

Wollongong Design Review Panel
Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2016/1061

Date	28 th February 2017
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration offices
Panel members	(Member) Brendan Randles (Member) Iain Stewart (Chair) Tony Quinn
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Pier Panozzo, Manager City Centre & Major Development David Fitzgibbon, Senior Development Project Officer, WCC Lucretia Liu, Planning Intern, WCC
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Austin Tuon – GEAR UP PROPERTIES PTY LTD
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	2
DA number	DA-2016/1061 This proposal was previously considered by the Design Review Panel on 15 September 2016 and 19 th December 2016. At this meeting the Panel made a number of recommendations which have influenced the design outcome proposed in the current application. This design review Panel has considered the previous panel comments in these recommendations.
Reasons for consideration by DRP	Clause 28 SEPP 65, Clause 7.18 WLEP 2009
Determination pathway	SEPP65 also JRPP form determination as valued \$43.7M (CIV more than \$20M)
Property address	28-32 Young Street & 29-31 Belmore Street, Wollongong
Proposal	Mixed use - Proposed demolition of all structures and construction of a seventeen (17) storey mixed use development containing three (3) additional basement parking levels. The development will comprise forty six (46) residential apartments (at levels 9-17), ninety (90) hotel rooms and associated restaurants and conference room (at levels 3-8) and 3 food and drink premises at the street level fronting both Belmore and Young Streets.
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	The Applicant presented a revised proposal, with reference to Panel's comments and changes in response to them. A discussion followed focussing on ongoing issues and possible means to addressing them.
Background	The site was previously inspected by the Panel.
Design quality principals SEPP65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	The panel indicated the proposal is a well resolved scheme. It was suggested that setbacks be indicated on elevations in accordance with ADG. The proposal is excellently drawn in plan, section and 3D. Advice has been heeded providing a good outcome.
Built Form and Scale	Acceptable
Density	Acceptable
Sustainability	Acceptable
Landscape	Acceptable

Amenity	<p>The universal access on the ground floor was considered a bit tortured and a scissor lift was recommended for disabled access adjacent to the fire stair.</p> <p>Adaptable apartments were queried as to how they'd changed. This was explained.</p>
Safety	Acceptable
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	Acceptable
Aesthetics	<p>The panel suggested the rear elevation louvres be removed and this level made consistent with the levels above. (The applicant said the louvers were there to resolve noise mitigation – perhaps there is an alternative strategy available to address this?)</p> <p>It was suggested the void areas adjacent to hotel courtyard wall blades could be infilled as deck area or TV lounge etc.</p>
Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	Yes
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	Yes
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	View corridors are well considered
Whether the proposed development detrimentally overshadows an area shown distinctively coloured and numbered on the Sun Plane Protection Map,	N/A
How the development addresses the following:	
the suitability of the land for development,	Yes
existing and proposed uses and use mix	Good mix of uses
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	Slope and contextual constraints well handled
the location of any tower proposed, having regard to the need to achieve an acceptable relationship with other towers (existing or proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation,	Tower, setbacks and building separation are well considered and positioned for existing and future context. The articulation of the tower into clearly defined hotel and residential components is now very well resolved.

setbacks, amenity and urban form,	
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Well considered
street frontage heights	Good
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Good
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Good
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Acceptable
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	No adverse impacts
Recommendations	The Panel recommend that proposal is amended to incorporate the above recommendations. The scheme is now well resolved.

Wollongong Design Review Panel
Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2016/1061

