

Attachment 4 - Design Review Panel Notes

Wollongong Design Review Panel Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2016/1355

Date	22 November 2016
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Building
Panel members	(Chair) Tony Quinn (Member) Tony Tribe (Member) Chloe Watts
Apologies	
Council staff	Mark Riordan, Manager Development Assessment & Compliance Pier Panozzo Manager City Centre & major Development Anne Starr, Senior Development Project Officer
Guests	Ben Selwood, Tim Curtin, Hoi Man Choy, Andrew Cowan
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	3
DA number	DA-2016/1355 Proposed day surgery 1-3 Urunga Parade Wollongong. This is the first design review for this site.
Reason for consideration by DRP	Required under WLEP, Design Excellence
Determination pathway	JRPP
Property address	1 Urunga Parade, Wollongong
Proposal	Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of a day surgery
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	Mr T.Curtin and Mr HM Choy addressed the panel (project manager and architect respectively)
Background	The site was inspected by the panel 22 November 2016
Design quality principles	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	The panel raised concerns over the buildings public domain interface. In particular the substation location and the building arrival / entry arrangement. The panel queried whether the substation could be relocated and or closed in with a slab roof and louvered doors to better address the streetscape. The slab roof over the substation could create benefit as an extended seating area for the café and provide some activation to the street albeit at a higher level. The panel requested further details be shown of the footpaths and street planting from kerb to building in accordance with the DCP. The panel was concerned about the entry location from the street and the lifts jammed in the corner of the lobby. The loading / ambulance bay was queried as to whether a vehicle could satisfactorily turn in this seemingly tight area. The proponent indicated traffic engineers had looked at it. This would need proving up with turning circles / swept paths shown. There was also insufficient site analysis shown within the context including existing and DA approved neighbouring buildings, vehicle & pedestrian access options, and significant approach vistas
Built Form and Scale	The architect explained the philosophy of the massing being broken down into several elements, including the fake timber verticals on the corner box. The panel were unconvinced by this "wallpaper treatment" and felt for such a small building it was too busy when read in the round. The panel suggested the façade be simplified (less busy) with fewer changes in materials.
Landscape	The panel discussed this under context and requested more detail be provided to understand the streetscape, including but not limited to the consideration of accessibility of the building from the public domain and how this development will add to the public domain of this precinct. There is nothing shown on the landscape plan as to treatment of the slab in the rear setback

	zone adjacent to the planter.
Amenity	The panel raised the issue of the entry amenity both on the street and in the basements, The lobby appears small and constrained and nothing is shown on the plans in the way of reception or waiting area. Both basement and street arrivals don't appear to be very welcoming. The panel queried whether the lifts could be relocated.
Aesthetics	The panel found the façade treatments to be problematic and as suggested under bulk and scale that they be of a simpler expression. The superficiality/ materiality of the very strong 5 storey vertical timber grain finish treatment of the corner was questioned. It is apparently not driven by any functional or environmental design criteria. The awning above the entry appeared weak and needs further work.
Design Excellence WLEP 2000	The proposal has not yet reached a standard of design excellence in terms of design, materials and detailing appropriate to its buildings typology and relationship to context including the amenity of the public domain.
Recommendations	The proposals interaction with the public domain is not resolved and needs further work as does the building façade and public arrival sequence.

**Wollongong Design Review Panel
Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2016/1355**

Date	28 th February 2017
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Building
Panel members	(Chair) Tony Quinn (Member) Brendan Randles (Member) Iain Stewart
Apologies	
Council staff	Mark Riordan, Manager Development Assessment & Compliance David Fitzgibbon, Senior Development Project Officer Lucretia Liu, Planning Intern
Guests	Ben Selwood, Hoi Man Choy, Andrew Cowan
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	3
DA number	DA-2016/1355 Proposed day surgery 1-3 Urunga Parade Wollongong. This is the second design review for this site.
Reason for consideration by DRP	Required under WLEP 2009 design excellence.
Determination pathway	JRPP
Property address	1 Urunga Parade, Wollongong
Proposal	Demolition of existing dwellings and construction of a day surgery
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	Mr HM Choy addressed the panel
Background	The site was inspected and assessed by the panel 22 November 2016
Design quality principles	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	<p>The Panel was still concerned about the limited analysis of context and interface with the public domain. The drawings do not show properties beyond the site; the landscape drawing does not even show the full extent of the footpath. The arrival sequence with the multitude of users and clashes between ambulance, cars and trucks remains unresolved.</p> <p>The removal of built form to create a drop off zone drastically reduces any street activation and/or built edge and gives the streetscape an under-croft back of house character. It also appears potentially unsafe with different types of vehicles and pedestrians brought into close contact. It was felt that the loading should be in the basement and separated from the public interface with the ground floor uses. An activated street-edge is preferred – with café potentially brought forward to the corner of New Dapto St and Urunga Parade and a more generous entrance hall off New Dapto. The vehicular drop-off should be more discrete.</p>
Built Form and Scale	<p>The building layout does not follow an intelligent structure/circulation model, which would locate the core at the centre or rear of the floor plate. Instead it dominates its entire corner, preventing views out and active uses at ground level. This is counter intuitive and creates a poor urban design outcome. Contrary to the proponent's claims, the Panel believes that relocating the core to the centre of the plan would improve circulation, the entry, vehicular circulation and even the arrangement of the specialized spaces at upper levels.</p> <p>The panel queried the numerous instances of discontinuous columns, which questions the feasibility of the typical floor layout; the proponent acknowledged that structural design and the</p>

	<p>degree of transfer possible has not been verified – with no floor to floor height allowances for transfer beams made possible. While the Panel acknowledges that it is difficult to resolve sloping frontages, the northern setback is poorly handled and highly constrained by OSD, planter beds and over scaled walls.</p>
Landscape	<p>The panel is concerned about the corner landscaped planter/OSD and felt that it was a poor urban design outcome. The panel felt that the public domain interface still needed further work with a more resolved design intent, street trees, activation and co-ordinated landscape.</p>
Amenity	<p>The panel queried the carpark layout resulting from the current core location - the basement carpark is set out over five levels and is inefficient. It was asked whether the core can be moved from the NE corner to a central core or even to the small pocket of land on the southern side. The outcome of this would more than likely produce more car spaces on each level.</p> <p>Concern also was raised about the carpark ramps not working with the likely depth of transfer beams. The planning of floors was queried and their efficiency. The architect indicated he would consider options with this and the core re-location.</p> <p>The recovery room in its current location did not take advantage of the best views available to the site and circulation on the floorplate was inefficient. The relocation of the building core may go some way to solving these problems.</p>
Aesthetics	<p>The panel felt that the aesthetics of the building had improved from the previous scheme, but the under-croft in its current form impacted negatively on this crucial public domain interface, and, as described above, the core expressed on the corner is a poor urban outcome on the ground plane</p>
Design Excellence WLEP 2009	<p>The proposal has not yet reached a design excellence standard in terms of design, public domain interface, circulation, streetscape, materials and detailing appropriate to this building type and its relationship to context.</p>
Recommendations	<p>The proposal's interaction with the public domain, entry and arrival sequence, circulation and basement layouts are poorly resolved. These need to be reviewed.</p>