

Meeting: UDRP – 26 March 2025

Date Wednesday 26 March 2025

Chair: **Phill Pollard**, Urban Design Review Panel

Attendees: Kristy Cianci (Ryan), Urban Design Review Panel
Elisabeth Peet, Urban Design Review Panel

Layla Clifford, Paraplanner, City of Newcastle
Monique Chang, Business Operations Officer, City of Newcastle

AGENDA	Item	Description
	2	Matters for consideration
9:30am-10:30am [60 mins]	2.1	124-126 Bull Street Newcastle West UD2024/00429.03 - MA2024/00381 Sec. 4.55(2) modification to DA2019/01169 for mixed use development demolition of structures erection of 14 storey mixed use including seniors living and aged care facilities - design changes to replace seniors living and aged care facilities with residential apartments Attendees: Applicant: Rob Mirams, Architect - Fender Katsalidis (Online) Trevor Fowler, Architect - Fender Katsalidis (Online) Claire Lim - Fender Katsalidis (Online) Tom - Fender Katsalidis (Online) Sam Coles, Town Planner - GWH Rob Bisley, Planner - Guide CN Officer: Eliza Arnott, Principal Development Officer (Concierge)

In the interest of providing open access to information to the public this referral will be made available on City of Newcastle's (CN's) Application Tracking system.

The content of this advice is intended to provide information for the Assessment Officer to consider in the determination of the relevant application. The Urban Design Review Panel (UDRP) is an advisory Panel only and the advice provided by the Panel is to inform the assessment process.

It is not the purpose of the UDRP to have any role in the determination of development applications, nor are its recommendations binding on CN's determination of an application.

Scope

The following drawings / documents have been reviewed:

Plan No / Supporting Document / No. of Pages	Prepared by	Reference/ date
Architectural Drawings (28 pages)	Fender Katsalidis	12 March 2025
Landscape Drawings (27 pages)	Oculus	07 March 2025
Urban Design Review Panel Response (27 pages)	Fender Katsalidis	26 March 2025

Background

Development Consent DA2019/01169 ('the Original Development Consent') was granted by Hunter Central Coast Regional Planning Panel ('HCCRPP') on 9 March 2021 for *'Mixed use development - demolition of structures, erection of two 14 storey mixed-use buildings with shared basement carparking (286 spaces), comprising seniors housing (114 bed aged care facility and 82 independent living units), residential flat building (166 units), medical centre, food and drink premises (café and restaurant) and retail premises (salon)'* at the subject site known then as Lot 1 DP 826956, 309 King Street Newcastle West.

At the time the Original Development Consent was granted, the land was legally known as Lot 1 DP 826956 with a street address of 309 King Street Newcastle West and encompassed the majority of the city block bound by King Street to the north, Union Street to the east, Bull Street to the south, and Ravenshaw Street to the west. The works approved by the Original Development Consent only relate to the western half of the entire allotment, with the West City Club (also known as NEX) being located on the eastern portion.

Development Consent DA2019/01171 was granted in December 2020 in relation to the subject site and included, amongst other works, approval for a one into two lot Torrens title subdivision. This subdivision has since been registered, resulting in the relevant portion of the site to now be legally known as Lot 1 DP 1301874 with a street address of 124-126 Bull Street.

The approved development triggered the architectural design competition requirement under Clause 7.5 (Design excellence) of the Newcastle Local Environmental Plan 2012 ('NLEP 2012'). However, the Government Architect New South Wales certified in writing that the development is one for which an architectural design competition is not required ('architectural design competition waiver').

The development is required to comply with the conditions of the architectural design competition waiver which, amongst other things, requires that a process of continuing design review be established to ensure the scheme retains design excellence through to completion of construction.

Modification Application MA2023/00221 to modify the Original Development Consent was approved by the HCCRPP on 3 April 2024 ('the Modified Development Consent'). The Modified Development Consent facilitated; an additional level (residential) to eastern tower B; a reduction in the number of residential aged care ('RAC') facility beds (50 beds); increased number of independent living units (107 units); a reduction and reconfiguration of residential apartments (159 apartments); a reduction and reconfiguration of commercial premises (2 commercial tenancies), a reconfiguration of car parking and waste room; changes to parking numbers and allocation (315 car spaces); changes to landscaping and communal open space; staging of development; Stratum Subdivision; and amendment to conditions

The development has previously been considered by the UDRP at multiple design review sessions held during the assessment of the Original Development Consent and the Modified Development Consent.

