

**Wollongong Design Review Panel**  
**Meeting minutes and recommendations**

<b>Date</b>	17 October 2023
<b>Meeting location</b>	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
<b>Panel members</b>	(Chair) David Jarvis (Member) Marc Deuschle (Member) Jennifer Bautovich
<b>Apologies</b>	None
<b>Council staff</b>	John Wood – City Wide Development Manager Nicole Ashton – Senior Development Project Officer Amanda Kostovski – Design Expert
<b>Guests/ representatives of the applicant</b>	Daniel Jukic - Anglicare Cristie Evenhuis – DF Planning - MS Teams Kendal Mackay – DF Planning Candice Pon Anglicare Benjamin Parks – Place Design Group – MS Teams Alvin Sim - Plus Architecture Tim Field - Place Design Group
<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	None
<b>Item number</b>	1
<b>DE number</b>	DA-2023/615
<b>Reason for consideration by DRP</b>	SEPP 65
<b>Determination pathway</b>	Southern Regional Planning Panel (SRPP)
<b>Property address</b>	4 Lindsay Evans Place, Dapto
<b>Proposal</b>	Senior Housing - demolition of existing building and ancillary structures, removal of 28 trees, construction of two (2) residential three (3) and four (4) storey buildings comprising 51 apartments with basement carparking and multi dwelling housing comprising nine (9) single storey dwellings, associated infrastructure, signage and landscaping
<b>Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel</b>	
<b>Background</b>	The site was previously inspected by the Panel on 16 June 2023.  The proposal is the third stage in a three-stage development of Anglicare Age Care village Dapto. Stages 1 and 2 consisted of a two storey Residential Age Care Facility, apartment building containing Independent Living Units and a Community Centre.
<b>Design Quality Principles SEPP 65</b>	
<b>Context and Neighbourhood Character</b>	<p>The proposal is located on a sloping site (falling from east to west by approximately 12.5m) in the northern portion of the village. Its northern boundary interfaces with a low-density residential neighbourhood and its eastern boundary interfaces with the Princes Highway (a busy four lane road).</p> <p>The site benefits from western views to the escarpment, southern views to bushland and has a landscape buffer to the east.</p> <p>The Stage 3 site's western and southern boundaries interface with the road network of the existing village. The main entry road to the village, Lindsay Evans Place, forms the western edge to this stage. On the other side of this entry road is a two storey RACF. A steep road forms the southern edge to the Stage 3 site and provides access into the development. Bushland and a</p>

	<p>community centre are located on the southern side of this access road. The bushland forms part of an APZ and the community centre is located towards the western end of the road, on the lower-lying land.</p> <p>The steep topography will create a challenging environment for the future residents of the development. Foremost, the proposal must demonstrate that safe and accessible pedestrian routes can be provided to the community facilities of the village, and that a bus stop, connecting the residents to the broader community, can be easily accessed.</p> <p>In response to the Panel's previous comments, more detailed site levels have been provided on floor plans to better document how the proposal relates to existing ground levels. A circulation diagram, showing how the subject site relates to its broader context, was also tabled at the meeting. However, further detail is required to clarify the pedestrian circulation strategy (refer to detail comments below, Landscape).</p> <p>To assist in demonstrating the proposal's contextual response, a street elevation along the southern access road, should be provided. The elevation should extend from the existing RACF up to the Princes Highway.</p>
<p><b>Built Form and Scale</b></p>	<p>At the previous meeting, the applicant presented several design options documenting alternative site planning strategies for the site. The study concluded that a design consisting of both villas and apartment buildings, aligned in a north-south direction along the contours of the site, provided the best response. The Panel agrees that the fundamental site planning strategy currently proposed is a reasonable response to the constraints and opportunities of the site.</p> <p><u>Alternative vehicle access strategy</u></p> <p>The Panel previously requested that the following design refinement be investigated:</p> <p><i>"Consideration should be given to accessing the western row of villas via Lindsay Evans Place and accessing the second row of villas via a road between building B and these villas".</i></p> <p>The broad design intent of this refinement was to provide a more active street frontage to the village entry and allow more space to be dedicated to COS.</p> <p>The applicant advised that this option had been explored, but their preference was to maintain the current vehicular access strategy as this was more conducive to their specific operational requirements and aesthetic vision of the village. The Panel accepts that the current configuration is a valid option. However, further development / detailed information is required to provide an acceptable interface between the rear POS of the villas and the entry road (refer to detail comments below, Landscape).</p> <p><u>Common circulation through Building B</u></p>

---

The incorporation of Building B into the common pedestrian circulation through the site is a positive initiative that will significantly shorten the travel distance between Building A and the community center. It will also significantly reduce the extent of switch back ramps that need to be negotiated to access the community center.