Date	13 December 2016
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration offices
Panel members	(Chair) Brendan Randles (Member) Iain Stewart (Member) Tony Quinn
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Pier Panozzo, Manager City Centre & Major Development Davis Fitzgibbon, Senior Development Project Officer
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Austin Tuon – GEAR UP PROPERTIES PTY LTD Elaine Treglown – TCG Planning
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	2
DA number	DA-2016/1061 This proposal was previously considered by the Design Review Panel on 15 September 2016 under DA-2016/1061. At this meeting the Panel made a number of recommendations which have influenced the design outcome proposed in the current application. This design review Panel has considered the previous panel comments in these recommendations.
Reasons for consideration by DRP	Clause 28 SEPP 65, Clause 7.18 WLEP 2009
Determination pathway	SEPP65 also JRPP form determination as valued \$43.7M (CIV more than \$20M)
Property address	28-32 Young Street & 29-31 Belmore Street, Wollongong
Proposal	Mixed use - Proposed demolition of all structures and construction of a seventeen (17) storey mixed use development containing three (3) additional basement parking levels. The development will comprise forty six (46) residential apartments (at levels 9-17), ninety (90) hotel rooms and associated restaurants and conference room (at levels 3-8) and 3 food and drink premises at the street level fronting both Belmore and Young Streets.
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	The Applicant presented revised proposal, with reference to Panel's comments and changes in response to them. A discussion followed focussing on ongoing issues and possible means to addressing them.
Background	The site was previously inspected by the Panel.
Design quality principals SEPP65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	Additional studies provided by the Applicant indicate a better understanding of Context and appear to have generated appropriate responses to the Panel's comments. The building's interface with both streets is better with apartments generally sleeving above grade parking (see notes below in Scale and Built Form). The reduction of the Young Street central opening – which read as a garage - improves the axial relationship with Market Street and normalizes its active street front at ground level. Perspectives provided indicate that streetscape has been well developed.

	The proposal is excellently drawn in plan, section and 3D.
Built Form and Scale	<p>The built form has been refined and the impact of above grade parking has been reduced through the introduction of sleeved units. However, the Panel is still concerned that the impact of above grade parking plagues the scheme as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ramp and constrained parking layouts marginalizes essential internal spaces over many levels (such as back of house, conference room, definition of voids and legible access from lift lobbies) - Above grade parking unnecessarily increases podium bulk, creating an unbalanced relationship with tower (the podium would be better lower and tower higher) - Above grade parking comes to both street façades on two levels, necessitating “masking” with false glazing; not only will this reveal car lights, it raises a clear risk for Council that retrofitting of parking space into apartments (and GFA exceeding density requirements) is possible in future - Above grade parking appears inefficient and wasteful compared to another full floor of parking under ground <p>While the applicant claims that required separation is achieved by above grade parking, the Panel believes that this separation can be achieved below grade – to the betterment of the scheme and its interface with context.</p> <p>The proposal’s relationship with adjacent sites is greatly improved and there is now much more control of building separation, amenity and privacy issues. The removal of the side indentations with apartments facing into them has removed the potential light well issue in the previous scheme. The H shaped form and apartment orientation is much better and will assist in ongoing ADG compliance.</p> <p>Slots have been removed as primary sources of ventilation and light; their retention for expression, light to lobbies and extra ventilation is supported. The removal of the south-western car park entry is a great improvement.</p> <p>The adaptable units require too much change to be feasible. They should be redesigned so that only minor change – and no moving of entire walls – is required for an apartment to become adaptable.</p> <p>The minimal ceiling height of the conference room and its unclear access from the lifts is problematic. If above grade parking were to be relocated to basement, more clarity and spatial amenity could be provided to this facility.</p>
Density	<p>The density proposed exceeds LEP requirements. In addition, there appears to be excessive car parking, with each additional car parking space, counted as additional GFA, further increasing this exceedance of density.</p> <p>Given the high scale and density allowable on this site, the Panel sees no justification in exceeding the LEP’s density requirements and recommends that the GFA proposed in reduced accordingly.</p>
Sustainability	<p>The building’s orientation and internal planning produces high mid winter solar access and natural ventilation compliance. The removal of non-compliant slots for natural ventilation is noted.</p>