The proposed modification to the approved development has previously been considered on three occasions by the UDRP; twice on a pre-application basis at the meeting held 28 August 2024 (ref. UD2024/00429) and 28 October 2024 (ref. UD2024/00429.01). then for a third time

The subject modification application (ref. **MA2024/00381**) was subsequently lodged and the proposed modifications reviewed for a third time at the meeting held 29 January 2025.

The proposed modifications are now referred to the UDRP for a fourth time. Relevant extracts from previous UDRP written advice have been reiterated below in italics, followed by comments on the current modification proposal.

1. Context and Neighbourhood Character

28 August 2024

The Site is located on the southern side of King Street, which is at this point quite a wide thoroughfare, with mature paperbarks and palm trees on a broad median at its centre. The Site is situated on a gentle rise from King Street and is bounded by a short street-frontage to Ravenshaw Street at its western side, and another long frontage to Bull Street at its southern side. It accommodated the former Hunter Water Board's motor vehicle servicing building – a single storey mid-century building which in more recent years has been utilised by the adjacent Wests NEX Club as a car park. The Club's auditorium currently discharges its emergency egress to an area between the Site and the Club. This area, which was approved as a landscaped through-site pedestrian link as part of the development, is a memorial to the lives lost when the former registered club, the Workers Club, at the corner of Union and King Streets, collapsed during the December 1989 Newcastle Earthquake. The design of this memorial link is not proposed to be altered under the Modification. The UDRP was advised during the architects' presentation that Wests club has advised them of its intention to activate the eastern side of the Memorial Walk with retail frontage – in lieu of the comparatively inhospitable egress that is currently located there.

The Market-town retail development, which includes apartments above its podium level, is situated on the western side of Ravenshaw Street opposite the Site. A large, NSW government offices building, an attractive low-rise brutalist structure that appears in good condition, and which includes publicly accessible landscaped forecourts, occupies the site immediately to the south in Bull Street. Current zoning for the blocks to the south and south-east of the Site permits buildings of a considerably greater height than existing development and is therefore likely to be the subject of development proposals in the future.

30 October 2024

No further comments.

29 January 2025

The design of the Memorial Walk is now proposed to be altered in the modification. Refer detailed comments under 'Landscape'.

26 March 2025

The approved design for the Memorial Walk has been reinstated, which is supported by the Panel.

2. Built Form and Scale

28 August 2024

Positive

- *Lowered podium - the proposed three stories works better in the street than the approved four stories within the streetscape.*
- *Having the additional communal open space is a positive in principle (as it allows each tower to have an independent communal area) - acknowledging that this is subject to further consideration in the context of the resulting height of building exceedance.*
- *Panel supports the minimum 3.2 metres floor-to-floor dimensions for levels containing residential apartments with wet areas vertically aligned. This is consistent with accepted industry practice increasingly being demonstrated.*

Additional height

- *An additional residential storey of apartments is proposed with a rooftop communal space to the western tower (Tower A) – this will need to be further considered in terms of FSR, as well as the visual presentation of its profile in the urban setting.*
- *Further information is needed to understand the impacts on the skyline – particularly considering that a modification for an additional floor to the approved eastern block (B) of the subject development was previously supported by the UDCG Panel because it permitted a varied roof line from the subject tower (A).*
- *The Panel noted there would need to be consideration if the varied height in the approval provided a basis for the justification in the existing height variation.*

