

Wollongong Design Review Panel - MS Teams Meeting
Meeting minutes and recommendations

Date	30 March 2022
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
Panel members	(Chair) Marc Deuschle (Member) Gabrielle Morrish (Member) David Jarvis
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Pier Panozzo – City Centre & Major Development Manager Vanessa Davis – Senior Development Project Officer Alexandra Mc Robert – Architect – Development Assessment & Certification
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Like Rollinson – MMJ Wollongong Joel McLoughlin – Urban Link Claire Kratochvil – Site Image Goran Urginovski – ATB Consulting Jared Beneru– Blaq Projects
Declarations of Interest	None
Item number	2
DA number	DA-2022/169
Reason for consideration by DRP	SEPP 65 clause 7.18 WLEP2009
Determination pathway	Southern Regional Planning Panel
Property address	36 Flinders Street, Wollongong NSW 2500
Proposal	Mixed Use Development - demolition of existing structures and construction of a mixed-use development comprising 119 residential apartments across two (2) residential towers, 1293sqm of commercial floor space, ground and basement level parking and a childcare centre.
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	The meeting was conducted by video link between the Panel (Council offices) and the Applicants' team (remote).
Background	A similar scheme was previously reviewed by the Panel prior to lodgement under DE-2021/113. The site was virtually inspected by the Panel at that time on 25 August 2021.
Design quality principals SEPP 65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	<p>The site is located within a B6 Enterprise Corridor on the western side of Flinders Street, a large-scale arterial road with heavy traffic and limited public domain quality.</p> <p>The development parcel to the southern boundary is likely to contain a shop-top serviced apartment development (currently at DA assessment stage), and the northern parcel contains a 1-storey commercial development.</p> <p>An existing drainage easement runs along the eastern boundary. A sewer main appears to run directly under the development, including an access point within the site boundary.</p> <p>While the built form context has been shown within the drawings and presentation submitted to the Panel, it has not been demonstrated how this context has influenced the development's resolution. Further work needs to be undertaken in this regard, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sewer main is to be accurately located, with the design addressing any impacts this may have, - Consideration of the bulk and massing of the towers in relation to neighbouring properties, particularly to the

	<p>south. Sun eye view diagram should be expanded to show the future context of the site, particularly to the south. The solar access diagrams should demonstrate that neighbouring sites maintain ADG compliant solar access,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How the development addresses the public domain along Flinders Street and how this development abuts adjoining developments to the north and to the south. <p>Connection to Country is an avenue that has not been explored for the development. Opportunities should be investigated as to how this can be integrated meaningfully into the development as an exemplar for the B6 corridor and developments of this size within the area.</p>
<p>Built Form and Scale</p>	<p>The overall refinement of the massing and tower forms is a justifiable response to the Panel's previous comments and site constraints. However, the finer form should be refined to improve amenity and better respond to the immediate context surrounding the site. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As an architectural feature, with its main purpose being aesthetics, consideration should be given to how the roof form could be modulated and revised to have a lesser shadow impact on the southern neighbour and the internal COS. The current roof form provides a consistent 3m overhang above the recessed upper level. The overhang on the northern side of both buildings appears to be overshadowing the habitable spaces below in winter as well as in summer. Whilst the overhang to the southern side of the buildings restricts solar access to the buildings immediately to the south (Building A and the southern neighbour) it provides no positive benefits to the building it services. Roof forms should be refined to minimise over shadowing of neighbouring buildings and provide controlled solar access to the subject site. - Both buildings A and B are set back an additional 3m at level 8 to provide 24m of separation between buildings. If the southern face of building B were developed in a defensive manner (no windows of habitable rooms orientated directly to the south, high level windows and screened windows are acceptable) consideration could be given to eliminating the 3m setback on the northern side of building A. This may provide capacity for an additional unit at level 8. This strategy will allow a more asymmetric, site responsive building form to be developed. - The western edges of buildings A and B sit parallel to the site's western boundary. This results in a building form that tapers towards the west, restricting solar access to the building to the south. Consideration should be given to realigning the western edges of both buildings to increase solar access to the building immediately to the south. If the northwestern corner of both buildings is set back 12m from the center of the neighbouring drainage channel, ADG compliant building separation can still be achieved. - The applicant advised that they are now aware, that the ground floor units addressing the communal open space are not permissible within this zone and these units are to be removed. Whilst the loss of casual surveillance to the communal open space is unfortunate the applicant should

