it adjoins the recent Arvia Apartment Building. This building is 10 storeys in height.

The placements of the proposed buildings, their height, street setbacks, etc., have largely been determined by the revised Master Plan. This Master Plan took into consideration not only the development potential of the Royal Hospital site, but also critical factors such as the overshadowing of Newcastle Beach, protection from the harsh, ocean-front environment and the opportunity to develop facilities along the beach front which were largely lacking within Newcastle. Another important consideration of the Master Plan was that the footprint and location of each of the buildings, considered the views so that no individual building, as far as possible, obstructed the views for the other buildings on the site. The only major change from the Approved Master Plan is the proposed retention of the David Maddison Building, which had been intended for demolition and replacement under the

previous Master Plan by a taller building. The Group strongly supports the building's retention as a significant piece of modern architecture in the city.

The most significant aspects of the site are its spectacular coastal location and its close juxtaposition with the eastern heritage sections of the city. The site is therefore highly prominent in a number of important visual catchments, including from the south and west (Watt Street and Fletcher Park), from Shortland Esplanade, and because of its scale, from many points around the city. The site enjoys spectacular views over the Ocean and Newcastle Beach. These views range from the Newcastle Baths to the Northeast, over Newcastle Beach directly East and to the headlands to the South. This exposure to the coastline also brings the problem of the harsh environmental conditions, particularly the strong, southerly winds that generally are accompanied by storms and rain.

Part of the context of this Newcastle Beach frontage, is the social aspects of the beach and the many recreational activities associated with the beach and Newcastle Baths. The beach frontage forms part of very popular walkways that link the harbour and the beaches in a continuous line through King Edward Park to Merewether. With the completion of the Mirvac development, there has been further stimulus to the cafes, restaurants and bars that have occupied the lower levels of the new buildings, which have become very popular as a year-round destination beside the beach.

12. Scale

As mentioned previously, the scale for the development on this site has been largely pre-determined by the revised Master Plan. The buildings proposed generally comply with the footprint and heights indicated in the Master Plan. The Group raised no issues with the scale and massing of the proposal, but noted at its June 2012 meeting:

The Group suggested that a physical model of the development be included in the model previously prepared by the Mirvac Group for the Royal Development. The provision of the model will be of great assistance in assessing the impact of the proposal. The Group also requested realistic, street level photomontages so that the proposal can be seen in relation to the adjoining buildings and with more accurate images of the materials and colours proposed. The Applicants agreed to provide this additional presentation material.

13. Built Form

While accepting the massing and general layout of the proposal, the Group previously commented in June 2012:

"The building has varied facade treatments to express the different internal accommodation. The hotel portion on the lower floors has been given a different façade treatment to the residential areas on the upper floor...

While the design strategy of expressing the different functions of the building is supported, the images show that the South building containing only residential functions has been given much the same treatment as the hotel. The Applicants are encouraged to give further consideration to the South building, with a façade more consistent with this strategy of giving unique expression to distinguish the residential and hotel uses."

The revised façade options attempted to address this issue, and the option considered to have the most potential (No4) was also tabled by the applicants at the meeting as a 3D rendering. Considerable discussion ensued in respect to the revised proposal, with the consensus of the Group being that further design development was highly desirable. While individual Group members offered different suggestions in respect to options for improving the façade treatment, the underlying concerns were shared by all members of the Group.

Of most concern was the junction between the Hotel element and the Southern apartment building, which included a glazed balustrade component which, in plan, turned back towards the Hotel façade by way of a faceted curve. While the stated intent of marking the junction between the two buildings and functions with a recessive element was supported, the protrusion of the apartment decks beyond the line of the hotel façade was considered to be counter to this objective. The full glazing of the balustrades at this point was also considered to be undesirable, however the overall concern about the form would not be simply addressed by making the balustrades more solid. The Group was of the view that the manner in which the buildings “cranked” in plan at this point required further design development, which included a physical recess at this point. This would involve the removal of at least part of the balcony of the apartments adjacent to the “crank”.

While differentiating the treatment of the hotel façade from the residential façade components was supported, it was suggested by Group members that the façade would be assisted by greater consistency between the apartment component of the northern building and the southern building apartments. The Group recommended in selecting materials colours and finishes generally, a cohesive overall development was desirable.

In respect to the expressed rectangular large-scaled frame proposed for the Hotel and Southern buildings, the Group was advised that the projected frame element which forms the rectangular patterning protrudes only some 300mm beyond the surrounding facades. There was some doubt expressed by the Group that this would be sufficient to make this element readily legible. This detail contrasts with the precedent photograph provided as part the façade options, which depicted “glazing elements set with patterned frame element” in which the frame was a more substantial structure which sat forward of and separate to the glass façade. Irrespective of this, the detailing of the facades within the rectangular frame element would be important to the presentation of the building, and glazing details and the degree of transparency of the hotel windows would be crucial considerations. The Group noted that unless a sophisticated double glazing system were utilized, a fully glazed façade to a hotel room potentially brings issues of privacy, sun control and external appearance (eg. will internal curtains be visible from the exterior?) If semi-reflective glazing is used, this has a reverse effect at night, in addition to undesirable visual impacts externally. It was suggested that an internal solid spandrel upstand would assist in addressing some of these concerns.