Changes to Tower A podium spaces

- *The prominent western corner is now proposed to be occupied by back of house/ services and is non-activated.*
- *Changes result in a poor public domain interface at the prominent western corner (corner of King and Ravenshaw Streets).*
- *Level 01 within the podium addressing this western corner has also lost activation due to storage cages now located around the building perimeter. In the Panel's view, both the Ground Floor and Level 01 should be activated to address both streets around this corner.*
- *The Panel acknowledged the positive activation of the Memorial Walk - however this does not overcome the lack of any activation now proposed on Block A's King Street frontage, and particularly its prominent western corner.*
- *The King Street façade, with the exception of the residential entry, is no longer activated with the basement entry, services, fire escapes, waste collection now dominating the building perimeter. This has led to a lack of engagement with the street for a substantial distance.*
- *What is now proposed at the street-front address to the public domain is a poorer outcome than the current approved design - sandwiching the residential lobby within what is now a full podium of services needs to be reconsidered. There is opportunity to put some of these services/ back of house items at a lower level on Bull Street to free up more of King Street for activation.*

30 October 2024

The northwest return corner of Tower A has been amended at base level in response to previous recommendations at ground and first floors. In response additional retail spaces have been introduced along the King Street frontage and toward the curved corner frontage to King and Ravenshaw Streets. A street awning projecting below the first-floor spandrels curves about the northwestern corner enhancing the retail forages rather than the vertical columns.

Activation of the first-floor podium level about the northwestern corner has been improved through the introduction of bronze coloured metal screens and more prominent planter boxes these in turn replicated by those to residential terraces on level 2 above.

The Panel supported the amendments, and enquired as to the potential for continuation of retail areas further about the prominent corner. It was accepted that relocation of the substation and switch rooms currently at the corner would provide limited additional retail space at a location of rising external pavement.

29 January 2025

The Panel made recommendations for further amendments to the internal circulation and corridors on residential levels and to the internal corner units- Refer detailed comments under Amenity

26 March 2025

The following changes were made to the development:

- The waste holding room was moved from the King Street façade as Council's waste team did not support its location on that Street.

- The Memorial Walk has been reinstated as per the approval.
- The east-facing corridor window has been pushed deeper into the façade to allow for cross-ventilation to the adjoining unit.
- Space for seating in the corridor has been provided.

The Panel support the changes to the design. The Applicant noted that there were issues in adding a third arm to the internal corridors for natural light, which the Panel previously requested, as it will result in the removal of the 3-bedroom unit on each floor, and the redistribution of its area to units with two bedrooms. The Panel notes that this is a modification and accepts that the configuration, though not ideal, is considered to technically satisfy the ADG requirement for light and ventilation; if it were a new design, the Panel would press for this window to the corridor.

3. Density

28 August 2024

The Panel indicated that an increase in FSR would not be supported on the site. The preliminary FSR indicated for the modification appears to have omitted some area(s) that should be included in the calculation.

30 October 2024

As above.

29 January 2025

The Architect has now provided additional detail and diagrams demonstrating FSR calculations

26 March 2025

No further comments.

4. Sustainability

28 August 2024

The increased need for winter heating for apartments with no solar access will mean an increased energy demand for apartment heating in winter. PV generation should be optimised, with battery storage encouraged either on-site, or via an engagement with an off-site storage arrangement.

Provision for EV charging will need to be increased to address the greater car ownership of apartment dwellers as opposed to seniors living residents. Details of proposed shared fast charging locations, as well as resident's own vehicle charging in allocated car parks should be provided. Provision should also be made for increased charging facilities as demand increases with EV uptake.

All-electric apartments are strongly encouraged, rather than provision of gas connection, which will become redundant.

30 October 2024

As above.

29 January 2025

EV charging

- *The Architect provided drawings illustrating the intended EV charging arrangement, including locations of chargers to be installed and location of infrastructure provided to allow for future individual carpark charging locations to all spaces as required.*
- *The Panel noted that where infrastructure is provided to allow for future charging points, this should be wired to allow electricity use to be attributed to the relevant apartment.*

26 March 2025

The plans have been updated to show proposed EV charging for future installations, including cable trays and distribution boards. The Panel noted the Applicant's assurance that sufficient power supply would be provided to the building at completion 100% of the parking spaces as the demand increases.

5. Landscape

28 August 2024

It is important that the landscape treatment at ground level achieves quite a lush and generous outcome - especially on the lower levels.

