

## GWH Response to UDCG Meeting 21<sup>st</sup> March 2018

### **Background Summary**

The UDCG has reviewed this project on a number of occasions, the last in September 2017 when it considered a S.96 proposal for amendments to the approved plans. At that time the proposed amendments primarily related to external materials and finishes, reduction in the number of apartments, and details of landscape design.

The current application proposes the following additional significant amendments:

- Reduction in height of the spire of the tower building
- Reduction in the number of apartments from the approved 262 to 173, with an increase in bedroom numbers and unit size
- Substantial changes to the external appearance of the tower in particular
- Relocation of communal facilities
- Revised parking layout
- Detailed planning changes to both blocks

### **1. Context and Neighbourhood Character**

The Proponent advised how the design has evolved to accommodate a more diverse mix of residential apartment sizes and types and has expressed a more upmarket approach to the elevations in keeping with other nearby developments recently completed or on the market.

### **2. Built Form and Scale**

While the arrangement of the levels has changed to accommodate the increased diversity in the range of units sizes the overall footprint of the building has not changed to a significant level. The floor to floor level has increased which allows the accommodation of the ADG required ceiling heights for habitable rooms, however a floor has been deleted to maintain the overall approved building height. Additional height is sought due to the design of the roof-top communal area. To sit comfortably this needs to be significantly set back from the edges except perhaps with the central balcony features continuing up to the roof level. The corners of the roof need to be recessive to allow the building to be seen in its simplified form. The design of the rooftop area is not sympathetic to the external treatment of the facades, and needs to be better integrated to provide an aesthetically cohesive outcome. Heavy, over-scaled columns are particularly unsympathetic. Care needs to be taken to allow sufficient space for roof top plant within this upper level without the need to increase the height even further. Subject to the above comments the additional communal floor is fully supported as it would provide a high level of amenity for residents.

However the other following proposed changes are of serious concern:

#### King Street block

- *The long internal corridors without any daylight are unacceptable. By comparison, the approved plans had attractive small communal seating areas at the eastern end of corridors with attractive outlook and good daylight to corridors. These should be retained.*

**Response: Windows have now been provided to the eastern end of the King Street Tower corridors to provide daylight.**

- *The very small separation distances between balconies at the internal corner interface with balconies in the tower block result in unacceptable privacy impacts. Note that in the approved scheme there was significantly greater separation between apartment balconies, and the balcony to the communal spaces had projecting blade walls, - although these too were barely adequate to deal with privacy.*

**Response: The separation distances between the balconies of the Hunter and King Street towers have been adjusted to reflect to the approved scheme and privacy screens have also been provided, as indicated below and on amended plans as attached.**



#### Tower Block

- Although the typical floor plans are acceptable and would result in high level of amenity for apartments, many of the balconies are extremely exposed, particular those located at the corners, and especially at higher levels. They should be provided with substantial screening, fixed and/or adjustable to ensure that they are habitable and attractive in almost all weather conditions.

**Response:** Exposed and corner balconies from Level 15 upwards have been provided with fixed screening in response to the Panel's comments.

- The provision of only a single lift serving people who enter from Hunter Street is questioned. Given the inevitable 'down-times' for repair and maintenance, as well as capacity issues at particular times, it would be highly desirable to provide two lifts. See also comments below under 'Amenity'. Given the relatively low rise to podium level, the stair from the Hunter Street entry could be made more attractive to everyday use, and more readily accessible

**Response:** A report prepared by Northern Transport Planning and Engineering indicates that at a peak of 25 pedestrians arriving simultaneously, the maximum wait time would be 90 seconds, which is considered internationally accepted for residential type developments. In addition, the capacity and speed of the proposed lift has been increased. The stairs from the Hunter Street entry have been fitted with tactile indicators and handrails to improve accessibility.

A full-time building manager located onsite will ensure that residents are notified of scheduled maintenance times (to be arranged in off peak times) and a quick response to repairs to ensure down-times are minimised.

#### **3. Density**

*Reduction to 173 residential units has brought the density to a more appropriate level.*

**Response:** The apartment mix has since been adjusted to be 180 units, which is still considered to be an appropriate level of density.

