

Wollongong Design Review Panel
Meeting minutes and recommendations

Date	27 August 2019
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
Panel members	Tony Tribe
	David Jarvis
	Marc Deuschle
Apologies	Anne Starr – Senior Development Project Officer
Council staff	Pier Panozzo – City Centre & Major Projects Manager
	Jerard Tungcab - Planning Intern
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Hong Huang – Brewster Murray Pty Ltd Jason Lee - Brewster Murray Pty Ltd Luke Rollinson - MMJ Wollongong Wei Dai – FR Project 2 Jake Li - FR Project 2 Shufan Zhang - FR Project 2
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	2
DA number	DA-2019-748
Reasons for consideration by DRP	Clause 28 SEPP65, Clause 7.1/8 WLEP 2009
Determination pathway	Clause 28 SEPP 65, Clause 7.18 WLEP 2009
Property address	264-268 Keira Street and 23 Kenny Street Wollongong
Proposal	Residential - demolition of existing structures and construction of a mixed use (shop top housing) - 108 residential apartments with ground floor commercial/retail premises
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	The previous WDRP reviews for this site and applicant (DE-2018/166, DE-2018/83) involved a different architect. The applicant's presentation left the panel with the clear understanding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current design is a development of the previous proposal. • It relies essentially the previous contextual data and analysis. • The design intent is for the Drainage Reserve to become a public access way (not evident in documentation sighted)
Background	The site was previously inspected and reviewed under DE-2018/166, DE-2018/83) and involved a different architect. The site was re-inspected by the Panel on 27 August 2019
Design quality principals SEPP 65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	A detailed site analysis meeting APG Appendix 1 guidelines (as previously recommended) is essential in a project of this scale and complexity. It would include a <i>"Plan that synthesises and interprets the context, streetscape and site documentation into opportunities and constraints that generate design parameters"</i> It would include comprehensive definition, and resolution of the many title encumbrances and physical constraints on the site, together with necessary stakeholder consents. (The proposal involves works over and under easements, impacting on access, egress, services, flood management both during construction and on completion) The panel supports the use of the drainage reserve as a quality public space and link between Kenny Street and McCabe Reserve. It is the sole oblique intrusion into a city block typified by single storey warehouse/bulk retail uses with a rectilinear lot configuration. Context analysis should address relationship issues with likely

	future development of adjacent properties to the north and south.
Built Form and Scale	<p><u>Sub-Ground works:</u></p> <p>Two basement car parks extend under the drainage reserve and into parking and access easements. Trunk sewers are required to be diverted. The construction and legal feasibility of these works needs to be verified.</p> <p><u>Ground and Street Level:</u></p> <p>In addition to its function as a through-site link, the drainage reserve functions as the main entry/s and shop-front exposure of the development.</p> <p>The panel is unconvinced the constraints and opportunities presented by the drainage reserve are adequately researched and demonstrated. The proposal appears simply one hydraulic-engineering driven solution. It lacks the necessary comprehensive, coordinated design approach to achieve a high quality, high amenity, functional, safe people place to be in, pass through and overlook.</p> <p>Comments on the plans presented included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider additional stair access points from ground level to pedestrian access way. Could have open risers and be more strategically located to provide a more direct connection to building entry points. • Consider treatment to actual adjacent walls to north or new 'green wall' on boundary • Extend proposed design treatment to kerbs in Kenny and Keira Streets • Consider stepped shop fronts recessed entry lobbies to: allow for extra stairs, provide sunny outdoor seating to N&E cafe, provide better weather protection, emphasise building front doors, provide variety to walkway experience. • If parking and easements are to be re-instated, show treatment. The panel is not yet convinced that the parking easement can co-exist with the space's role as a pedestrian friendly cross site link. Further detail development is required. • Consider planter boxes mounted on walkway edge, rather than legs • Drawings to clearly show line of roof or building over. <p><u>Low Rise Apartments:</u></p> <p>Levels 1-5 extend from Keira to Kenny Street. A pronounced step in the northern facade occurs 3 apartments west of Keira Street.</p> <p>To maintain a 5 storey street wall to Keira Street, Level 5 is setback and is visually (not actually) treated in recessive colours. Refer Aesthetics.</p> <p>On each floor southern apartments facing Keira and Kenny Streets are to be built to the boundary. Context analysis should address the likely development of properties to the south.</p> <p><u>Tower:</u></p> <p>The Kenny Street tower form is clearly driven by LEP heights and APG building separation standards.</p> <p>The north elevation is skewed parallel to the northern (Drainage Easement) boundary to meet separation requirements.</p>

