

**Wollongong Design Review Panel**  
**Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2016/1354**

<b>Time &amp; date</b>	1 September 2017
<b>Meeting location</b>	Wollongong City Council Administration offices
<b>Panel members</b>	(Chair) Brendan Randles
	(Member) Tony Quinn
<b>Apologies</b>	(Member) Iain Stewart
<b>Council staff</b>	Mark Riordan, Manager Development Assessment & Compliance Pier Panozzo, Manager City Centre & Major Development Theresa Whittaker, Senior Development Project Officer Christian Han – Planning Intern
<b>Guests/ representatives of the applicant</b>	Mark Hitchcock, Registered Architect BHI Architects Mark Dillon, architect, BHI Architects
<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	Nil
<b>Item number</b>	1
<b>DA number</b>	DA-2016/1354 This proposal was previously considered by the Design Review Panel prior to its lodgement on two occasions on 7 February 2016, 10 May 2016 (DE-2016/12). It was also considered post lodgement on 11 November 2016 and 28 February 2017. On each of these occasions, the Panel has made a number of detailed urban design and architectural recommendations, which have progressively influenced the design outcome proposed in the current application. The Panel has considered the previous panel comments in these recommendations.
<b>Determination pathway</b>	JRPP will be the determining authority due to the cost of works exceeding \$20M
<b>Property address</b>	43 - 45 Atchison Street and 40 – 46 Kenny Street, Wollongong & a 10m wide section of the Ellen Street road reserve which is subject to a road closure application
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing structures and construction of a shop top housing development containing 205 residential apartments, two (2) levels of commercial/retail floor space, four (4) basement parking and servicing levels and associated landscaping and services
<b>Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel</b>	Mark Hitchcock, Registered Architect BHI Architects Mark Dillon, architect, BHI Architects
<b>Background</b>	The site was previously inspected by the Panel.
<b>Design quality principals SEPP65</b>	
<b>Context and Neighbourhood Character</b>	The Panel has discussed the local and site context on previous occasions with the Applicant. A thorough site analysis was prepared by the architects and presented at the first two meetings. Although it has not been substantially amended since the first meeting, the analysis demonstrates a high level of understanding of the site and its context and a great desire on the part of the architects to respond to the many challenges the site presents.

	<p>The Panel's main concern with the original proposal related to the feasibility of introverted retail area and extensive commercial space at first floor level in this city edge locality. At that stage, the circulation was not clear and the building's interface with the street was largely inactive. In response to these concerns, the proponents have over time, activated streets with specialty tenancies, clarified internal circulation to allow clear physical and visual cross site links and refined the interface with the street edge.</p> <p>The Panel were also concerned that the building massing did not sufficiently resolve this complex programme and was plagued by deficiencies and inefficiencies below and above ground. This has been significantly improved with more articulate built form, more efficient planning and an enriched composition of well chosen materials.</p> <p>The Panel is delighted that – apart from some easily amended items and detail resolution of overland flow - the scheme is now well resolved, achieving “design excellence” and should make a valuable contribution to the locality.</p>
<p><b>Built Form and Scale</b></p>	<p>There are significant improvements to built form in terms of overall composition, incorporation of loggia, rationalization of planning and so on. After a long process, the results are highly commendable. Some minor issues remain however :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the heavy pillars along the steps should be removed and replaced with simple steel handrails (as suggested by the peer review urban designer)</li> <li>- the heavy decorative piers along the internal face of the loggia are superfluous and often clash with the internal columns. The Panel believes that 850 – 1200mm face brick panels between glazing parallel to the street frontage will suffice. The brick panels should be coordinated with the internal column layout and external loggia; this may suggest a range of opening widths, which is fine.</li> <li>- the large void south of unit C407 (and below and above) appears like an error. The Panel suggests that square single or duplex units are inserted on each level to resolve this space. To resolve privacy issues, its east facing façade should not be further east than the glass line of unit C407 (and below and above) and the bedroom to unit C408 (and below and above) should be pushed out into balcony and face east only. These changes must not push GFA over the density requirements for the site.</li> <li>- the Panel was advised by Council's hydraulic engineer that the south west corner steps may impede cross site flow. Therefore, open space under the steps must be provided to ensure that water flow can continue at street level. This may require the reallocation of detention elsewhere. To successfully resolve this issue, it is advisable to speak to Council ASAP.</li> <li>- An effective way of closing treads to vermin while allowing flood water to penetrate is still required. An automatically opening flap may be the way forward; council engineers know one such system. Treads and risers must be coordinated to achieve durable and beautiful finish.</li> </ul>

<b>Density</b>	The density for the site appears to comply with the requirements of the LEP. However, some re allocation of GFA may be required with the additional units flagged above.
<b>Sustainability</b>	Solar access and natural ventilation requirements appear to comply with ADG requirements. Water collection for reuse in communal open spaces and solar panels – at least for external lighting – is highly recommended.
<b>Landscape</b>	While there is no deep soil proposed, there are a number of commercial and communal open spaces, which is a good outcome for future residents and visitors. The various gardens and arcade spaces are well designed. Street trees should be coordinated with Council landscape architects to ensure appropriate species for public domain.
<b>Amenity</b>	See notes above regarding street handrails, overland flow issues and “missing’ units. Amenity of lobbies, efficiency of planning and spatial quality is significantly improved. Egress needs to be reviewed by specialist consultants to ensure BCA compliance
<b>Safety</b>	Acceptable
<b>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</b>	A good mix of retail and apartment types is proposed, as well as high quality communal and commercial open spaces.
<b>Aesthetics</b>	The Panel commends the Architects on achieving a high quality aesthetic for this very large site. Now the massing is varied and complementary, expression too is varied but controlled and the base, which had so many issues to resolve, is very well handled. The mixture of materials proposed is supported, however : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- see notes in built form regarding some issues to resolve</li> <li>- to live up to the aspirations of the perspectives and to reflect honesty of materials, hardwood battens should be used on porch soffits. Timber composite sheet can be shiny and NOT natural looking (as often suggested) and would create a disappointing outcome. Although the soffit is a relatively small surface area, it will have immense impact on the whole.</li> </ul>
<b>Design Excellence WLEP2009</b>	
<b>Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved</b>	Yes
<b>Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and</b>	Yes

amenity of the public domain,	
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	No
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	Yes
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	Yes
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,	
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Yes
street frontage heights	
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Yes
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Yes
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Yes
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	Yes
Key issues, further Comments & Recommendations	With the above amendments, the proposal is supported by the Panel.