Wollongong Design Review Panel
Meeting minutes and recommendations

Date	19 October 2022
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
Panel members	(Chair) David Jarvis
	(Member) Alexandra McRobert
	(Member) Brigitta Schyns
Apologies	None
Council staff	Pier Panozzo – City Centre & Major Development Manger Amanda Kostovski – City Architect Brad Harris – Development Project Officer
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	**In office attendee:** Angelo Di Martino – ADM Architects **MS Teams:** David Pearse – DSBLA Daniel Kostovski – Rise Property Group
Declarations of Interest	None
Item number	2
DA number	DA-2022/960
Reason for consideration by DRP	SEPP 65, WLEP 2009 Clause 7.18 Design Excellence
Determination pathway	Southern Regional Planning Panel (CIV >$30m)
Property address	116-122 Corrimal Street, Wollongong
Proposal	Demolition of existing structures and construction of proposed mixed use development comprising of a 12 storey building with 10 levels of residential apartments (containing 83 units) with internal/external rooftop communal space over commercial tenancies (at ground level), two levels of basement carparking and "sleeved" rear ground level commercial parking.
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	The meeting was conducted by video link between the Panel (Council offices) and some of the applicants' team (remote).
Background	The site was originally seen prior to lodgement on 7 September 2021 (DE-2021/117) The site was Inspected by the Panel on 19 October 2022
Design quality principals SEPP 65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	The site is located within Wollongong City Centre's commercial core, slightly north of Crown Street. It is irregularly shaped and has a frontage width of 53.94m, while its zoning allows a building height of 32m. To the north of the site is an existing building housing a mix of serviced apartments and residential units. Not only is this building located close (approximately 3m) to the subject site's northern boundary, it also orientates living rooms / balconies towards the subject site and breaches the maximum height control by a number of stories. The site has an approved DA with a built form that virtually fills the southern portion of the site and a height that exceeds the LEP height requirements by as much as two storeys. The Panel agrees with the Applicant that this approved envelope would be unlikely to result in an amenable and high-quality mixed-use building or positive response to context. The site has a narrow carriageway - Moore Lane - to its western side; because it is flanked by heritage buildings to its southern

	intersection with Crown Street, it is unlikely that the lane will be widened in the future. The site and its context are generally well described in the documentation provided. Whilst the massing strategy for the site appears to be a reasonable response to the constraints of the site, the Panel are not yet convinced that the proposal has been sufficiently tested in its future context. This is particularly important given that the proposal is significantly in excess of the maximum permissible height control and proposes reduced setbacks with non-habitable interfaces. It is therefore recommended that the Detailed Locality Model (drawing A-003) provided by the applicant is further expanded to demonstrate that the proposed building contributes to a positive pattern of development for the city block. To do this, a potential future building form on the corner of Crown Street and Corrimal Street must be modeled. The form of this building will inform an appropriate built form response for 124 to 140 Corrimal Street, which will in turn inform an appropriate building form on the subject site. Each building form should realise its potential FSR and demonstrate compliance with ADG amenity requirements (particularly solar access). It is anticipated that this study will result in some refinements to the currently proposed building form. This study is required to demonstrate that WLEP design excellence criteria has been met: *"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",*
Built Form and Scale	As noted above, the built form exceeds the LEP's 24 and 32m height planes which fall across the site. Given the non-compliance of the existing building to the north, both with height and side setback, the Panel accepts that some exceedance of the 24m height plane may be a reasonable response to the immediate context of the site, provided that built form is intelligently located and that the impacts of the proposed height are minimized. However, further contextual analysis (detailed locality model, as outlined above, Context and neighbourhood character) is required to establish if the noncompliance of the 32m height control is warranted. The proposed L shape building provides minimal setbacks to the north and orientates units in an east or west direction. This is a reasonable response to the site context that avoids a direct visual connection with the neighbouring building to the north. However, detail of screens to the northern edges of balconies, adjacent to the northern boundary should be provided to demonstrate that visual privacy is maintained while providing solar access, consistent with the objectives part 3F Visual privacy of the ADG. Units 301-901 have not demonstrated compliant setbacks and should be annotated as such. The Panel remain supportive of the development a lane along the southern edge of the site. The lane contributes to the quality of