	<p>The panel is of the view that a full context analysis would conclude future typical tower development in the block would be rectilinear, i.e. walls parallel and perpendicular to the street boundaries.</p> <p>Maximum setbacks, habitable rooms and balconies would likely be to the north (sun, outlook, light), Habitable rooms and balconies facing south would be minimal.</p> <p>The option of a simpler rectilinear tower form with lesser setbacks towards the Kerry St end should be explored. This could better fit with both the anticipated tower development on the block, and the low-rise units below.</p> <p>The proposed tower form will inevitably impact upon the solar access of the adjoining sites to the south. An analysis of potential future building forms on adjoining sites will play an important role in modelling and refining the proposal to ensure an appropriate building form with adequate solar access (ADG compliant) can be developed on the adjoining site to the south.</p>
Density	<p>The proposal appears to comply with the WLEP FSR standards. However, external finessing initiatives should be explored to visually manage the apparent mass and bulk of the tower.</p> <p>See: Aesthetics</p>
Sustainability	<p>Landscape irrigation systems and management in association with the proposed rainwater harvesting system need to be clarified.</p> <p>ADG cross ventilation compliance is claimed. This appears to include 10 apartments unsatisfactorily relying on ventilation via communal corridors (L1-L5) and 7 dubious single facing apartments (L7-13). The opportunity to relieve this by exploring an alternative tower plan configuration with 4 corner apartments (see also Bulk and Scale) should be pursued.</p> <p>Solar access to apartments appears to comply with APG guidelines. However, it is recommended the two maisonette apartments (L2-5) be deleted. These will be effectively sunless year-round, and they create a gloomy undercroft area to the COS at L1 and have inter-apartment privacy concerns.</p> <p>The large roof area provides the opportunity for a substantial PV panel array. The panel strongly encourages the use of solar energy to supplement the house power demands of such a substantial city centre development.</p>
Landscape	<p><u>GF Public Domain:</u></p> <p>The landscape treatment of the public domain on the ground floor appears to be addressing the planning issues related to the right-of-ways and easements as opposed to instilling an appropriate streetscape into this publicly accessible thru site link. It should be responsive to the architectural form / layout such as where the lobbies are, where the various uses are and how people will use this space.</p> <p>Although the panel understands that there are flooding issues associated with this site, it should be explored if and how trees could be incorporated into the link or demonstrated why they cannot. The use of hard paving, low planting and raised pots in a linear pattern may address the flooding issues but they do not form a successful public domain solution.</p> <p>The interface between the thru site link, the development, and the</p>

	<p>streetscapes at either end of the development need to be included in any future design solution. Details of the streetscape should be provided including materials, levels, street trees and planting as a minimum.</p> <p>The level change and sectional profile between the thru site link's ground level, and the building GF needs careful consideration along its entire length. It should be explored how more opportunities could be created for traversing between the two and whether or not the interface needs to be straight along the entire length. Altering the alignment may allow for better creation of spaces, opportunities for tree or other significant planting, and will remove the monotony of the current design.</p> <p>View lines from the residential lobbies into the public domain should be considered. The public domain may be able to become a wayfinding device without the need for excessive signage directing visitors to the lobby entries.</p> <p>Landscape and architectural plans need to be extended to include all works up to the kerbs for both street frontages.</p> <p><u>Level 01:</u></p> <p>The south facing courtyard on level 01 should be reconsidered. The current landscape solution is poor with 'outdoor dining amenity' labelled but not shown to be possible. The narrow, linear nature of the design does little to provide functional space other than seating on what appear to be backless seating walls.</p> <p>The space currently has privacy concerns with several private spaces easily accessible from the COS, the worst of which is a bathroom only 1m away from seating in the centre of the space. Reconfiguring the space to have courtyards forming POS for the central units, with two smaller pockets of COS at either end, may be preferable. The two communal open spaces could provide quiet shaded spaces for relief in summer. Regardless of the solution adopted how these spaces are seen from above must be considered.</p> <p><u>Level 6:</u></p> <p>The general arrangement of the roof garden on level 6 is acceptable however again labels indicate 'outdoor dining' opportunities but none are evident. It may be considered how the thresholds between some of the spaces and circulation are tightened to provide more privacy and a series of individual spaces in comparison to the series of conjoined spaces currently shown.</p> <p>It must be demonstrated how the seating walls / planter edges are detailed in section to provide adequate soil volume for successful tree growth. They appear only 450mm high which is not acceptable.</p> <p>The use of artificial lawn should be reconsidered. The current design means this area will receive large amounts of sun and this will make it extremely uncomfortable a lot of the time. Further to this, the planter floating at its centre creates two small linear strips of lawn that are unusable. Creating division of space using this planter is good, however it could be repositioned to remove the small, unusable linear strips of lawn (instead creating small, medium and/or large lawn pockets) and in the process could provide more shade to the lawn overall.</p> <p>All on structure planters should be fully irrigated using roof collected water. All rooftop trees should be anchored.</p>
--	--

