

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING

Meeting Report and Recommendations

Meeting Date: 31 January 2018

Time and Location: Halliday Room, City of Canada Bay Council

Panel members	Conrad Johnston (Chairperson)
	Peter Hill
	Peter McGregor
	Susan Miles
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Judy Clark (Planning Consultant assisting Council) Paul Dewar Samuel Lettice Anthony Wynn Kendal Mackay (Planning Consultant assessing DA on Council's behalf for Item 2)
Guests	N/A
Declaration of interest	Nil

Business Item and Meeting Report

Item number	2
DA number	DA2017/0544
Property address	34 Walker Street Rhodes
Proposal	Demolition of existing structures and construction of a mixed-use development comprising two buildings of 19 and 34 levels containing 400 residential apartments, retail space, a leisure centre, childcare centre, basement parking for 588 cars and stratum subdivision
Applicant or applicant's representative in attendance to address to the Design Review Panel	John Pradel SJB Architects Others: Emil Kucevic, James Kidd, Murray Donaldson, Audrey Chee, Tom Gregg
Background	The site was inspected by the Panel on 31 January 2018

Key Issues and Recommendations

1. Podium

The Panel was briefed on the strategic planning context and background history of the site, the planned delivery of a major Council facility (leisure centre) as part of the development and acknowledges the complexity of the project. The concept of 2 towers above a podium with a strong civic presence is considered an appropriate response to the site in principle however some further matters need to be addressed to mitigate the impact of the proposal on the streetscape and the adjoining buildings. The Panel recommends that:

- 1.1 Along the street edges the podium should be setback a minimum of 3 metres (and no more than 4 metres) as envisaged by the Rhodes West Development Control Plan 2015 (RWDCP), to address concerns about the monolithic scale of the podium and its resultant building bulk (this would necessitate consequential adjustment to the setbacks of the towers from the podium edge). Improved public domain, particularly widened footpaths and additional significant street tree planting should be provided within any additional setback.

- 1.2 The height of the podium along the southern boundary adjoining 24-32 Walker Street should be reduced. The nil boundary setback along the southern side boundary at the proposed podium height of 18 metres (compared to up to 14 metres generally envisaged in the RWDCP- in conjunction with 1 storey in the south eastern corner of the site) will have a significant unacceptable impact on the amenity and outlook of units on the northern side of the building to the south.
- 1.3 Additional bulk should be removed from the podium in this area to reduce overshadowing impacts, supported by detailed shadow diagrams that demonstrate the resultant overshadowing of the affected units.
- 1.4 The setback to this area of the building should be reconsidered and will need to achieve both the ADG separation distance and also ensure the solar access of the adjoining building will still comply with the 70% sunlight considerations.

2. Public domain, streetscape and pedestrian links

- 2.1 The façade of the podium should be opened up more where possible to the street at each level to express the public/civic activities contained within it, give a richness of depth, and improve street activation and surveillance.
- 2.2 The ground floor plan should be reconsidered to be more open and legible and allow direct pedestrian sight lines.
- 2.3 The north south pedestrian connection should reinforce the creation of the future north south laneway as envisaged by the RWDCP. Notwithstanding the laneway location shown under the RWDCP and the fact it is on a different site to this DA, the possibility of moving the laneway adjacent to the eastern boundary may make more sense to achieve this important pedestrian linkage through the development.
- 2.4 Public access should be ensured through easements and/or dedication, including dedication of the increased podium setback area to facilitate extension of the public domain at street level.

3. Other Matters

The Panel recommends that:

- 3.1 The SEPP 65 solar analysis diagrams for the units are checked for accuracy as there appear to be errors in the number of units that claim to achieve 2 hours sunlight.
- 3.2 Undergrounding of power is required along all street frontages if not already done to allow for taller street tree planting

3.3 Consideration should be given to inclusion of a community garden for residents of the units within the residential communal open space.

3.4 The material schedule should be further clarified as some abbreviations used on the plans do not appear in the key.

Note: The building design should achieve best practice in terms of sustainability (e.g. dual piping for recycled water).