	public domain and assists with servicing and access strategies. The applicant is encouraged to liaise with Council to ensure vehicle access and servicing can be accommodated by the lane / building setbacks. Consideration should be given to removing the awning currently proposed to the lane way and extending the Corrimal Street colonnade around the lane, to provide continuous and consistent pedestrian cover. A recess in the building façade and a break in the building base have been created in the Corrimal Street façade, to articulate the building and identify the building entry. Unfortunately, the recess aligns with the booster cupboard and fire egress door. Further development is required to relate the residential entry to the split in the street façade. This may be achieved by extending the entry foyer further south or developing the egress stair to allow access to the southern side of the lifts at ground level. Allowing the foyer to be located further south to align with the split in the façade. In response to the Panels previous comments, the base of the building has been developed to provide a continuous two storey street wall to Corrimal Street that better relates to the neighbouring building.
Density	The provision of a future built form study that demonstrates how the proposal will contribute to a cohesive pattern of development is required to demonstrate that the proposal does not present as an over development of the site.
Sustainability	The proposal provides for 5 corner apartments per floor and two, two storey apartments claiming natural cross ventilation via a stacking effect. This provides a total of 42 of the 71 units (59%) in the first 9 storeys of the building, claiming natural cross ventilation. The proposal appears to fall marginally short of the minimum cross ventilation requirements of the ADG, if the two maisonette units are to be included. The northern and southern faces of all corner apartments have been developed in a defensive manner, with limited openings currently proposed. Minimum unobstructed openings on opposing faces of each unit must be provided in accordance with ADG part 4 B, natural ventilation objectives, whilst still complying with the objectives of part 3F (Visual privacy) of the ADG. Further development / detail information is required demonstrate compliance with ADG cross ventilation objectives. The applicant is encouraged to seek expert advice to ensure ADG cross ventilation objectives are met. Window opening sizes must be clearly documented and some wind modeling may be required to demonstrate that the two-storey apartments reliant on stacked ventilation meet ADG objectives. Given the constraints of the site, an appropriate strategy has been developed to maximize solar access to apartments, by facing apartments towards the east and west. However, further detail information is required to demonstrate that the proposal meets ADG solar access requirements. Suns eye view diagrams taken at hourly intervals between 9am and 3pm should be provided. These diagrams should also demonstrate privacy screening does not

	compromise solar access outcomes. The diagrams must demonstrate solar access to the subject site and the future neighbouring built form to the south to be accurately quantified. Opportunities to harvest rainwater for use in maintaining any plantings established on the building or the site should be explored. Other water minimization measures (reuse of rainwater for toilet flushing and washing machines) should also be considered. Low embodied energy should be a consideration in material and finish selections.
Landscape	<u>Public Domain</u> Consideration must be given to street trees and the public domain treatment with regards to the potential future Corrimal Street widening. Explore a single row of street trees to align with any future road widening. Pending clarification of the road widening time frame, a second row of trees may be considered. Placement of all street trees (one or two rows) should retain a gap where the lobby enters. Trees should be placed at maximum 8m centres and services should be confirmed during the concept design phase to ensure their installation is possible. The in-and-out paving line seems to have little relationship to the building design or context. Clarify its design or reconsider its inclusion. Associated public art / furniture may be retained. However, consider furniture arrangement and its relationship with columns and movement zones along the street. Consideration must be given to the condition between the built form frontage and the laneway at street level. Consider removing awning and setback frontage along laneway to continue the colonnade similar to approach on Corrimal Street. Explore opportunities for breakout space along laneway. The laneway may not require both bollards and a change in material to delineate the pedestrian from vehicular traffic. Consider having either a material change with a kerb or bollards only. Consider removing the green edge along the southern boundary and shifting that space to the northern edge instead to assist with larger public domain and breakout space for built form. Consider opportunities for small trees in grates. <u>L1 Roof garden</u> Generally, the COS appears capable of providing a good level of amenity for future residents. There is a concern however that the amount of solar access received will not meet the minimum requirements of the ADG – more detail must be provided. Notably, if the rooftop COS is to be considered the principal COS for solar access requirements, it should be easily and equitably accessed by all residents with multiple uses for a variety of residents. Universal access should be provided to all areas, including the pool area. It is unclear if visual privacy has been provided to pool users from apartments to all sides. At this stage, this appears to have been resolved through the use of stair lifts – further detail of this should be provided. The artificial lawn raises potential impacts from the UHI effect. Consideration should be given to using natural turf. If areas are raised to accommodate this, an access route for the pool could be