In June 2012 the Group noted: *“The Applicants stated that the final selection and detailing of materials and colours for the external of the building is still on going. Various options are being explored and tested within the overall budgeting of the project. The building is likely to be a mixture of pre-cast concrete elements, sandstone cladding, glass louvres and glass balustrades for the Decks. The Group requested the final selections of colour and materials be presented at the same*

time as the updated photomontages, etc., to enable proper consideration of the built form.” There apparently remain decisions to be made by the Applicant in respect to materials selection, and as yet neither the requested photomontages (including the surrounding context) nor the final colours and materials have been provided. The issue of the treatment of the extensive blank wall sections on the northern and southern facades of the taller (Northern) building was raised, which was considered very important because of their extent and prominence. The Architect advised that stone cladding was no longer a likely option, and that other possibilities were being explored. The Group reiterated its view that these elements of the building warranted very careful detailing and a quality finish, with a view to its ongoing capacity to gracefully weather the harsh conditions. The London Olympics Athletes Village was offered as a possible precedent which demonstrates a sensitive handling of a similar form.

14. Density

The Group noted that, in respect to the proposed Loggia spaces on the apartments of the Northern building, a practical approach was encouraged in respect to interpretation of what is considered to be “external space”. The degree of permanent opening of the proposed louvre systems that is required to count these spaces as decks rather than internal space as far as FSR should be practically applied in the Group’s view. While not suggesting that the Loggia spaces be made completely weather tight, sufficient adjustment in the louvre mechanisms should be permitted to temper weather extremes in this location and to make the Loggia spaces usable in windy weather.

15. Resource, Energy and Water Efficiency

No further comments.

16. Landscape

In respect to landscape, the Group noted the following at its June 2012 meeting: *“As noted elsewhere in this report, further montage images are required of the courtyards and entry spaces, which will allow a better understanding and appreciation of the proposed open landscaped spaces. The inclusion of proposed landscaped spaces on the existing Mirvac scale model would be very helpful in this regard... It was acknowledged by the Group that the site and its orientation are very exposed to salt-laden winds, which severely limit the capacity of even the most salt tolerant species to thrive. Wind studies for the courtyard and entry spaces are desirable to facilitate and inform design development... It was also suggested that an assessment of wind loads be made on the two proposed Cook Island and Norfolk Pines to ensure that soil depths are sufficient to retain the mature trees in extreme wind events... Once further information is provided by way of the above, a more detailed analysis of the proposed landscape can be undertaken.”*

No new documentation was provided in respect to landscape by the Applicant, now was landscape depicted in the 3D rendering of the building façade tabled at the meeting. It was therefore not possible to undertake the foreshadowed more detailed analysis of the proposed landscape treatment.

17. Amenity

The Group noted at its June 2012 meeting: *“The Group had concerns with the units located on the lowest level of the South building, particularly at the Southern end of the site. These units appear to be at, or very close to, footpath level in Shortland Esplanade, and have been set forward to the street boundary. This creates obvious problems of security, privacy, etc. It was suggested that these units be reviewed and appropriate measures provided to ensure satisfactory living conditions. Consideration could also be given to commercial uses for these at-grade spaces, given their attractive aspect and proximity to the street.*

A number of units on the West side of the building may require further consideration of the amenity provided (Unit 6, South Building and Units 9, 10, 11 and 12, North Building). The floor plans of these units are irregular, making furnishing difficult and with Kitchen and laundry facilities quite limited. Consideration might be given to possibly amalgamating Units 11 and 12 into a single, two Bedroom units or single Bedroom unit with Studio, which would have much better opportunity for functional living arrangements.

The Group also expressed concern regarding the Entrances to both apartment buildings, in particular the South Building. Greater consideration needs to be given to security, weather protection and definition of the Entrances to enable visitors to find individual apartments. The Entrances are not highly visible from the drawings provided and protection from the elements appears less than can be achieved.”

No advice was offered at the Meeting that any of the above issues had been considered or addressed. The only change to the plans that the Group was made aware of, related to marginally increasing the area of several decks – which was considered by the Group to be a lesser concern than several of the matters raised above.

18. Safety and Security

No further information was provided in respect to the following earlier comments by the Group:

“The Group understood the rationale for the location of the apartment building Entrances on the Western side of both the North and South buildings.

While this location gives better weather protection, it also raises the issue of security with the absence of the usual street surveillance. The Applicants undertook to consider the entrance sequence for both buildings in more detail.

The Group questioned the security and amenity of the Ground Floor units of the South building and requires further design refinement.”

19. Social Dimensions

Previous comments were reiterated in respect to the prospective positive contribution of the development to the city.

20. Aesthetics

Previously (June 2012) the Group indicated that it *“was generally supportive of the design approach in terms of concept materials, colours, etc. This support is subject to further details being provided by the Applicants of the final selections for these items.*

While it is difficult to be precise given the relatively preliminary nature of the drawings submitted, the articulation of the buildings, particularly where the North and South building change alignment, should be given further consideration. At present, the building simply “bends or folds” in Elevation as the façade angle changes to the street alignment. There is an opportunity to create a richer and more interesting expression or articulation of this change in alignment...

The residential Entrances as mentioned previously, also require further refinement and definition so that there is clear indication of the Entrances to these, significant residential developments. As there are two separate residential components within the one development, the distinction between the two entrances is important.

The Group suggests that these matters of refinement are included in the further submission from the Applicants, which will include the model and the photomontages, with more accurate depictions of the actual building and materials.

Much of the design development and additional documentation described above remains to be undertaken. In the absence of this, the Group is not in a position to provide unqualified support.

Recommendation:

The Group previously offered its broad support to the proposal, subject to consideration of a number of issues and appropriate design development. As is evident in the minutes of the previous (June 2012) meeting, it was anticipated that a developed design response to the issues raised, as well as substantial additional information, would be provided prior to the Group being in a position to support the Development Application.

While remaining supportive in principle of the proposal and its potential positive contribution to the city, the extremely limited additional information provided to date, and the absence of response to a number of identified important issues precludes the Group's support of the Application until these are addressed and resolved.