	<p>utilise this change as an opportunity to reconfigure the ground floor to provide a functional access and servicing strategy to the southern commercial space and the childcare center.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration should be given to removing units from the base of the southern tower to avoid issues (noise / privacy) with childcare proximity, - Southern commercial unit's depth (covered in amenity) - The single storey face brick podium has been broken down into a series of repetitive bays, to provide a reasonable interface with the street. However, entries to each tower are very difficult to distinguish within the homogeneous façade. Consideration should be given to breaking the brick façade with darker, more recessive elements to provide more clearly defined entrances. Consideration should also be given to developing the expression of the southern end of the podium fronting Flinders Street to respond to the childcare centre. - Awnings may also be developed to respond to the more articulated podium outlined above and contribute to the clear expression of tower entrances.
Density	<p>Further to the refinements noted in <i>Built Form and Scale</i>, above, the density of the development seems appropriate for its location and context within the B6 Enterprise Corridor.</p>
Sustainability	<p>The use of solar power and water heating is strongly encouraged, particularly to service communal areas, carpark lighting, ventilation, and pumps.</p> <p>The proposal appears capable of providing natural cross ventilation and solar access in accordance with the objectives of the ADG. However, the proposal must be tested in its future context, to determine if ADG compliant solar access can be achieved when the adjoining site to the north is developed.</p> <p>Opportunities to harvest rainwater for use in maintaining the landscape established on the building and site should be incorporated.</p> <p>Additional water minimisation measures (reuse of rainwater for toilet flushing and washing machines) should also be considered.</p> <p>Landscape plantings should address Council's aims for biodiversity protection, weed minimization, and low water use.</p> <p>Materials used to construct the project should be sustainable, low embodied energy alternatives where suitable, and be chosen based on life-cycle costs.</p> <p>Materials should be chosen to minimise heat absorption and prevent any exacerbation of the urban heat island effect. Particularly this needs to be considered with regards to surface materials within the landscape, roof materials, and any unprotected surfaces on the facades.</p> <p>Every attempt should be made to maximise the urban tree canopy cover within the development and along the adjacent public domain. Medium to large canopy trees should be planted in deep soil, and/or within large planters, and be provided with adequate soil depth and volume, and healthy growing conditions.</p>

	<p>The proponent tabled the use of EV charging stations which is fully supported.</p>
Landscape	<p><u>Communal Open Space</u></p> <p>While both at grade and podium level COS is provided, the Panel feels its arrangement, amenity and usability needs further consideration.</p> <p>Diagrams showing solar access to the COS show several areas that self-overshadow in the early afternoon. It is likely these do not comply with the minimum solar requirements as a result.</p> <p>The lower ground floor COS along the western edge is not easily accessible and is unlikely to be well used as a result. Access to and from the space is via a long stair and what appears to be a goods lift which is not appropriate. At this stage the Panel feels this space may be more beneficial as a DSZ dedicated to providing beautiful landscape to view, as opposed to COS, unless integration with the lobbies and primary building circulation networks can be established.</p> <p>If access can be resolved, making it an engaged part of the development's COS, the following should be considered in its design development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general arrangement could be improved by considering how people use the spaces provided. For example, the exercise area adjacent to the entry causes visual impacts for both users and visitors upon arrival. Perhaps a more secluded location for exercise (north or south end) and a central colocation of the BBQ and lawn would be more appropriate. - Trees are planted extremely close to boundaries and the building. - The space cannot act as both COS and DSZ in its entirety. See comments on DSZ below. <p>The podium COS is highly visible from above, likely making users of this space feel quite exposed. It also has a limited program with a high proportion of circulation rather than usable space. Improvements should be made that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create more destination spaces with a range of function / program, - Give universal access to the lawn and all spaces, - Provide adequate soil volume to allow for healthy tree growth (current planters appear narrow and small in parts). <p>The trees on the roof are questioned as to their function, aesthetics, and long-term viability. It is unclear what purpose they serve, how they will be maintained, and if there is a contingency in place should the trees fail to flourish. Further to this, the chosen species: <i>Banksia integrifolia</i> / <i>Cupaniopsis anarcardioides</i> / <i>Melaleuca linariifolia</i> / <i>Tristaniaopsis laurina</i>; especially the <i>banksia</i> and <i>melaleuca</i>, often exhibit irregular growth and may not be suitable trees for such an application. In combination with other comments made regarding built form and mass, this roof feature should be reconsidered; a green roof without trees, or fewer but strategically located trees, may be more appropriate.</p> <p>The landscape plans should show the streetscape interface to demonstrate how the site's landscape design complements the public domain and aligns with other nearby developments. In</p>