	The provision of rainwater tank and solar panels is commendable.
Landscape	<p>The separation of residential and hotel open spaces are commended by the Panel, as is the provision of alternative communal terraces at higher levels for different groups. Privacy is greatly improved between communal terraces and adjacent rooms. Shade giving trees to terraces improve the amenity of the open spaces generally.</p> <p>Planter boxes at terrace edges ensure that privacy will be maintained when adjacent sites are developed.</p> <p>Street tree planting and paving match the WCC's public domain standards and requirements.</p>
Amenity	<p>Ground level streetscapes to both Young and Belmore Streets are improved; main lobby is well designed and welcoming. Covered porch provides generosity externally.</p> <p>The removal of slots to achieve natural ventilation is noted. The use of slots for articulation and light to lobbies is supported.</p> <p>Compliance with mid Winter solar access and natural ventilation requirements is evident.</p> <p>Separation of residential and hotel communal open spaces are supported. Communal open spaces are improved generally and amenities added.</p> <p>The conference room is still very low and access is obscure.</p> <p>Above grade parking constrains essential back of house facilities and obscures circulation, spatial definition (especially of entry voids) and general disposition of spaces at lower levels. The above grade parking levels do not achieve high efficiency and ramps to get to these levels are very wasteful. The Panel recommends that all above grade parking is relocated to basement levels.</p>
Safety	Acceptable
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	Acceptable
Aesthetics	<p>The building's expression and materiality are greatly improved. The articulation of the podium is well considered and contrasts well with the finer expression of the tower. However, the Panel believes that the building's appearance would be greatly improved if the proportional relationship between the podium and tower were to be amended i.e. if the tower was reduced in height and the tower increased accordingly.</p> <p>The expression of the podium's side walls is an attractive and intelligent response. It could be improved if the expressed concrete slabs and columns were replaced with fine horizontal joints. This would better complement the screen façade to the street.</p>

Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	Yes
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	Yes
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	View corridors are well considered
Whether the proposed development detrimentally overshadows an area shown distinctively coloured and numbered on the Sun Plane Protection Map,	N/A
How the development addresses the following:	
the suitability of the land for development,	Yes
existing and proposed uses and use mix	Good mix of uses
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	Slope and contextual constraints well handled
the location of any tower proposed, having regard to the need to achieve an acceptable relationship with other towers (existing or proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form,	Tower, setbacks and building separation are well considered and positioned for existing and future context
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Well considered; however, see notes above regarding proportional awkward relationship between podium and tower
street frontage heights	See notes above regarding proportional awkward relationship between podium and tower
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Good
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Good

pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Above grade parking remains problematic
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	No adverse impacts
Recommendations	The Panel recommend that proposal is amended to incorporate the above recommendations; that above grade parking relocated to the basement, that density reduced to comply with LEP requirements and the podium lowered as described above.

PROPERTY: 28 – 30 Young St + 29 – 31 Belmore St, Wollongong

MEETING DATE: 15 September 2016

DEVELOPMENT: Shop Top Housing

ATTENDANCE:

UDRP Panel :

Brendan Randles	Chair	Architect/ Urban Designer
Gabrielle Morrish		Architect/ Urban Designer
Iain Stewart		Architect/ Urban Designer

Attendance :

Pier Panozzo	WCC
Janelle Johnston	WCC
Tom Vanovac	Vanovac Tuon Architects
Elaine Treglown	TCG Planning Environment Urban Design

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
<p>Context and Neighbourhood Character</p> <p>Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is the key natural and built features of an area, their relationship and the character they create when combined. It also includes social, economic, health and environmental conditions.</p> <p>Responding to context involves identifying the desirable elements of an area's existing or future character. Well-designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood.</p> <p>Consideration of local context is important for all sites, including sites in established areas, those undergoing change or identified for change.</p>	<p>The site is located within an evolving context at the edge of Metro Wollongong's Commercial Core, with frontages to both Young and Belmore streets. The site has a frontage of 40.23m, has a significant fall to the west and is centred on Market Street, which rises to its east. While Young Street hosts a mix of mixed use and shop top housing developments, its Belmore Street context comprises lower scale residential dwellings, as well as larger buildings to the north and south. This is the first time the Panel has reviewed a proposal for this site. No Pre DA meetings were held for this application and only a minimal site analysis was provided to support the proposal. Considering its scale, proposed uses and likely impact on the entire precinct, significantly more consideration of context, including future anticipated built form, landscape and streetscape, is required.</p> <p>The proposal comprises a hotel with some retail at grade, generally located within a five to seven storey podium, with hotel and residential uses housed within a slimmer fifteen storey tower, centred on Belmore Street. Above grade parking impacts on both street frontages, with three storeys of screened parking along Belmore Street and screened parking featuring behind a screened façade on Young Street. The impact of above grade parking is especially severe along Belmore Street, exacerbated by the provision of two entry ramps and all required services. It is therefore recommended that one driveway entry only is proposed and that services are compacted as much as possible to maximize retail frontage.</p> <p>Only minimal landscape information has been provided with the proposal with scant information relating to streetscape treatment, including paving and trees along both street frontages. This is not adequate for a project of this scale and significance.</p>