- *Given the location and the visually "hard" materials selected – it is important that soft vegetation is provided to offset the harshness of the materials (especially concrete). Any opportunities for planting in full deep soil should be pursued, as these locations have much greater capacity for a usefully sized mature landscape, that is more proportionate to the scale of the development. Plantings in deep soil are also likely to be longer-lived.*
- *Having the soil volumes - making sure the planting is contiguous.*
- *Soil volumes and the depth of soil in planters on-structure are a major influence on the success of landscape.*
- *Small soil volumes or narrow landscaping beds will dry out rapidly and will be more prone to failure.*
- *Rooftop communal areas – if supported in future – will need to provide a sense of being in an attractive landscaped area – rather than being on structure, with occasional plantings in containers dotted about.*

30 October 2024

- *The above advice was reiterated.*
- *It was also noted that all landscape that is contributory to the appearance of the buildings is to be maintained under the management of the Owners Corporation. (That is all landscape areas other than small planters within private open space for herbs etc).*
- *Safe and workable access needs to be available to all contributory landscape.*
- *All landscaped areas are to be irrigated.*
- *Soil volumes are to be provided in accordance with ADG recommendations, and should be nominated in documentation.*

29 January 2025

Landscaping

- *Generally the landscape proposal has improved.*
- *6.8% deep soil on an inner-city site can be considered a reasonable outcome.*
- *The proposed communal rooftop areas are supported*

Northern end of 'Memorial Walk'

- *The landscape proposal to the Northern end of the 'Memorial Walk' has been significantly amended, removing the planter beds and a substantial part of the water feature previously proposed adjacent to the Memorial wall.*
- *The Panel raised concerns regarding the new proposal for individual raised circular planters dividing the open space and the significant increase in hardstand in this area, as well as the loss of the water elements in the northern half of the walk.*
- *These central planters divide the space which is otherwise a hard paved and hard-surfaced environment. Freestanding screen elements intended to screen the egress stairs from the Club may create areas for semi-concealment and should also be reconsidered in a CPTED context.*
- *Removing the planter beds adjacent to the memorial wall also now leaves this as a stand alone element which is quite different to the original proposal.*
- *No details were provided in the documentation package presented explaining the reason for changes proposed to the approved landscape design. No rationale was provided for the revised scheme – which was considered significantly inferior to the approved design. The Applicant noted during the meeting that concerns regarding structural loading may have influenced the proposed changes.*
- *The Panel noted that this is an important cultural space intended to mark the loss of life, injury, disruption and community displacement brought about by the 1989 earthquake. Considerable effort, discussion and consultation went into the approved design. If practical issues mean that the approved treatment of the space is not achievable, any newly proposed scheme needs to be pursued with the commitment, vigour and application that were applied to the approved design.*
- *Although the subject Modification application scheme is lacking in information and visual illustration, it was evident from the limited documentation provided, that the new scheme falls well short of the standard of approved scheme and the qualities required for the memorial space. Additional information and explanation are required to understand options available and the reasoning for change from the approved design. In particular any forthcoming revised design needs to be supported by a thorough consideration of the importance of the memorial to the City.*
- *Perspectives and clear graphic illustration should support options for any amended proposal. These are required to understand the character and qualities of the space.*

26 March 2025

The approved design for the Memorial Walk has been reinstated, which is supported by the Panel.

The podium-level communal open space should be clearly secured from the street to prevent unauthorised use. The architectural and landscape documentation does not include this information.

The pool fence is depicted as Corten panels (sheet steel) in the landscape documentation. While this material could be appropriate as a feature element, its use for the entirety of the fence is discouraged as it blocks sightlines. The adjacent uses are communal spaces and not residential units, and it would be beneficial for there to be sightlines - particularly to monitor children in the pool if using other facilities such as the gym. Rod style fencing is the Panel's recommended option for the majority of pool fencing as it allows better air circulation.

6. Amenity

28 August 2024

Tower A typical apartment floor plate:

- *Tower A has 10 apartments with a single core - this is 2 more apartments than the maximum recommended by the ADG with 6-8 units per core being better practice. Only one point of access to natural light and ventilation is provided in the extensive corridor lengths. This is further*

exacerbated by lack of articulation of the corridors at the building perimeter, and narrow corridor widths.