However, for this strategy to be successful, the break created in the center of Building B to form the entry lobby should be clearly defined. To further improve the clarity of the common circulation link through Building B consideration could be given to:

- Breaking / lowering the roof form above the lift lobby, allowing the link to present as a break between two separate building forms.
- Recess the line of the east-facing glazing to the lift lobby on all levels to provide a more clearly defined recess between the building forms. This could be achieved with minor amendments to the layout of the level 2 unit to the north of the lift lobby. There is room to slide the living room of this unit a little further west, whilst remaining below the line of the roof, to allow the east facing circulation corridor to be recessed further into the façade of the building (perhaps aligning with the splayed geometry of the wall below) and to allow the glazing to the lift lobby to setback within the eastern façade.
- Continuing the external finish of the common circulation path to extend into the lobbies.
- Increasing the width of the lobby.

#### Building B, bulk and scale

Building B is a continuous building form in excess of 70m in length. It is acknowledged that the angled façade treatment assists in articulating the long facade of the building. However, further refinements of the building form should be undertaken to reduce the scale of the building's eastern façade. Consideration should be given to defining the building as two separate forms (refer to detail comments above) and setting back the upper level from the eastern façade.

#### Pedestrian access to apartment buildings

The primary pedestrian route to all apartment buildings will be via a narrow entry point adjacent to the basement carpark entry. Minimal space has been provided here to accommodate both the pedestrian and vehicular access whilst maintaining adequate separation from the adjacent villa. It appears that the pedestrian path will be looking down into the courtyard / bedroom of the villa and an awkward junction is created between the pedestrian path and driveway.

To address this issue, it is recommended that the adjacent villa is reconfigured to provide more space for pedestrian and vehicular circulation and to mitigate potential privacy issues. A landscape strip should be provided between the pedestrian path and driveway. A continuation of the landscaped verge on the

---

	<p>adjoining foot path could be created, the verge could accommodate low grasses or low planting.</p> <p><u>Villas</u></p> <p>The eastern face of eastern villas are located approximately 1.2m below the level of the adjacent foot path. Landscape sections must demonstrate that potential privacy issues between the pedestrian path and the POS / habitable rooms of villas are mitigated.</p> <p><u>Building A interface with Princes Highway</u></p> <p>Levels 1 and 2 of Building A are located below the level of the Princes Highway. This mitigates the perceived mass of the building but raises concerns regarding the amenity of units. The Princes Highway is a busy / noisy four lane highway, therefore units fronting it will be exposed to significant traffic noise. Lower-level units will also have limited outlook and access to natural light. Landscape sections should demonstrate that potential privacy issues between the highway and the adjacent residential units can be mitigated.</p> <p>A visual impact study was tabled at the meeting demonstrating that the proposed roof top plant on Building A would not be visually prominent from the highway.</p> <p><u>Interface with low density residential</u></p> <p>A 9m setback has been provided from the site's interface with the adjoining low-density residential neighbourhood to the north. When combined with a considered landscaped interface, the proposed setback will provide an appropriate (ADG compliant) interface with the neighbouring residential properties. Design amendments should include investigating how the mass and extent of the retaining wall to this edge can be reduced.</p>
<b>Density</b>	<p>A combination of single storey villas and modestly scaled apartment buildings has been proposed.</p> <p>The proposed density is acceptable.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>Opportunities to harvest rainwater for use in maintaining any established plantings on the buildings or the site should be explored. Other water minimisation measures, (reuse of rainwater for toilet flushing and washing machines) should also be considered.</p> <p>The use of solar power and solar water heating, as well as general electrification, is strongly encouraged, particularly to service communal circulation and parking areas.</p> <p>Low embodied energy should be a consideration in material and finish selections.</p>