#### **4. Sustainability**

*The proposal provides numerous passive inclusions to improve sustainability for the building. Rooftop solar collection panels are a good inclusion as is the waste management strategy being in line with best practice standards. This is welcoming as many multi-level apartment buildings do not have the provision for residents to recycle their garbage. This building boasts two chutes. Assuming one is for recycling this would mean that glass and cans etc will be put down the chute. This will create a lot of noise as the chutes are accessed directly off the common corridors. If possible this should be modified to allow residents to enter into an acoustically isolated room prior to putting garbage or recyclables down the chutes.*

**Response:** The location of the garage chutes is considered to be acceptable as the chutes and risers are acoustically attenuated and the corridors themselves provide a suitable level of acoustic attenuation. It is also noted that bedrooms, which would be the most sensitive receptors are located away from the chute locations.

The development will comply with relevant BCA standards in relation to acoustic requirements.

## **5. Landscape**

*While no deep soil planting is provided, the communal areas proposed show promise of significant areas of potentially attractive landscaping. The images prepared of the roof top terrace show a very inviting landscaped area. Consideration should be given to screening for the area from winds, in addition to the high, glazed balustrades proposed. Care with the high winds is needed in selection of plant species and furniture.*

*A full landscape plan should be provided, including information on ADG compliant soil volumes for plantings, along with sections (to scale) through all landscaped areas, indicating changes in level, planter walls and earth mounding.*

**Response:** A landscape plan has been prepared by DBI (refer Attached). Careful consideration has been given to selection of plant species that are robust and suitable for the rooftop location. Appropriate furniture will also be chosen to suit the location and conditions. Suitably detailed landscape plans will be prepared at construction certificate stage.

## **6. Amenity**

*The proposed changes to the design improve the level of amenity to be enjoyed by the residents. Larger balconies are achieved (but see comment above regarding screening) and some units are larger, with the building having a variety of communal areas and facilities.*

*Depending on which unit you live in, access to your unit may be straightforward or fairly convoluted. The emphasis placed on the Hunter Street entry means that to access most units, everyone is expected to use one small lift to get to the concourse level then walk across to the two main lifts servicing the main tower or go along the corridor in the King Street building to access lifts at the far end of the building. More likely these residents will use the King Street entry, although given the light rail initiative that could be indirect for many.*

*A more simplified pedestrian circulation would greatly improve the amenity of the building. With a relocation of the vehicular circulation west of the main lift core and taking pedestrian egress out to Hunter Street rather than King would allow cars to access parking via a route south of the main lift core and may then allow pedestrian access directly to the lift core on Ground level significantly improving the access to the building.*

**Response:** An effort has been made by the applicant to improve and simplify pedestrian circulation compared to the approved scheme wherever possible. Given the size of the site and with dual street frontages it is somewhat unavoidable that residents at times will have to traverse the site to access their apartments.

## **7. Safety**

*The broader demographics of the occupants associated with the variety of apartment sizes will improve safety within the building complex. The communal spaces will provide a variety of areas for residential use. The roof top terraces will potentially provide a safe sunny outdoor space. Care in selection of the furniture is needed to maintain safety. It should be robust and ideally fixed in place due to the very high winds likely at this level.*

**Response:** Noted. Appropriate furniture will be chosen to suit the location and conditions. Suitably detailed landscape plans will be prepared at construction certificate stage.

#### **8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction**

*The proposed mix of units has improved considerably with this latest design. The broader mix of apartment sizes proposed now including 3 bedroom units should widen the demographics of the building occupants and have a positive impact on the social integration of the building into the adjacent community.*

*It is understood that lift access to individual floors is proposed to be limited to residents of that floor. While this may or may not increase safety, it does not assist social interaction where residents on one level are not able to easily visit friends on another floor. The design for the lift controls should be capable of allowing residents to "buzz in" residents from other floors within the building, as usually occurs for outside visitor access.*

**Response: Noted. Relevant consideration for function of intercoms and building access controls will be detailed at construction certificate stage.**

#### **9. Aesthetic**

*The changes to the façade are considered to be positive in relation to the scale and context of the building. Breaking up the building vertically so that it relates to the height of Worth Place and incorporating materials of similar colour and quality to that of New Space assists in relating the building to its context. The balcony treatment is visually interesting and provides a suitable balance of maintaining privacy and revealing the view.*