- Further issues resulting from the L-shaped floor plate - apartments at the internal corner of the L-shape have minimal living room fenestration. The relationship of living rooms to the exterior and their aspect need further consideration and re-planning to provide pleasant spaces and adequate amenity - of particular note is the lack of direct solar access. The current layout is not helped by the apartment directly to the south being stepped out by approximately a metre - which further obstructs visual access to the exterior.*
- The typology is predicated on a model that the ADG looks to discourage which is the single-core, double-loaded long, narrow and/or cranked corridors that result in an excess of single-aspect apartments, generally with poor amenity.*
- Excessively long, fairly narrow corridors are proposed, together with some poor internal planning of apartments that further reduces their aspect and access to light, such as multiple dog-legs from the entry door to the living room before being able to see outside/sky.*
- Opportunities to split cores should be further explored. See also comments for natural cross ventilation.*

Solar access

- Solar access is below minimum requirements.*
- 17% is a very high proportion of apartments to not receive any winter sun – especially considering that the site has a long, unshaded northern aspect, and has frontages to three (3) streets.*
- The Panel noted the extent of glazing proposed. This should be further considered with external shade protection that should be integrated with the façade design. Dark or excessively tinted glazing is not supported due to outlook amenity generally and impacting on beneficial winter solar amenity.*

Natural cross ventilation

- Natural cross ventilation performance is well below the ADG minimum requirements.*
- Applicant's calculations are not correct. The Panel's calculation was closer to approximately 38% across the development even accepting the dispensations given above 9 storeys. This represents poor performance, which is directly attributable to the double-loaded, single core building typology.*
- The Panel noted the single-aspect unit types with a corner window within a slot or near the building perimeter are not consistent with the definition of a dual-aspect type capable of achieving natural cross-ventilation.*
- The Panel noted that two single aspect apartment types in Tower B had counted as dual aspect in the current approval. However, these are clearly single aspect types. It is therefore expected that further redesign of Tower A will demonstrate a building typology with multiple cores that maximise the provision of true dual aspect types – including corner, cross-through units with aspects to more than one direction, with opening at a minimum of 90 degrees, demonstrating unobstructed air flow paths deep through the unit's floor plan.*

30 October 2024

Tower A Typical Floor Plates

- Minor amendments have been provided principally to the internal layout of the internal corner apartment.*
- The applicant maintains that a single point of external light and natural ventilation to corridors complies with the ADG, which is technically correct. However corridors are long, and have a ninety degree junction – meaning that daylight only reaches a limited extent of each corridor.*
- The apartment numbers – at 10 per floor - are above the ADG recommended maximum of 8, but are argued as being justified by the efficiency of a single core.*
- Corridor widths of 2m are cited as providing a good standard of amenity - although this might be an inadequate response to the number of apartments per floor. A widening of the corridor at the lift lobby area or adjacent to the window at the eastern end of the corridors (as a seating space) would potentially improve amenity for the larger apartment loading per lift core.*

Solar Access

Apartment configuration has reduced compliance from 71% to 69% overall. The applicant argues that access to desirable outlook from south facing apartments in Tower A and the preference for larger apartments to the upper levels of Tower A as compensation for the reduction.

Cross-Ventilation

Floor plate reconfiguration has now achieved the same 51% compliance as the approved 2019 DA. An increase in window sizes has also been provided to achieve the highest possible air movement.

While noting incremental improvements that have been implemented since the previous presentation and the compliance or near compliance with some additional ADG recommended minimums has been indicated, for a large and relatively unconstrained, north-facing site, the levels of residential amenity achieved need to be reconciled against the need for design excellence to be demonstrated.

