

ATTACHMENT 3 - Design Review Panel Notes - 31 July 2018

Wollongong Design Review Panel Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2017-730

Date	31 July 2018
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
Panel members	(Chair) Brendan Randles (Member) Tony Quinn (Member) Marc Deuschle
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Mark Riordan – Manager Development Assessment & Certification Pier Panozzo – City Centre & Major Development Manager Anne Starr – Senior Development Project Officer
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Angelo Di Martino – ADM Architects Mark Grayson – Frank Knight – Town Planner Charlie Hanna – Client/Owner
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	1
DA number	DA-2017/730
Reason for consideration by DRP	<p>Clause 28 SEPP 65, Clause 7.18 WLEP 2009</p> <p>On 27 June Council briefed the Southern Regional Planning Panel (SRPP) on the status of the application. The SRPP requested that the application be re-referred to the DRP for specific comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thomas Street elevation and interface between public and private domains on Thomas Street including the relationship between footpath levels and commercial terraces on the ground floor. Front setback, particularly in relation to the front setback of 10 Thomas Street. Whether Thomas Street setback and footpath width is sufficient for street planting Thomas Street elevation is approximately 63m. Whether this length appropriate in streetscape? Review of additional cross sections which extend to adjoining sites. Heritage buildings, on appropriateness of setback dimensions between proposed Parsons Lane apartments and the rear of existing Keira Street heritage items within the site. <p>Whether the relationship between the Level 1 communal open space and 10 Thomas Street is satisfactory, having regard to privacy and amenity impacts.</p>
Determination pathway	SRPP
Property address	115-117 & 131-141 Keira Street & 2A, 2-6 Thomas Street Wollongong
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings and ancillary structures and the construction of a mixed use development above basement parking.
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	
Background	<p>Previously considered by the panel pre-lodgement under DE-2016/146 on 29 November 2016, and post-lodgement on 25 July 2017.</p> <p>This is a complex site, with a number of contrasting boundary conditions, a steep topography and close adjacency to Heritage buildings along Keira Street. Given the height and density controls for the site, it has been a challenge to resolve the built form, while introducing a cross site link, maintaining amenable streetscape and</p>

	<p>establishing an acceptable rapport with adjoining buildings. Generally, the Panel have supported the progress of the proposal and noted the improvements in each of its iterations.</p> <p>When the Panel last saw the proposal, it requested additional detail regarding the heritage buildings, their future use and rapport with adjacent open spaces and built form. It also noted that adjoining buildings and spaces should be shown on all plans, section and elevations to allow a better understanding of the proposal's relationship with its varied context.</p>
DRP Comments	
<p><u>Thomas Street elevation</u></p> <p>Is the Panel satisfied with the interface between public and private domains on Thomas Street including the relationship between footpath levels and commercial terraces on the ground floor?</p>	<p>The proposal has responded to comments from the Panel regarding this frontage during the design process. It has moved from a frontage dominated by planters to open steps, in order to create openness and continuity between the public domain and shop fronts. As proposed, the frontage incorporates a large setback, which allows it to solve the complex undulating levels along the street and allow street planting, while incorporating accessible access to streets as levels allow. The risk to this frontage - with its large undercroft area and abundance of commercial spaces removed from the retail network - is that it remains unoccupied and becomes a hard paved and seemingly abandoned fixture on the streetscape.</p> <p>To improve this frontage and improve its engagement with the public domain, the Panel recommends :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As far as possible, reduce the extent of over hang and undercroft proposed - As far as possible, maximize the height of the undercroft - Develop a design narrative for the frontage i.e. steps, spaces for sitting, planters etc. that corresponds to specific uses and spatial requirements of the future commercial uses along this facade while retaining a generally open feel and good visual connection - Indicative furniture layouts should be provided if applicable to use - request Council requirements for street trees (species, spacing, etc.) and accurately plot on drawings - Match spacing, pit type and detail to species – follow the ADG minimum requirements for soil depth and volume as set out in section 4P table 5.
<p>Is the front setback appropriate, particularly in relation to the front setback of 10 Thomas Street?</p>	<p>Given the awkward geometry of the street frontage and the abundance of commercial space proposed, the Panel is satisfied that a larger setback is appropriate in this case. Unlike 10 Thomas Street, a zero setback would be hard to sustain, especially along such a length, with such variation to levels and associated access issues. While the setback proposed certainly raises challenges as to how it is treated and used (see above), its advantages include its correspondence with the established setbacks of the heritage property north of the site.</p> <p>This condition – and the proposal's relationship with 10 Thomas Street – would be greatly improved if the site between these two properties was resolved – either as a landscape, built form or a combination of both. If retained as a mere car park, this site will impact negatively on both properties visually and physically. The Panel therefore encourages the owners of both properties to work</p>