*The artistic impressions of the roof top terrace are attractive in themselves, but appear divorced from the aesthetic treatment of the remainder of the building, including the elevations of the roof level. The light-weight recessive nature of the forms shown in the 3D renderings may also be compromised by structural necessities to control the wind and environment at such heights. In particular the tall glass balustrade shown cantilevering out of the base supports is dubious given the excessive winds likely to prevail. To achieve the attractive images shown, the structure at the top needs to be recessed well back from the edge.*

**Response: The design roof elements have been revised to better integrate the rooftop design and complement the overall building façade design.**

**All structures (including the glass balustrade) will be designed and certified by structural engineers as required.**



**Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality**

Various issues are raised under Built Form and Scale, Landscape, Amenity and aesthetics headings which must be resolved, or further developed and refined.

**Summary Recommendation**

Although there are many very positive features in the S.96 proposal which are strongly commended, the critical concerns raised under Built Form, Scale and Landscape must be resolved, and referred back to the Panel should Council consider desirable.



## **URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING**

### **ITEM No. 5**

Date of Panel Assessment: 16 May 2018

Address of Project: 386 King Street  
509 Hunter Street  
Newcastle

Name of Project (if applicable): Sky Apartments

UDCG No: UDCG No 2017/00024

DA No: DA2011/0617, DA2011/0617.01

No. of Buildings: Two towers

No. of Units: 180 plus 467m<sup>2</sup> commercial space

Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None

Attendees: Applicant  
Kevin Snell  
Mick Noonan  
Stacey Stephens  
Ian Summers

Council  
David Paine

*This report addresses the nine Design Quality Principles set out in the Apartment Design Guide (2015) under State Environmental Planning Policy No.65. It is also an appropriate format for applications which do not include residential flats.*

### **Background Summary**

The UDCG has reviewed this project on a number of occasions, the last on 21 March 2018 when it considered a S.96 proposal for amendments to the approved plans.

The current application proposes the following additional significant amendments:-

- Reduction in height of the spire of the tower building
- Reduction in the number of apartments from the approved 262 to 180, (note: previous presentation to the group proposed 173 dwellings) with an increase in bedroom numbers and unit size
- Substantial changes to the external appearance of the tower in particular
- Relocation of communal facilities
- Revised parking layout
- Detailed planning changes to both blocks

## **1. Context and Neighbourhood Character**

21 March 2108 *The Proponent advised how the design has evolved to accommodate a more diverse mix of residential apartment sizes and types and has expressed a more upmarket approach to the elevations in keeping with other nearby developments recently completed or on the market.*

## **2. Built Form and Scale**

21 March 2108 *While the arrangement of the levels has changed to accommodate the increased diversity in the range of units sizes the overall footprint of the building has not changed to a significant level. The floor to floor level has increased which allows the accommodation of the ADG required ceiling heights for habitable rooms, however a floor has been deleted to maintain the overall approved building height. Additional height is sought due to the design of the roof top communal area. To sit comfortably this needs to be significantly set back from the edges except perhaps with the central balcony features continuing up to the roof level. The corners of the roof need to be recessive to allow the building to be seen in its simplified form. The design of the rooftop area is not sympathetic to the external treatment of the facades, and needs to be better integrated to provide an aesthetically cohesive outcome. Care needs to be taken to allow sufficient space for roof top plant within this upper level without the need to increase the height even further. Subject to the above comments the additional communal floor is fully supported as it would provide a high level of amenity for residents.*

16 May 2018: *The revised treatment of the roof top communal area has addressed the principal concerns identified. Some further attention is needed to the living landscaping to ensure the attractive, leafy impressions provided in the landscape documentation approximate what will be achieved in reality.*

21 March 2108 *The following proposed changes are of serious concern:-*

### *King Street block*

*.The long internal corridors without any daylight are unacceptable. By comparison, the approved plans had attractive small communal seating areas at the eastern end of corridors with attractive outlook and good daylight to corridors. ...*

*.The very small separation distances between balconies at the internal corner interface with balconies in the tower block result in unacceptable privacy impacts. Note that in the approved scheme there was significantly greater separation between apartment balconies, and the balcony to the communal spaces had projecting blade walls, - although these too were barely adequate*