29 January 2025

Natural ventilation

- *53% natural ventilation achieved across entire development (both towers)*
- *Western tower alone only achieves 40%*
- *The Panel suggested further indenting the glazing line at the eastern end of the corridor to introduce a window into one of the adjoining apartments to improve cross ventilation*

Internal planning of the Western Tower

- *The Panel acknowledged the corridor configuration is an improvement from the approved development but recognised that the benchmark was low.*
- *The Panel continue to recommend extending the internal corridor to the South for additional natural light to offset the impact of the 'dog-leg' corridor and the large floorplate.*
- *Provision of a seating area within the corridor is still encouraged.*

Internal corner apartment

- *The planning of the 'internal corner' apartment requires additional work to improve aspect and amenity.*
- *Whilst an internal corner unit addresses potential issues of privacy between units, the proposed layout compromises the aspect from the living room which has a narrow aperture to the west being partially blocked by the party walls opposite.*
- *The living area also has limited balcony access.*
- *Options should be investigated for an amended floor plan which may include 'wrapping' the balcony around the corner and re-arranging location of living and bedrooms.*

Commercial Ceiling Heights:

- *Proposed ceiling heights to the commercial areas must be clearly indicated on the plans to ensure adequate amenity and activation is achievable. This is particularly important in areas where proposed structural elements will limit available height.*

26 March 2025

The recommendations by the Panel as shown above have been addressed as follows:

- *Natural ventilation has been improved by pushing the corridor window deeper into the building, allowing for the natural ventilation of units 301 – 1401.*
- *The Applicant stated that extending the internal corridor to the south will result in the loss of a 3-bedroom unit on each level.*
- *The internal corner apartment has extended the balcony around the corner.*
- *The Applicant provided sections through the commercial level to demonstrate how suitable floor-to-ceiling heights can be achieved.*

7. Safety

28 August 2024

Lack of activation of King Street and Ravenshaw Street corner reduces casual surveillance of the street.

30 October 2024

*Activation of the King and Ravenshaw Corner has improved casual surveillance.
Continuation of foot path illumination about the corner from the retail frontages is recommended.*

29 January 2025

The Panel noted CPTED principles should be applied to the amended landscape design of the Memorial Walkway including consideration of potential areas of concealment.

26 March 2025

The Memorial Walkway is being reinstated.

Ensure the Bull Street communal open space on the podium is fenced and gated to prevent unauthorised access.

Basement Storage Cages

Several storage cages in the basement need to be reviewed due to safety concerns. Some, including cages 1107, 1409, and 1305, have doors that open directly into driveways or unsafe circulation areas. Others, such as cages 1303 and 1209, are arranged in a way that creates concealment or entrapment spaces.

All storage cages should be assessed to ensure residents are not required to move items into driveways, ramps or main circulation zones, and that they do not create concealment or entrapment risks. Where possible, it is recommended that cages be relocated to secure, private areas of the carpark, away from visitor parking and publicly accessible zones.

8. Housing Diversity and Social Interaction

28 August 2024

- *Apartment mix considered generally satisfactory. However, the Panel notes Newcastle's new DCP includes requirements for Platinum Level housing. While the new DCP does not apply to the current approval, it could be a consideration that increases the housing choices in lieu of the loss of all aged care unit types.*
- *Proposed provision of communal areas is generally considered to be positive.*

30 October 2024

No additional comments.

29 January 2025

The Architect confirmed 20% of dwellings have been designed to Silver Level, with 10% having the potential for adaptation to Platinum Level. This is strongly encouraged.

26 March 2025

The Applicant explained that in order to achieve 10% at the Platinum level, the building would need to be redesigned. However 20% Silver level will be achieved, which the Panel accepted as reasonable given this modification application and not a new DA.