	<p>Landscape plantings should address the aims for biodiversity protection, weed minimisation, and low water use.</p> <p>The Panel strongly recommends that electric vehicle charging stations be provided.</p> <p>The proposal appears to be capable of being developed to meet ADG solar access and natural ventilation objectives.</p> <p>Further development of the single storey villas is recommended to improve solar access to living areas (refer to detail comments below, Amenity).</p>
<b>Landscape</b>	<p>As previously noted, the planting palette and landscape materiality seem reasonably considered and appropriate to the project. Several planting densities (based on pot size proposed) vary from species to species and seem a little low – this will need to be reviewed or explained.</p> <p>Generally, the landscape design, in particular the amenity provided by the communal open space, still requires better resolution and quality. Key considerations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is there an overall circulation strategy for this site or the greater development? How does this site fit into this and does it provide opportunity for residents to use circulation for exercise / communal use?</li> <li>- What program is provided for the recreation of residents? Currently the scheme predominantly offers seating but little else.</li> <li>- How can the larger open spaces available be conceived as usable / programmed COS – key spaces include those at the northern ends of all linear NS landscapes.</li> <li>- Can an external space be provided that complements the internal communal room of Building A?</li> <li>- Coordination between architectural and landscape designs must be undertaken; eg POS designs are currently not coordinated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Lindsay Evans Place</u></p> <p>The proponent explained that the entry onto Lindsay Evans Place will be embellished with signage walls that try to incorporate several existing meters / services. The Panel understands this and would like to see more information / clarity as to how this will appear. In particular, there is a pump room of considerable size – and it appears to be new – which will have a major impact on the quality of the entry and needs to be better integrated and resolved.</p> <p>The proponent has decided to leave villas along Lindsay Evan Place fronting to the east; as such the rear POS face this street. Clarity is required as to how the POS interfaces with the entry landscape along Lindsay Evan Place given that landscape and</p>

---

architectural sections show different approaches. Architectural and landscape documents must be coordinated and an elevation should be provided to document the western perimeter interface (fencing / retaining wall and decking). Consideration may also be given to lowering the height of the perimeter fence in strategic locations to allow casual surveillance of the entry road whilst maintaining the privacy of the POS.

The Panel is in support of retaining the existing trees (and using a raised deck in these locations) but would suggest the planting strategy is reviewed to provide more than trees in lawn if this is to be the main entry into the development.

Villas and Villa Spine (Road)

The private road between the villas appears to be designed as a pedestrian priority street which is supported. The design could emphasise pedestrian priority by either increasing the 'footpaths' to either side thus reducing the 'road', or to treat the entire street as pedestrian.

The alignment of the C-shaped structural turf (provided for fire truck turning only) should be considered secondary to the program, amenity, quality, and arrangement of the landscape space at the northern end of this street. This space is the largest unified outdoor space on the site and should be designed as a communal asset for the project. While the fire truck turning should be allowed for, it should not dictate the alignments within the space.

The greater proportion of POS for all villas appears to be within front setbacks as opposed to rear. Front POS should be minimised and rear maximised. Soft landscaping within the front POS should be maximised.

Central Landscape Spine, space between villas and Building B

The southern junction between the driveway and the footpath is very tight and requires further development (refer to detail comments above, Built Form).

The predominant program of this space is circulation. While the Panel supports units having direct access off this spine, the design should be reviewed to inject small spaces with program other than seating. As part of this work, reviewing how levels work between the villas and Building B may help to avoid privacy concerns for the villas. The Panel believes the northern end of this spine may have the opportunity to be a more significant space and does not endorse this as the location for a clothesline.

Upper Landscape Spine, space between Buildings A and B

Similar to the central spine, the predominant program of this space is circulation. Similarly, injecting spaces with program other than seating must be investigated. Again, the Panel believes the northern end should be a more significant space and does not endorse this as the location for a clothesline.