*.The main entrance at ground floor appears to have no lobby or enclosure. Given the southern orientation and the adjacent vehicle entrance this would be somewhat bleak for the many residents and visitors who would not arrive by vehicles. An attractive enclosed lobby with at least a small seating area should be provided.*

16 May 2018: *The revisions have gone a reasonable way to addressing the identified concerns, although in a number of instances the revised outcome is not ideal. Specifically:*

*The corridors have been provided with glazing at their eastern end, although this does not adjacent to the mooted seating recess mid-way along each corridor. It is preferable that the glazing be detailed to allow an external aspect from the corridor, providing private open space and apartment windows are not severely overlooked. This revision is a less attractive outcome than the light-filled common areas around the lift lobbies of the approved scheme, but is considered to be a clear improvement on the previously dark and viewless corridors of the 21 March scheme. Articulation of the corridor is a potential*



further improvement, but is hardly provides an attractive area for sitting. Overall these amendments are far less than desirable when there are obvious better outcomes which would entail minimal loss of commercial yield, and can be supported only on the basis that the overall quality of the design is of good standard. The applicant is urged to further explore improvements.

The relationships between apartments and their balconies in the corner junction between the two towers have been improved, with the outcome providing privacy levels that could be considered to be acceptable though not ideal.

The enclosure of the entry lobby has achieved a more comfortable entry to the tower. If there is not a fire separation issue, the Entry space could be made more interesting and could relate better with the retail space opposite across the driveway, if the Entry wall closer to the driveway was glazed.

#### 21 March 2108 Tower Block

*.Although the typical floor plans are acceptable and would result in high level of amenity for apartments, many of the balconies are extremely exposed, particular those located at the corners, and at higher levels. They should be provided with substantial screening, fixed and/or adjustable to ensure that they are habitable and attractive in almost all weather conditions.*

*.The provision of only a single lift serving people who enter from Hunter Street is questioned. Given the inevitable 'down-times' for repair and maintenance, as well as capacity issues at particular times, it would be highly desirable to provide two lifts. See also comments below under 'Amenity'. Given the relatively low rise to podium level, the stair from the Hunter Street entry could be made more attractive to everyday use, and more readily accessible*

16 May 2018: It is proposed to provide screening for wind to levels above floor 15. This was considered to be a positive initiative, although wind levels above say 6 floors can be unpleasant on even a relatively calm day, and it would be advantageous to carry this detail to corner balconies on mid-level floors as well.

The advice in respect to lift wait times and the addition of tactile indicators and handrails to the fire stair providing access to Hunter Street is noted. The Group accepts that what is proposed is arguably compliant, but it represents a lost opportunity for providing a more relaxed and user-friendly pedestrian experience moving between Hunter Street and the remainder of the development.

### **3. Density**

21 March 2108: *Reduction to 173 residential units has brought the density to a more appropriate level.*

16 May 2018: The reduced number of proposed dwellings is now 180 which is acceptable.

### **4. Sustainability**

21 March 2108: *The proposal provides numerous passive inclusions to improve sustainability for the building. Rooftop solar collection panels are a good inclusion as is the waste management strategy being in line with best practice standards. This is welcome as many multi-level apartment buildings do not have the provision for residents to recycle their waste. This building includes two chutes. Assuming one is for recycling this would mean that glass and cans etc will be put down the chute. This may create a lot of noise as the chutes are accessed directly off the common corridors. If possible this should be modified to allow residents to enter into an acoustically isolated room prior to putting garbage or recyclables down the chutes.*

18 May 2018: The applicant indicated that their investigations had indicated that current BCA requirements mean that acoustic impacts from material in the chutes will not adversely impact residents.

## **5. Landscape**

21 March 2108: *While no deep soil planting is provided, the communal areas proposed show promise of significant areas of potentially attractive landscaping. The images prepared of the roof top terrace show a very inviting landscaped area. Consideration should be given to screening for the area from winds, in addition to the high, glazed balustrades proposed. Care with the high winds is needed in selection of plant species and furniture.*

*A full landscape plan should be provided, including information on ADG compliant soil volumes for plantings, along with sections (to scale) through all landscaped areas, indicating changes in level, planter walls and earth mounding.*

16 May 2018: The provided landscape plan did not indicate soil volumes or plant sizes. These are a requirement of the ADG and should be provided with a revised roof landscaping design. Concern was expressed by the Group in regard to the quite limited plantings proposed for the roof, and what appeared in the limited information provided, to be restricted soil volumes available. It is evident that a strategy for utilising fewer, larger plants in containers conflicts with the applicant's concerns in regard to wind damage to larger scaled trees and shrubs.