9. Aesthetics

28 August 2024

Materials

- *Panel supported removal of the “fake wood grain” material. However, if there is not going to be the visual warmth which a “wood-look element” provides – then the lower levels need high quality, high interest, tactile material(s) to ensure that its appearance is engaging and provides attractive more relatable and inviting interface.*
- *High quality materials will also provide a better interface with pedestrians and fabric of the public domain.*
- *The Panel noted the predominate use of pre-cast concrete where the walls are solid. Cast-in coloration of pre-cast or use of mineral stains will produce a better aesthetic outcome, and greater durability.*
- *The Panel acknowledged that the Applicant proposes to alleviate the predominance of pre-cast concrete with textured finishes. More detail is needed to confirm the level of texture that will be achieved. It is also necessary to consider the pattern / layout of the joints of the pre-cast Panels, as well as cast-in pattern shadow-lines.*
- *High quality, durable finishes at the street level/lower levels are required (eg. Potentially consider polished concrete). Further details on materiality are needed for the Panel to be satisfied that the extent of concrete and the concrete finishes would be acceptable for the development.*
- *The Panel also requested further details for finishes proposed to paving and steps which go up into the lobbies. It was observed that raw concrete walls near footpaths can be an issue for maintenance and appearance. This zone is likely to require different higher quality finishes.*
- *Proposed scale of development will see heavy use arriving and leaving the buildings which is associated with significant wear and tear. Residents and visitors need to be given a feeling that they have arrived somewhere special and with a materials palette that is well-suited to areas of high demand and lower demand foot traffic.*

30 October 2024

Previous responses to improvement of external finishes have been implemented, including:

- *Polished precast panels with exposed aggregate in lieu of coloured concrete to the podium.*
- *Bronze coloured metal panels, louvres and window frames in lieu of charcoal coloured metal.*
- *Precast ribbed concrete panels have now replaced ‘Timber look’ cladding.*

The Panel supported the changes made, and considered them to raise the aesthetic appeal and durability of the development.

29 January 2025

The Panel continues to support the revised material palette in general noting that high quality materials are critical to the demonstration of continued design excellence. The exception is the inclusion of dark painted wall areas adjacent the windows. These areas are particularly prone to staining and should be replaced with long lasting and hard wearing materials.

26 March 2025

No further comments.

Panel Recommendation:

28 August 2024

The presentation provided was a preliminary design for a proposed modification to the existing approval. While noting a regret that no accommodation will now be provided for a residential aged care facility or for self-care living for seniors, it was conceded that there is also a need for general accommodation in the City.

The deep floorplate of the previous RAC and self-care accommodation has been reduced somewhat from the approval. However, the L-shaped revised footprint remains substantial, with more apartments per floor than the recommended ADG recommended maximum being accessed from a single lift core. Further consideration needs to be given to a dual core design, that can provide a greater proportion of dwellings that receive winter sun and compliant cross-ventilation. At a minimum, substantially better provision needs to be made for light and ventilation to more generously proportioned corridors, along with improved aspect and increased performance for apartments.

Street activation of King Street and the Ravenshaw Street corner also needs to be further considered and addressed, as well as landscape design.

Other issues, including FSR raised under the headings above should be addressed.

30 October 2024

While some good progress has been made in response to some of the issues raised previously, there remain other aspects of the proposal that have not achieved a standard that is capable of full support as an excellent design. These require further design development.

The UDRP is mindful that the project must achieve demonstrated design excellence in order to avoid a design competition, and to take advantage of design excellence bonuses.

Previous comments have been partially responded to, and the opportunity for greater solar access and resident travel amenity remains problematic.

29 January 2025

A revised approach is needed for any amended landscape proposal on the Memorial Walk, and its landscape treatment, as outlined under the Landscape heading.

Internal corner units still require further design development to ensure adequate amenity from within the unit. This may require amendments to the lift and stair core adjacent.


Opportunities for some additional windows to dwellings adjacent the indented Eastern corridors should be explored to increase cross-ventilation compliance.

An additional opening for natural light to the corridor to the South is still encouraged as well as the provision of seating areas within the Eastern corridors.

The above items need to be addressed prior to the Panel providing support for the amended proposal.

26 March 2025

The recommendations of this report, dated 26 March 2025, identify a number of minor items to be considered. If those items are addressed, the Panel will be satisfied that the revised design has met Design Excellence and does not require a waiver.

Selected Recommendation	Description	Action
<p>Green</p> 	<p>The UDRP supports the proposal in its current form.</p> <p>The panel advises that this is a well-considered and presented scheme and that the architectural, urban design and landscape is of a high standard.</p>	<p>Only minor changes are required as noted and provided these changes are incorporated, and presented to CN, the UDRP will not require a further presentation.</p>