

## Attachment 5 – Most Recent Design Review 6 December 2017

### Wollongong Design Review Panel Meeting minutes and recommendations DA-2017/1462

Time & date	6 December 2017
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration offices
Panel members	Brendan Randles Tony Quinn Iain Stewart
Apologies	Pier Panozzo, Manager City Centre & Major Development
Council staff	Theresa Whittaker, Senior Development Project Officer
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Angelo Di Martino (Architect) Michael Ilias (Client) Elaine Treglown (Planner) Tracey Whiteman (Landscape Architect)
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	1
DA number	DA-2017/1462
Reasons for consideration by DRP	DA; not triggered by any environmental planning instrument.
Determination pathway	JRPP
Property address	71-77 Kembla & 47 Burelli Streets Wollongong
Proposal	A Grade office building
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	The applicant's presentation was clear and made reference to the Panel's comments regarding the former proposal.
Background	<p>The site was inspected by the Panel on 6 December 2017. It is a significant site, occupying an important corner opposite heritage buildings that inform the cultural and social history of Wollongong. The site also addresses Wollongong's cultural precinct and, being adjacent to the dominant Council building, forms part of a significant civic streetscape.</p> <p>A proposal for this site was presented to the Panel some months ago. The proposal was noticeably preliminary and lacked fundamental planning logic or resolution at ground level. It was also more expressive architecturally but appeared not to respond in form or language to its heritage or civic context.</p> <p>The current proposal has responded well to Panel comments and apart from some design issues (see below) and planning deficiencies (setbacks and a parking shortfall of 20 cars) is very well resolved.</p> <p>The context is well described and impacts of the new building on adjacent public and private domain are clearly illustrated. However, adjacent built fabric and public domain should be shown on all plan, elevation, section and perspective drawings.</p>

<p><b>Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved</b></p>	<p>In response to the Panel's comments, the proposal has been substantially changed and improved.</p> <p>Internal planning at all levels has been greatly improved, a double storey ground level introduced and a café located to activate and respond to the evolving cultural streetscape. The Panel understands that the proponent has worked hard to overcome flooding requirements to achieve an amenable ground level interface, with a generous public open space taking up level changes along its sloped façade. An improvement of the Kembla Street entrance could be improved by planning a space of delay between the revolving door and steps.</p> <p>The panel believe that the public steps proposed would be better full width along the Burelli Street frontage, that contiguous paving between inside and outside would be preferable and that the proposed planter should be removed to maximize openness. The corner ATM is also obscured from the street by planting here and the removal of the planter will rectify this CPTED planning issue.</p> <p>The car park entry and servicing have been neatly incorporated along the southern boundary of the building; a workable strategy has been devised to provide access and parking during the different construction stages of the site directly south, which is in common ownership.</p>
<p><b>Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,</b></p>	<p>The form and expression of the proposal have been toned down considerably and now seems to fit very well into its heritage and civic contexts. The double height ground level provides a generous streetscape expression that will enhance the site's civic quality and the large projecting portico will create a distinctive (but not over bearing) corner. The glass treatment is restrained and ordered with an interesting colour coding strategy used to provide texture and legibility. The west facing façade is decidedly secondary and uses intelligently conceived vertical screening to both address westerly sun and provide rich expression.</p> <p>While the form and expression of the proposal are supported by the Panel, a few elements appear not to be solved at present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the main entry appears not to align with the building's expression; hence the main door sits beside rather than below the projected frame. This leads to an ambiguity of massing and glazing above the doors that weakens the balance of the composition. A number of solutions were discussed but perhaps the easiest solution would be to slide the entry west into the next bay and reorganize the ground floor – it may be better that way.</li> <li>- The elegant double storey expression proposed should extend to the full width of the northern façade</li> <li>- The feature brick as a heritage reference should be given more attention; the fins should be double height, the brick used could be 50mm x 300mm for example and the extent of brick on the double storey ground level increased to avoid the sense that it is merely tokenistic.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,</b></p>	<p>The proposal defines the corner very well and artfully modulates the Burelli Street frontage. As such, the proposal enhances view corridors.</p>

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,	Y – see above
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 – see above Y – the proposal has been designed with good reference to existing civic and heritage buildings and the future residential building proposed for the site to its south. While there are some departures from setback requirements to the east – which require zero setbacks - the Panel supports the proposed setback as it allows east facing windows to an otherwise blank façade. The minor breach on the top level is supported as this is only a hood.
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Y – see above
street frontage heights	Y – see above
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Y
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Performance glass to the north and well integrated west facing screening enhances both ESD and building expression. The Panel encourages any other environmental initiatives to achieve a star rated office building in this prime location.
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Y
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	Y – see above
Recommendations	The proponent should incorporate all of the above changes into the DA drawings and proceed. There is no requirement to return to the Panel.