In order to achieve any approximation of the pleasant landscape outcomes illustrated in the renderings, it will be necessary to introduce a greater extent of living plants. If it is not considered possible to provide some wind protection for larger plants and their containers, the strategy should be revised to provide more extensive areas of lower plantings closer to floor level.

## **6. Amenity**

21 March 2108: *The proposed changes to the design improve the level of amenity potentially enjoyed by the residents. Larger balconies are achieved (but see comment above regarding screening) and some units are larger, with the building having a variety of communal areas and facilities.*

*Depending on which unit you live in, access to your unit may be straightforward or fairly convoluted. The emphasis placed on the Hunter Street entry means that to access most units, everyone is expected to use one small lift to get to the concourse level then walk across to the two main lifts servicing the main tower or go along the corridor in the King Street building to access lifts at the far end of the building. More likely these residents will use the King Street entry, although given the light rail initiative, that could be indirect for many.*

*A more simplified pedestrian circulation would greatly improve the amenity of the building. With a relocation of the vehicular circulation west of the main lift core and taking pedestrian egress out to Hunter Street rather than King would allow cars to access parking via a route south of the main lift core and may then allow pedestrian access directly to the lift core on Ground level significantly improving the access to the building.*

16 May: As discussed under Built Form above, the access for all residents between their dwellings and the streets could be made more pleasant and less convoluted. The proposed routes are arguably acceptable, but could be significantly improved by a more generous access way for pedestrians – particularly between the podium level and Hunter Street.

## **7. Safety**

21 March 2108: *The broader demographics of the occupants associated with the variety of apartment sizes will improve safety within the building complex. The communal spaces will provide a variety of areas for residential use. The roof top terraces will potentially provide a safe sunny outdoor space. Care in selection of the furniture is needed to maintain safety. It should be robust and ideally fixed in place due to the very high winds likely at this level.*

May 16 2018: The applicant has indicated a furniture store on the roof level will be used to ensure that furniture is not blown around during high winds.

## **8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction**

*The proposed mix of units has improved considerably with this latest design. The broader mix of apartment sizes proposed now including 3 bedroom units should widen the demographics of the building occupants and have a positive impact on the social integration of the building into the adjacent community.*

*It is understood that lift access to individual floors is proposed to be limited to residents of that floor. While this may increase safety, it does not assist social interaction where residents on one level are not able to easily visit friends on another floor. The design for the lift controls should be capable of allowing residents to "buzz in" residents from other floors within the building, as usually occurs for outside visitor access.*

May 16 2018: The Group reiterated its support for the revised mix of apartment types. In respect to resident access to friends on other floors, the applicant indicated a willingness to look into opportunities with Building Management Systems to allow intercom activation between apartments of short term access between relevant floors (only), as occurs for visitors from external intercoms.

## **9. Aesthetics**

21 March 2108: *The changes to the façade are considered to be positive in relation to the scale and context of the building. Breaking up the building vertically so that it relates to the height of Worth Place and incorporating materials of similar colour and quality to that of New Space assists in relating the building to its context. The balcony treatment is visually interesting and provides a suitable balance of maintaining privacy and revealing the view.*

*The artistic impressions of the roof top terrace are attractive in themselves, but appear aesthetically quite divorced from the aesthetic treatment of the remainder of the building, including the elevations of the roof level. The light-weight recessive nature of the forms shown in the 3D renderings may also be compromised by structural necessities to control the wind and environment at such heights. In particular the tall glass balustrade shown cantilevering out of the base supports is dubious given the excessive winds likely to prevail. To achieve the attractive images shown, the structure at the top needs to be recessed well back from the edge.*

May 16 2018: The aesthetics of the proposed development have been further improved by a better integration of the roof elements with the remainder of the building. The net result is a significant improvement of the aesthetics of the previously approved tower.

