

Wollongong Design Review Panel
Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2016/1719

Date	22 May 2017
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration offices
Panel members	(Chair) Brendan Randles (Member) Iain Stewart (Member) Tony Quinn
Apologies	Theresa Whittaker, Senior Development Project Officer
Council staff	Mark Riordan – Manager Development Assessment & Certification Pier Panozzo, Manager City Centre & Major Development
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Peter Rasa – PRD Architects Scott Millican - PRD Architects
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	3
DA number	DA-2016/1719 This proposal was previously considered by the Design Review Panel on 22 March, 12 April, and 12 July 2016 (DE-2016/33) & 31 January 2017 (DA-2016/1719). At these meetings 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 \$27.1M (CIV more than \$20M)
Property address	38 Atchison Street, Wollongong
Proposal	Mixed use development - ground and mezzanine level commercial with 92 residential apartments over 2 basement car parking levels
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	
Background	The site was previously inspected by the Panel
Design quality principals SEPP65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	<p>The Panel has discussed the site extensively with the proponent over previous panel meetings. The applicant shows a good understanding of the site and has by now addressed many of its pressing issues in the current proposal.</p> <p>However, the proposal still struggles with its street context at its lower two levels, especially in regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - forecourt landscape; should be simplified and awning removed from this area - pergola should be removed and replaced with trees - double height shopfront and entry needs a more definite integration with the parti of the building; horizontally, a two level expression should be reinforced. Massing, the defined full height slot, entry, awnings, ground level and first level set outs and the landscaped court need much better coordination. - ramp and planters must be removed from court area - platform lift should be incorporated into the northern edge of the court within the twin fin expression of the building
Built Form and Scale	The scale of the building is acceptable. The built form however has

	<p>a number of issues which reflect a lack of detail attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See notes above regarding issues around the entry court; the integration of the full height slot with ground and first levels; height and location of street facing awnings; northern ground, first and second floor alignments; and entry detail - Void between levels 2 and 5 lobbies requires BCA input - Unit entry directly opposite lift on levels 13 – 16 is unacceptable - Bathroom to dining space in north eastern units on levels 13 – 16 creates poor amenity and should be amended
Density	Acceptable
Sustainability	As per Basix. Not discussed at meeting, but proposal must comply with mid winter solar access, natural ventilation and max 15% no solar access. Water collection and reuse should be incorporated as well as solar panels to reduce energy costs.
Landscape	Acceptable
Amenity	<p>See notes above in Context and Built Form and Scale regarding :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - removal of ramps and simplification of entry court expression - integration of platform lift - resolution of issues at entry - entry door in front of level 13 – 16 lifts - bath to dining room issue on levels 13 - 16 <p>In addition :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the ground floor WC beside the commercial lift will create adverse visual and physical impacts - the mezzanine levels to commercial spaces may be better pushed to glass (to be studied) - access to and egress from level 01 storage is not clear
Safety	Acceptable
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	Acceptable
Aesthetics	Acceptable. However, fire boosters and cupboards must be clearly shown and well detailed in well resolved location
Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	A materials board describing all materials, colours and detail is required to be submitted as part of the DA package

Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	Y
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	N
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,	Y
existing and proposed uses and use mix	Y
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	N/A
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,	Y
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Y
street frontage heights	Y
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Y
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Y
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Y
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	Y
Recommendations	With the incorporation of the above amendments and materials board, the Panel can support the proposal.