	with the owner of 143 – 147 Keira Street – and perhaps Council - in order to establish a design framework for this location.
Is the Thomas Street setback and footpath width sufficient for street planting?	<p>The Panel believe that the setback and approx. 2.5m footpath width is sufficient for street planting. This has not yet been coordinated with a particular species and street character in mind however; the Panel therefore believes that the proponent should discuss species type and layout with the Council, determine the requirements of the tree type and layout selected and incorporate this into a fully resolved landscape plan for the frontage.</p> <p>Considerations to address during this process should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tree height and clear trunk zone (i.e. taller tree with few lower limbs) - Size, materiality and location of tree pit to allow pedestrians to walk over (tree protection must be included) - Underground services and limitations - Staggering trees along street with those along boundary to allow wider clearance for pedestrian movement. - Appropriate species to align with Council requirements
Thomas Street elevation is approximately 63m. Is this length appropriate in streetscape?	<p>While the Panel believe that the abstract “field” expression is an interesting response to the geometry of the frontage, it agrees that the length of the façade could be overwhelming in this context. It is recommended that the façade is further modulated by :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limiting the length and singularity of the facade by incorporating a subtle change in language at either one of its ends for a substantial length of the façade (e.g. more than two bays) - Incorporating a slot – perhaps linking to the lobby on the south side for example – to divide the field expression from the contrasting element - Contrasting expression could signal a shift to the side elevation, perhaps using consistent solid spandrels for example - Resultant façade should demonstrate an appropriate balance between two elements – one vertically proportioned and the other, reflecting the length of the frontage through the use of a “field” expression as proposed.
Review of additional cross sections which extend to adjoining sites.	<p>Additional sections have been prepared by the applicant and forwarded to the Panel. These sections however have been drawn at too small a scale and applied with a fill that reduces their legibility significantly. To be useful to the Panel, these sections must be reprinted one per A3 page, with the fill removed and landscape detail added. Annotations and dimensions should then clearly illustrate the relationship between the proposed built form, the space within the setback, its landscape and the adjoining open spaces and built form.</p> <p>What the sections reveal at this stage is the bulk that the current height and density controls allow. . What is not illustrated however, is the detail of the side setbacks, built and landscape interfaces and regulatory compliances. In any instances where ADG separation is not complied with, it must be demonstrated how physical and</p>

	acoustic privacy is maintained, how overbearing on adjoining properties is prevented and how an acceptable transition in scale is achieved.
<u>Heritage buildings</u> Comment on appropriateness of setback dimensions between proposed Parsons Lane apartments and the rear of existing Keira Street heritage items within the site.	<p>Generally the Panel supports the town house frontage along the east of Parsons Lane and the 9m setback to the west side of the lane. However, this assumes that an appropriate interface is created and maintained on all the properties – heritage and otherwise – west of the lane, so as to maintain security, privacy and amenity between adjoining properties.</p> <p>The plans and sections prepared for this review were requested at the last design review panel meeting but only now, have been seen by the Panel. These drawings reveal some interfaces that are non compliant and totally lacking in amenity - these require amendment and resolution as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To create an amenable, secure and compliant interface between 137 Keira Street, the southern town house needs to be rotated to face south, with a 6m setback to the southern boundary and no windows facing west. - To create an amenable, secure and compliant interface with 131 – 135 Keira Street, the existing windows need to be filled in, or substantially screened, and a courtyard of an appropriate depth integrated into the existing built form to allow light and air to the Keira Street facing properties. - Each heritage building and adjoining property needs to be similarly assessed and provided with a similar detailed design strategy so as to ensure that : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Physical and visual impacts between the adjoining built forms are minimized o The urban design quality of Parsons Lane is maintained and/ o The heritage character of the adjoining properties is protected and enhanced.
Consider whether the relationship between the Level 1 communal open space and 10 Thomas Street is satisfactory, having regard to privacy and amenity impacts.	<p>To comply with the ADG, the communal space needs to be setback a minimum of 6m from the southern boundary of the property. To achieve this, a wide planter must be provided along the southern edge of apartment A102's terrace with substantial planting to prevent overlooking. Soil depth must be in accordance with the ADG.</p> <p>Although not referred to by the SRPP, the condition adjacent to apartment A103 is similar to that of A102; i.e. the POS is less than 6m from the site boundary. The planter along this edge should be widened and treated in the same manner as above so as to achieve the 6m setback.</p> <p>With the narrowing of this space, it may be more appropriate to combine the western portion of this terrace with the private terrace of unit A102. Should this occur, the proponent must demonstrate that the minimum requirement of COS is maintained at 25% (noting also that the Thomas Street open space is not considered communal open space for residential use).</p>
Key issues, further Comments &	<p>Given its scale and density, any proposal for this complex and constrained site presents a great challenge. Given the bulk of the</p>

Recommendations	<p>proposal, it is inevitable that the impacts of the proposal are going to most keenly show at its interfaces with adjoining streets, properties and existing the heritage fabric. For this reason, the Panel have encouraged the applicant – as with all applicants – to include adjoining context on all plans, section and elevation drawings, to highlight potential impacts on adjoining properties and to illustrate both the character and detail resolution of these crucial interfaces.</p> <p>This advice has only been partially followed – to the Applicant's and the proposal's detriment. Without precise contextual information it is very difficult to assess the design quality, compliance and potential impacts of the proposal – especially in this case, where each boundary condition is diverse and challenging for quite different reasons. The request from the SRPP provides an opportunity for the applicant to fully explain these interfaces, to reflect on their shortcomings or lack of resolution, to establish clear principles on what should be achieved and to make well considered design amendments to resolve them.</p> <p>Therefore, each particular point made by the SRPP should be responded to by the Applicant as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A short text demonstrating an understanding of the issue and a series of principles to resolve it - Clear section and plan detail demonstrating a well considered design response - An acknowledgement of compliance - 3D images illustrating the design quality of each proposed amendment
------------------------	---