	tiered and seating edges created. The paving edge to the lawn should be excluded to maximise the lawn available. All privacy issues need to be addressed; one example is the interface between the POS and COS at the SW corner of the communal room. This still appears to be unresolved. The COS to the north of unit 107 would be better utilized as private open space to mitigate privacy concerns. This may also be applicable for the COS north of Unit 107. The planting on the central southern podium may be difficult to maintain. Consider if some can be converted to POS, and how access for maintenance can be provided. Details should be provided to ensure the ADG minimums are met, with regards to soil depths and soil volumes required for adequate plant growth. Roofing materials on the penthouse level should be carefully considered and ensure easy maintenance and positive outlooks. The panel highly suggests the use of green roofs where possible.
Amenity	The Panel commends the following aspects of the proposal: - active lane to the southern frontage - the potential to manage vehicles and servicing from rear lane - generous frontage to both street and lane, with full width active uses - the layout generally, which may depend on long corridors but are provided with clear views out and generally amendable apartment layouts It is recommended that further consideration is given to the following: - suns eye's views are required to confirm mid-winter solar access - Cross ventilation compliance to be confirmed - acceptability of northern separation non-compliance will depend on the containment of impacts on visual and acoustic privacy to adjacent property and the provision of a contextual built form study to demonstrate that the proposed built form contributes to an appropriate pattern of development for the city block. - distances to egress stairs appear BCA non-compliant - Provision for the servicing of tenancy 2. Consideration should be given to redirecting the egress passage to allow tenancy 2 to be accessed directly from the ground floor carpark. - Lift access must be provided to the roof garden and an accessible path of travel provided to all areas of COS. Additionally, the internal layouts of some units pose amenity issues, particularly those units in the north-western corner where no window is visible from the kitchen and occupants are required to walk through the living space to access the bathroom. Additionally, southern facing units should ensure the kitchen wall is no further than 8m line-of-sight to a window to ensure these units are not overly dark. Finally, study and storage areas (such as those in Units 205-905) should have line of site to a window no more than

	2.5m times ceiling heights, as they are likely to be used as habitable space.
Safety	Assess climb-ability and fall heights across all COS particularly with placement of furniture to reduce need for further fencing through the COS. Providing landscape sections would help to understand these issues clearly. Consider spaces to provide alternate and a mixture of uses i.e., edible gardens and others that can provide diversity across the COS for residents.
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	Pending further refinement, the proposed mix of uses will provide a positive contribution to this precinct. However, it should be noted that the requirement to move plumbing fixtures within the kitchens of adaptable units is not considered equitable or in the true nature of "adaptable" units, particularly as plumbing will be set in concrete flooring. An appropriate solution should be demonstrated.
Aesthetics	Perspective images show a well-proportioned building form; However, this is yet to be tested in its future built form context. The materials selection shown on elevational drawing provide an appropriate material pallet for this context. However, further detail information should be provided to ensure that the design intent shown in the elevations and perspective studies is realised. The type of face brick, balustrade (frameless, semi frameless?), screens (fixed, operable, louvers type / size and spacing, finish?), glazing/ frames should be specified. It is recommended that a large-scale section (1:20) is provided to document the design intent more clearly. Proposed screens provide a significant contribution to building aesthetic. Details of screens should be provided to demonstrate that they do not impede the amenity of the units they serve. Screens located on the northern faces of balconies are of particular concern. It must be demonstrated that solar access to units are not unduly compromised. 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' substations etc. should be discretely accommodated and shown. More detail on the roof design is required, including maintenance access to plant and PV panels etc and screening.
Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	Further information required
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	Further information required
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	N/A
Whether the proposed development detrimentally	Further development of a contextual built form study is required.

overshadows an area shown distinctively coloured and numbered on the Sun Plane Protection Map,	
How the development addresses the following:	
the suitability of the land for development,	The site is suitably located and provides good potential for the proposal.
existing and proposed uses and use mix	The proposed mix of uses will provide a positive contribution to this precinct.
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	Further development of a contextual built form study is required.
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 development of a contextual built form study is required.
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Future built form study required to justify / refine the current built form.
street frontage heights	Further development / detailed information required, to demonstrate if the proposed height non-compliance.
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Further information required
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Further information / development required
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	A reasonable strategy has been developed to accommodate both vehicles and pedestrians. However, the applicant is encouraged to liaise with Council to ensure all technical issue are addressed in relation to vehicular access and servicing.
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	Confirmation / detail clarification of road widening is required.
Key issues, further Comments & Recommendations	Whilst the massing strategy for the site appears to be a reasonable response to the constraints of the site, the Panel are not yet convinced that the proposal has been sufficiently tested in its future context. This is particularly important given that the proposal is significantly in excess of the maximum permissible height control. A detailed future built form study is required to refine and justify the current built form response. Further consideration of the following issues is also required: - Align entry lobby with façade articulation. - Provide suns eye view diagrams to demonstrate ADG compliance. - Further detail to demonstrate ADG natural ventilation compliance.

	- Further detail documenting building finishes, particularly proposed screens. - Provision of lift access to the roof garden.