## **Summary Recommendation**

21 March 2108: *Although there are many very positive features in the S.96 proposal which are strongly commended, the critical concerns raised under Built Form, Scale and Landscape must be resolved, and referred back to the Panel, should Council consider desirable.*

May 16 2018: The further design development of the s96 design has progressed to a level at which the previously raised concerns are considered to have been satisfied. . The roof top landscape design requires further design development and additional standard information as outlined in the ADG. Providing that this is submitted to the satisfaction of the relevant Council officers, the Group considers the application could be supported.



## **URBAN DESIGN CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING**

### **ITEM No. 5**

Date of Panel Assessment: 21 March 2018

Address of Project: 386 King Street  
509 Hunter Street  
Newcastle

Name of Project (if applicable): Sky Apartments

UDCG No: UDCG No 2017/00024

DA No: DA2011/0617 , DA2011/0617.01

No. of Buildings: Two towers

No. of Units: 173 plus 467m<sup>2</sup> commercial space

Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None

Attendees:

Applicant  
Kevin Snell  
Mick Noonan  
George Arugia  
Stacey Stephens  
Ian Summers

Council  
David Paine

*This report addresses the nine Design Quality Principles set out in the Apartment Design Guide (2015) under State Environmental Planning Policy No.65. It is also an appropriate format for applications which do not include residential flats.*

### **Background Summary**

The UDCG has reviewed this project on a number of occasions, the last in September 2017 when it considered a S.96 proposal for amendments to the approved plans. At that time the proposed amendments primarily related to external materials and finishes, reduction in the number of apartments, and details of landscape design.

The current application proposes the following additional significant amendments:-

- Reduction in height of the spire of the tower building
- Reduction in the number of apartments from the approved 262 to 173, with an increase in bedroom numbers and unit size
- Substantial changes to the external appearance of the tower in particular
- Relocation of communal facilities

- Revised parking layout
- Detailed planning changes to both blocks

## **1. Context and Neighbourhood Character**

The Proponent advised how the design has evolved to accommodate a more diverse mix of residential apartment sizes and types and has expressed a more upmarket approach to the elevations in keeping with other nearby developments recently completed or on the market.

## **2. Built Form and Scale**

While the arrangement of the levels has changed to accommodate the increased diversity in the range of units sizes the overall footprint of the building has not changed to a significant level. The floor to floor level has increased which allows the accommodation of the ADG required ceiling heights for habitable rooms, however a floor has been deleted to maintain the overall approved building height. Additional height is sought due to the design of the roof-top communal area. To sit comfortably this needs to be significantly set back from the edges except perhaps with the central balcony features continuing up to the roof level. The corners of the roof need to be recessive to allow the building to be seen in its simplified form. The design of the rooftop area is not sympathetic to the external treatment of the facades, and needs to be better integrated to provide an aesthetically cohesive outcome. Heavy, over-scaled columns are particularly unsympathetic. Care needs to be taken to allow sufficient space for roof top plant within this upper level without the need to increase the height even further. Subject to the above comments the additional communal floor is fully supported as it would provide a high level of amenity for residents.

However the other following proposed changes are of serious concern:-

### King Street block

.The long internal corridors without any daylight are unacceptable. By comparison, the approved plans had attractive small communal seating areas at the eastern end of corridors with attractive outlook and good daylight to corridors. These should be retained.

.The very small separation distances between balconies at the internal corner interface with balconies in the tower block result in unacceptable privacy impacts. Note that in the approved scheme there was significantly greater separation between apartment balconies, and the balcony to the communal spaces had projecting blade walls, - although these too were barely adequate to deal with privacy.

.The main entrance at ground floor appears to have no lobby or enclosure. Given the southern orientation and the adjacent vehicle entrance this would be somewhat bleak for the many residents and visitors who would not arrive by vehicles. An attractive enclosed lobby with at least a small seating area should be provided.

### Tower Block

.Although the typical floor plans are acceptable and would result in high level of amenity for apartments, many of the balconies are extremely exposed, particular those located at the corners, and especially at higher levels. They should be provided with substantial screening, fixed and/or adjustable to ensure that they are habitable and attractive in almost all weather conditions.

.The provision of only a single lift serving people who enter from Hunter Street is questioned. Given the inevitable 'down-times' for repair and maintenance, as well as capacity issues at particular times, it would be highly desirable to provide two lifts. See also comments below under 'Amenity'. Given the relatively low rise to podium level, the

stair from the Hunter Street entry could be made more attractive to everyday use, and more readily accessible

### **3. Density**

Reduction to 173 residential units has brought the density to a more appropriate level.

