

<b>Date</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> March 2019
<b>Time</b>	12.30am-1.30pm
<b>Location</b>	Bates Smart Board room

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
Design Review Panel Lee Hillam – Government Architect NSW Philip Pollard AMENITY UNE	Louise Berner- TfNSW Adam Haddow- SJB Jure Domazet – Doma
Observers Gavin Edgar – Doma Sean Kearney- Doma Simon Swaney – Bates Smart Brad Dorn- Bates Smart	
Remotely: Geoffrey Douglas -City of Newcastle Council	

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Item</b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Introductory Comments</b></p> <p>This session of the DRP was focussed on the three referral matters arising from the Joint Regional Planning Panel session. Therefore the structure of these notes has been varied to provide a direct response to only those issues.</p> <p>The JRPP asked the DRP to review the scheme based on the following queries;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Details, materials and articulation (also noting this was a requirement within the terms of waiving a design competition)</li> <li>2. The height of the colonnade area to Stewart Ave. Specifically, wouldn't it be a better design outcome to increase the height of the colonnade by one storey to match the height of the roof element of the adjoining train station (which defines the public domain to the North), with the building recess above also increased by one level to maintain proportions between the setback and the recess (and as the recess may visually relate to the carpark more than the Hunter Street streetwall/podium)</li> <li>3. Review the appropriateness of the southern setback at upper levels (above the recess) in terms of the effect of the building massing and presentation (in the absence of an above streetwall setback) on a narrow laneway, and having regard to potential redevelopment of the site to the south, and impacts of the setback as proposed on development options for the site to the south, including options for residential development at upper levels.</li> </ol>

Item No.	Item
2.	<p><b>DRP Comments</b></p> <p>The DRP generally support the design development of the Commercial building support this project moving forward through the approvals process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Details materials and articulation are supported. The use of brick at the pedestrian level is supported as an appropriate reference to the heritage of the site, as a low maintenance material that expresses quality and solidity and is line with the Masterplan proposal. The large metal clad columns should be of a material that is manageable in case of wear and tear and graffiti. The discussed option of painted sheet metal plates with countersunk screws is supported.</li><li>2. The height of the colonnade is supported as proposed. The panel discussed alternative colonnade heights in order to pick up lines being set by the transport interchange canopy, or to respond to other site lines such as set by the council building on Hunter St, or by the DCP. The reasoning behind the panels decision to support the proposed colonnade height can be outlined as;<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Relationship to the station is not thought to be a strong representation of the datum, considering that future development in the area would also address the 16m street wall height, not the station structure. The station is a standalone element in the streetscape.</li><li>• The height of the colonnade is thought to be in good proportion to the rest of the building, given the height at 11 storeys.</li><li>• Any increase in the colonnade height would potentially detract from the nature and use of the colonnade at a pedestrian scale.</li><li>• The UDCG have given advice to a development at 10 Dangar St Wickham (other side of the station) that a 2 storey entry to mirror this proposal is preferred.</li><li>• The height of the recessed floor at Level 4 to address the DCP 16m street wall height, in the absence of a building setback is thought to be the right approach for the site. Noting that other developments in the vicinity have varying street wall references.</li></ul></li><li>3. The southern setback is understood to be not in line with current DCP setback guidelines. Alternative proposals that tested the potential for the neighbouring site to be developed with the current setback, and then with the suggested setback to the land above the street wall were presented. Both a residential use and a commercial use were modelled. It was shown that enforcing a set back to the commercial building did not produce a significantly better outcome for the development potential of the site. The effect on the amenity of Beresford Lane was considered to acceptable given its use as a service lane. Therefore the setback, as proposed, is supported by the Panel.</li></ol>

Item No.	Item
3.	<b>Actions</b> 1. No actions with regard to this Design Review Panel meeting.