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
<p>Built Form and Scale</p> <p>Good design achieves a scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing or desired future character of the street and surrounding buildings.</p> <p>Good design also achieves an appropriate built form for a site and the building's purpose in terms of building alignments, proportions, building type, articulation and the manipulation of building elements.</p> <p>Appropriate built form defines the public domain, contributes to the character of streetscapes and parks, including their views and vistas, and provides internal amenity and outlook.</p>	<p>The built form comprises a podium of five to six storeys to Young Street and seven storeys to Belmore Street filling the entire site, with a staggered tower of fifteen storeys setback from all boundaries. While no clear distinction is expressed between residential and hotel uses in the tower, residential uses occupy the upper nine levels. A communal space at level six is proposed to be shared between residential and hotel uses; this of concern to the Panel, who would recommend that that these uses are clearly defined and separated e.g. by confining the hotel to the podium with residential tower above. The extension of hotel rooms into the tower form itself blurs a distinction between uses and confuses the built form premise. By splitting the tower into two slabs joined by a service core, an H shaped form is created with light wells featuring along the north and south elevations; it is unclear how the amenity of adjoining units would be sustained if adjoining sites were to be developed to a similar scale.</p> <p>While the scale of the proposal generally complies with LEP and DCP requirements, building separation between habitable spaces (including common open areas) and adjoining properties along side boundaries does not conform with the requirements of the ADG.</p> <p>While the formulation and resolution of the built form is generally well handled, with an appropriately scaled streetscape and well resolved elevations, the Panel is concerned with the extent of above grade car parking proposed, which reduces street activation and passive surveillance. Ideally, any car parking above grade should be sleeved with units to provide street continuity. In addition, the Panel is concerned that the proposal's reliance on</p>

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
	<p>light wells and narrow slots in the front facing facades will create conflicts with the aims and objectives of the ADG; while the former may reduce amenity compliance once adjoining sites are developed, the latter appears not to comply with “indentation” standards and should be reviewed.</p>
<p>Density</p> <p>Good design achieves a high level of amenity for residents and each apartment, resulting in a density appropriate to the site and its context.</p> <p>Appropriate densities are consistent with the area's existing or projected population. Appropriate densities can be sustained by existing or proposed infrastructure, public transport, access to jobs, community facilities and the environment.</p>	<p>While at first glance, the proposal appears to be consistent with the LEP's density requirements for the site, virtually all residential and hotel circulation space has not been included in GFA calculations. Most of these circulation spaces have no access to light or air and cannot be considered breezeways.</p> <p>As the Panel consider all circulation spaces within the building footprint to be GFA, the proposal is therefore well over the allowable density for this site. It is recommended that the required reduction in GFA be undertaken in such a way as to address/ remove the urban design and amenity issues sited in this report. With reduced GFA, a reduction in parking required may remove the need for above grade parking along the Young Street frontage, which would allow the proposed conference room to achieve an amenable ceiling height.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p>Good design combines positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.</p> <p>Good sustainable design includes use of natural cross ventilation and sunlight for the amenity and liveability of residents and passive thermal design for ventilation, heating and cooling reducing reliance on technology and operation costs. Other elements include recycling and reuse of materials and waste, use of sustainable materials and deep soil zones for groundwater recharge and vegetation.</p>	<p>While specific sustainability strategies were not discussed at the meeting, it is acknowledged that the proposal achieves high levels of solar access and cross ventilation. However, any reliance on narrow slots or light wells to achieve cross ventilation is unacceptable. In the absence of deep soil, a comprehensive landscape strategy is required to provide shade-giving trees at podium level. Other measures, such as solar panels and water reuse are required to meet sustainability objectives.</p>