For particular consideration:

- The central seating nook may cause a clash given it sits directly in the desire line between Buildings A and B.
-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed BBQs have no tables, only seating. This southern area should better consider how it can complement the internal communal room within Building A.</li> <li>- The northern space should be considered an important node. Again, the inclusion of a clothesline in this location is not supported by the Panel.</li> <li>- Given the width of the space, could edge buffers be minimised (maintain privacy) and circulation push east to allow small spaces to be formed along the western edge (thus maximising solar).</li> </ul> <p><u>Northern Edge</u></p> <p>The Panel understands the staircase proposed here is due to the steepness of the site and likely need by workers to access the site from the Princes Highway to the east. The section provided shows a very large cut and resultant blank wall (described as insitu concrete during the meeting) which is unlikely to complement the overall natural setting for the development. It should be investigated if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The staircase could be removed or made less utilitarian.</li> <li>- Terraced planting could be introduced parallel to the wall to soften its impact.</li> <li>- The top of the wall could be reduced in height, perhaps raked or stepped more often along its length.</li> <li>- The balustrade topping the wall reduced in height relative to the previous point and be of a palisade nature to allow planting through.</li> </ul> <p>Consideration must be given to the material finish of the retaining wall. Utilising insitu-concrete for the entire length of the wall is discouraged. An elevation clearly documenting the treatment / material finish of this wall should be provided.</p> <p><u>Sections</u></p> <p>Several sections indicate what appears to be deep soil where there is a carpark under. These need to be updated to show correct site conditions.</p> <p>Where planting is on deep soil it should be flush with surrounding surfaces whenever possible. Where walls are required above podiums, they should be minimised however must provide the minimum ADG requirements for proposed planting with regards to soil depth and volume.</p>
Amenity	<p><u>Apartments</u></p> <p>Apartment layouts are generally functional / providing a reasonable level of amenity.</p> <p><u>Villas</u></p> <p>Further development of villas should seek to relate each villa to its immediate context and provide improved levels of solar access to all living areas.</p> <p>Roof forms should be developed to accommodate clerestory windows or skylights to increase solar access to living rooms.</p>

	<p>The most northern and southern villas could be given a different treatment to create a point of difference and improve amenity. Living rooms could be re-orient (north and south) to provide an improved outlook and increased levels of natural light. This development will also allow the carport to be accessed via the circulation space servicing wet areas and bedrooms, rather than providing a door directly connecting the dining room to the carport.</p> <p><u>Communal open space</u></p> <p>Further development is required.</p> <p>Refer to comments above for detailed commentary (Landscape).</p>
<b>Safety</b>	<p>Circulation is central to the safety and security of residents, including the steepness and length of ramps, the overlap of vehicular and pedestrian circulation across the entire development (Stages 1-3), and the visual connections maintained between spaces (CPTED).</p> <p>How the APZ is dealt with needs to be demonstrated.</p>
<b>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</b>	<p>The proposal provides a reasonable mix of dwelling typologies, when considered in the context of the entire village.</p> <p>Further development of communal spaces is required to improve opportunities for social interaction.</p>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	<p>The information submitted describes simple and pared back buildings which have a common language of materials. This is commended and will provide a good outcome for the village.</p> <p>Building B should be more clearly expressed as two separate building forms, (refer to detail comments above, Building Form).</p> <p>In response to the Panel's previous comments, detail sections describing building finishes have been provided. To ensure the architects' design intent is realised the applicant is encouraged to provide a more detailed specification of all materials and finishes. Dimensioned details of all balustrades, handrails and screens should be provided and specification provided regarding paint finishes and cladding materials.</p> <p>Servicing of the building must be considered at this stage of the design process. The location of service risers, car park exhausts, AC condensers, down pipes and fire hydrant boosters should be shown.</p>
<b>Key issues, further Comments &amp; Recommendations</b>	<p>The site planning responds to its immediate context in a reasonable manner to provide a positive addition to the existing village. However, further consideration / development of the following is recommended:</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Further development of Building B to reduced scale and define common circulation through the building.</li><li>- Further development to improve the spatial quality of the pinch point created between vehicle entry into the basement carpark, pedestrian entry and the adjacent villa.</li><li>- Further development of villas to improve amenity.</li><li>- Provide southern street elevation.</li><li>- Provide an elevation of the northern retaining structure.</li><li>- Provide an elevation of the terraces and screening fronting the village entry road.</li><li>- An increase to, and improvement of, the communal open spaces.</li><li>- Further clarification of materials / finishes.</li></ul>
--	--