	<p>respect to this, the turf proposed under trees seems inappropriate / unsustainable / hard to maintain for a public landscape such as this. Furthermore, the tree locations block the lobby entry visually and physically. In conjunction with ground floor modifications suggested in other sections, their location should ensure complementary distribution with the revised scheme.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the childcare centre landscape design is a placeholder or a final design. Several issues to be resolved include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The majority of the space does not receive solar access, - Noise and visual privacy need to be addressed for the above tenants and the neighbouring site, - The path would be better created as a circuit to encourage movement as opposed to a linear, start-stop path, - Reviewing the appropriateness of play equipment such as the 'tyre play structures', - Several junctions between materials are problematic in smaller space: path and softfall, and dead corner to sandpit. <p>With regards to landscape details, it must be indicated what the 'minimum' provided soil depths are, to ensure adequate provision for tree, shrub, and lawn growth is provided.</p> <p><u>Deep Soil Zone</u></p> <p>The diagram showing the DSZ calculation is labelled incorrectly.</p> <p>While the colocation of COS and DSZ is conditionally acceptable, the arrangement within this project does not comply. The ADG should be reviewed with respect to this. DSZ can have paths or space no greater than 10% of the total area and this must be permeable.</p> <p>An arborists report has still not been provided detailing any existing trees on the site, and those within close proximity to the development.</p>
<p>Amenity</p>	<p>Amenity issues to resolve include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential lobbies need to be clearly identified within the podium façade (as outlined above), - The Childcare centre operators are required to walk through residential common areas to access their bin storage area and no direct access has been provided from the car park to the southern commercial unit. There is currently no practical way in which to service this unit. The lower levels of the building must be reconfigured to allow all tenancies to be accessed and serviced in a convenient and practical manner, - The childcare lobby may be better located along the southern edge, which, together with a carpark replanning, should aim to provide clearer and consolidated movement through the carpark for parents dropping off, and access to the centre, the southern commercial premises is too long with minimal street frontage and access to natural daylight only through the front façade, - The Flinders Street frontage should maximise commercial frontage. As part of this it should be investigated how the

	<p>turning circle and delivery area could be better planned and less intrusive,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ceiling height on the first floor should be established at 3.3m to allow for future adaption, <p>Units are generally configured to provide a reasonable level of amenity. However, it is suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Units on the northern tower, B208 / B207, may be better planned as a 3-bed and a 1-bed respectively. The intent is that apartment B208 wraps around the corner occupying the area containing the living areas of B207 to avoid acoustic and visual privacy issues. This could require the living area in B207 to move with the likely loss of a bedroom to this apartment type. This would solve potential privacy issues caused by the current arrangement - Units 201 and 208 are accessed directly through their kitchens, the kitchens of these units are internalised spaces with no access to natural light. These units should be reconfigured to meet minimum ADG amenity objectives. - The proposal has been configured to allow ADG compliant solar access and natural cross ventilation. However, from the information provided it is not possible to determine if units on the eastern side of the building receive the full 2 hours of solar access to both living areas and areas of private open space. A detail study of solar access at 11:00am should be provided to confirm ADG compliance.
Safety	A safe and convenient servicing strategy must be developed for each tenancy.
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	Appropriate for the type and location of development.
Aesthetics	<p>The Panel feels that the aesthetic of the two towers needs further development.</p> <p>Articulation should occur in response to the contextual and climatic influences evident on the site, in particular, further shading is required to control solar access on the western facades</p> <p>Further to this, it was felt that each of the two towers should be uniquely identifiable to help with address, wayfinding and producing an interesting and fine future grain for the area.</p> <p>Recommendations outlined above (Built Form) should assist in developing points of difference between each tower which will assist in providing a clear identity to each building.</p> <p>Detail sections (1:20 or 1:50) through the building should be provided, to clearly demonstrate the architect's design intent. Sections should show balustrade details / specification, concealment of services, lighting, drainage, soft treatments, details of screens and louvres etc.</p> <p>Servicing of the building must be considered at this stage of the design process. The location of service risers, AC condensers, down pipes, fire hydrant boosters etc. should be accommodated with no safety or negative visual impact.</p>

Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	Has potential but needs further development and detail information.
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	Has potential but needs further development.
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	Still needs to be demonstrated
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,	Suitable
existing and proposed uses and use mix	Suitable
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	Still needs to be demonstrated
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,	Further refinements required as per report.
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Further refinements required as per report.
street frontage heights	Minor refinements required as per report.
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Still needs to be demonstrated
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Still needs to be demonstrated
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Still needs to be refined / demonstrated

<p>impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain</p>	<p>Still needs to be demonstrated</p>
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>The proposal has responded to the Panel's previous comments in a positive manner to provide a building form that provides better amenity to its future occupants. However, further refinement is recommended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better relate to the immediate context of the site, - Provide a functional servicing and access solution to all tenancies, - Refine the proposal's interface with the public domain, - Developed the expression of both towers, - Further improve amenity.