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
<p>Landscape</p> <p>Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, resulting in attractive developments with good amenity. A positive image and contextual fit of well-designed developments is achieved by contributing to the landscape character of the streetscape and neighbourhood.</p> <p>Good landscape design enhances the development's environmental performance by retaining positive natural features which contribute to the local context, coordinating water and soil management, solar access, micro-climate, tree canopy, habitat values and preserving green networks.</p> <p>Good landscape design optimises useability, privacy and opportunities for social interaction, equitable access, respect for neighbours' amenity and provides for practical establishment and long term management.</p>	<p>The landscape design prepared for this proposal is very preliminary and does not illustrate how amenable communal spaces and upper level terraces – with well apportioned facilities – will be provided. Detail sections and planting specification are required to address :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - quality and containment of private gardens at podium level - privacy issues between adjoining gardens - management of hotel and residents at podium level - facility provision and protection from elements at roof level - boundary conditions around the building - street tree planting and paving

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
<p>Amenity</p> <p>Good design positively influences internal and external amenity for residents and neighbours. Achieving good amenity contributes to positive living environments and resident well-being.</p> <p>Good amenity combines appropriate room dimensions and shapes, access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook, visual and acoustic privacy, storage, indoor and outdoor space, efficient layouts and service areas and ease of access for all age groups and degrees of mobility.</p>	<p>The following amenity issues must be addressed. These include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - slot widths to both street frontages do not meet ADG requirements - internal studies at residential levels do not comply with the ADG's indentation requirements - private gardens at podium level create privacy issues and appear stark, mere light wells and under designed left over space - a shared hotel/ residential communal open space is not supported - no facilities or WC at roof level communal open space - the proposed conference room does not comply with ceiling height requirements

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
<p>Safety</p> <p>Good design optimises safety and security within the development and the public domain. It provides for quality public and private spaces that are clearly defined and fit for the intended purpose. Opportunities to maximise passive surveillance of public and communal areas promote safety.</p> <p>A positive relationship between public and private spaces is achieved through clearly defined secure access points and well lit and visible areas that are easily maintained and appropriate to the location and purpose.</p>	<p>With two vehicular entry ramps, a sub station, fire services and numerous egress doors, active street frontage is severely constrained to less than 30% of its Belmore Street frontage. This condition is compounded by three levels of screened car parking directly above, thereby reducing street activation and passive surveillance.</p>
<p>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</p> <p>Good design achieves a mix of apartment sizes, providing housing choice for different demographics, living needs and household budgets.</p> <p>Well-designed apartment developments respond to social context by providing housing and facilities to suit the existing and future social mix.</p> <p>Good design involves practical and flexible features, including different types of communal spaces for a broad range of people and providing opportunities for social interaction among residents.</p>	<p>While the indicative planning suggests an acceptable apartment mix, the Panel is concerned with :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the shared hotel and residential open space at podium level - the constrained size of the only residential communal space at roof level.

SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings	UDRP Comments
<p>Aesthetics</p> <p>Good design achieves a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements, reflecting the internal layout and structure. Good design uses a variety of materials, colours and textures.</p> <p>The visual appearance of a well-designed apartment development responds to the existing or future local context, particularly desirable elements and repetitions of the streetscape.</p>	<p>While the architectural response is not detailed, the built form and material composition is promising and could develop into a fine proposal. However :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a fine grain of studio or duplex units would create a better podium expression than mere screening - side elevations at upper levels appear unnecessarily closed - the central Y column and wide hotel opening lacks finesse and appears like a car park entry - the lack of landscape at street level and long both frontages creates a harsh presentation

Further Comments & Outcome
<p>The Panel does not support the scheme in its current form. The scheme should be redesigned to meet the allowable density for the site and to address each of the points outlined above. Any resubmission should be referred to the Panel for further review.</p>

End of advice