### **4. Sustainability**

The proposal provides numerous passive inclusions to improve sustainability for the building. Rooftop solar collection panels are a good inclusion as is the waste management strategy being in line with best practice standards. This is welcoming as many multi-level apartment buildings do not have the provision for residents to recycle their garbage. This building boasts two chutes. Assuming one is for recycling this would mean that glass and cans etc will be put down the chute. This will create a lot of noise as the chutes are accessed directly off the common corridors. If possible this should be modified to allow residents to enter into an acoustically isolated room prior to putting garbage or recyclables down the chutes.

### **5. Landscape**

While no deep soil planting is provided, the communal areas proposed show promise of significant areas of potentially attractive landscaping. The images prepared of the roof top terrace show a very inviting landscaped area. Consideration should be given to screening for the area from winds, in addition to the high, glazed balustrades proposed. Care with the high winds is needed in selection of plant species and furniture.

A full landscape plan should be provided, including information on ADG compliant soil volumes for plantings, along with sections (to scale) through all landscaped areas, indicating changes in level, planter walls and earth mounding.

### **6. Amenity**

The proposed changes to the design improve the level of amenity to be enjoyed by the residents. Larger balconies are achieved (but see comment above regarding screening) and some units are larger, with the building having a variety of communal areas and facilities.

Depending on which unit you live in, access to your unit may be straightforward or fairly convoluted. The emphasis placed on the Hunter Street entry means that to access most units, everyone is expected to use one small lift to get to the concourse level then walk across to the two main lifts servicing the main tower or go along the corridor in the King Street building to access lifts at the far end of the building. More likely these residents will use the King Street entry, although given the light rail initiative, that could be indirect for many.

A more simplified pedestrian circulation would greatly improve the amenity of the building. With a relocation of the vehicular circulation west of the main lift core and taking pedestrian egress out to Hunter Street rather than King would allow cars to access parking via a route south of the main lift core and may then allow pedestrian access directly to the lift core on Ground level significantly improving the access to the building.

### **7. Safety**

The broader demographics of the occupants associated with the variety of apartment sizes will improve safety within the building complex. The communal spaces will provide

a variety of areas for residential use. The roof top terraces will potentially provide a safe sunny outdoor space. Care in selection of the furniture is needed to maintain safety. It should be robust and ideally fixed in place due to the very high winds likely at this level.

### **8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction**

The proposed mix of units has improved considerably with this latest design. The broader mix of apartment sizes proposed now including 3 bedroom units should widen the demographics of the building occupants and have a positive impact on the social integration of the building into the adjacent community.

It is understood that lift access to individual floors is proposed to be limited to residents of that floor. While this may or may not increase safety, it does not assist social interaction where residents on one level are not able to easily visit friends on another floor. The design for the lift controls should be capable of allowing residents to "buzz in" residents from other floors within the building, as usually occurs for outside visitor access.

### **9. Aesthetic**

The changes to the façade are considered to be positive in relation to the scale and context of the building. Breaking up the building vertically so that it relates to the height of Worth Place and incorporating materials of similar colour and quality to that of New Space assists in relating the building to its context. The balcony treatment is visually interesting and provides a suitable balance of maintaining privacy and revealing the view.

The artistic impressions of the roof top terrace are attractive in themselves, but appear divorced from the aesthetic treatment of the remainder of the building, including the elevations of the roof level. The light-weight recessive nature of the forms shown in the 3D renderings may also be compromised by structural necessities to control the wind and environment at such heights. In particular the tall glass balustrade shown cantilevering out of the base supports is dubious given the excessive winds likely to prevail. To achieve the attractive images shown, the structure at the top needs to be recessed well back from the edge.

### **Amendments Required to Achieve Design Quality**

Various issues are raised under Built Form and Scale, Landscape, Amenity and aesthetics headings which must be resolved, or further developed and refined.

### **Summary Recommendation**

Although there are many very positive features in the S.96 proposal which are strongly commended, the critical concerns raised under Built Form, Scale and Landscape must be resolved, and referred back to the Panel should Council consider desirable.