Amenity	<p>See also: Sustainability</p> <p>The plans should include bedroom dimensions (ex wardrobes) to verify ADG guidelines are met.</p> <p>ADG guideline for Kitchen depth from windows appears exceeded in most instances.</p> <p>Adaptable unit proposals involve excessive reconfiguration and disruption (demolition, new walls, loss of storage, excessive cost). (Unit 103 specifically)</p> <p>The single tower lift proposed serves 42 apartments (APG Guideline Max 40). In addition, it is the only lift serving the COS on Level 6.</p>
Safety	<p>In its role as a public through site link and providing entry to a significant number of apartments the design of the drainage reserve must include considered attention to safety aspects including lighting, passive and active surveillance.</p> <p>More direct access from vehicles to entries must be a consideration, implying a limited vehicle thoroughfare.</p> <p>Safe and convenient disabled access (especially late-night) to entry foyers is to be addressed.</p> <p>The size and complexity of the development, the remoteness of the entries warrant a detailed management plan to be included in any application for consent. This would include proposals and commitments relating to all security and safety issues.</p> <p>Potential conflicts between the parking easement and pedestrian cross site link must be addressed. Further detail development is required to determine if these two uses can safely co-exist.</p>
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	<p>A wide mix of apartment sizes is proposed. It is noted that no 'affordable' or social housing is included.</p>
Aesthetics	<p>See Context, Built Form and Scale Notes first.</p> <p>The panel is of the view the elevations and perspectives sighted are at the 'conceptual' or 'exploratory' stage.</p> <p>The little evidence of co-ordination of structural or BCA requirements, whether expressed or disguised, into the external expression of the building.</p> <p>Previous panel comments recommended 'over-use of painted rendered surfaces should be avoided' Whilst identification of proposed materials and colour is vague and sparse it appears the predominant materials proposed are 'Concrete Feature-colour 1,2,3 or 4' interpreted by the panel as being painted render in dark greys, browns with highlights of white. Far more design consideration and information are required from the ground pavement to the roof-top.</p> <p>The apparently ad-hoc, stylised, pattern-making expression of tower facades needs to be explained.</p> <p>The blank, limited fenestration, sunless, south presentation of the tower warrants further careful design consideration beyond patterns of paint colour.</p> <p>The abrupt termination of the tower (a previous panel comment) has been addressed, but not from the south view. The applicant is encouraged to develop this idea further. By developing the building base to be more clearly expressed as two separate elements that allow the tower to extend down to the ground level.</p> <p>A humanising and scale element in the computer-generated</p>

	perspectives, a person, a car, a light pole, a tree and maybe with a dog, would leave the panel happier that 'people place' is foremost in the designers' view.
Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	<p>The Design Excellence standards of WLEP 2009 are applicable to this site.</p> <p>The standard is considered achievable, with further attention. Refer 'Aesthetics' above</p>
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	<p>Further work needs to be evidenced in the analysis and synthesis of the complex contextual, engineering, title and physical opportunities and constraints of this site. Design objectives and priorities need to be clarified and the alternative options considered for resolving conflicts addressed.</p> <p>e.g. the 'public domain' quality and function of the through-site link is considered unsatisfactorily compromised by the single flood management option considered.</p>
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	NA
Whether the proposed development detrimentally overshadows an area shown distinctively coloured and numbered on the Sun Plane Protection Map,	Compliance is claimed but needs to be verified.
How the development addresses the following:	
the suitability of the land for development,	Yes, subject to satisfactory resolution of constraints.
existing and proposed uses and use mix	<p>Commercial space proposed is limited in area and to the ground floor. Whilst a greater proportion of commercial/retail would normally be encouraged, the panel believes with its location above street level, design focus should be on providing the highest quality experience. See notes above Cafe outdoor seating, entries etc</p> <p>The wide variety of residential apartment sizes is supported.</p>
heritage issues and streetscape constraints,	<p>McCabe Park across Keira Street is a Heritage item. See notes re shadows below.</p> <p>Further work is required to address visibility and access of elevated ground level uses to the street level. Refer above.</p>
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,	<p>The tower location apparently complies with WLEP numerical standards, and APG building separation guidelines. (boundary setback)</p> <p>Further investigation is required into its relationship with other (existing or proposed) towers on neighbouring sites.</p> <p>See note: Built Form and Scale</p>
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	See notes: Built Form and Scale

street frontage heights	Appears to address relevant standards.
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	<p>See notes: Sustainability above.</p> <p>Shadow diagrams sighted need to be extended to include streets and relationship to McCabe Park, compare existing to proposed impacts and confirm date they represent (21/6?)</p> <p>Wind and reflectivity issues are apparently not addressed.</p>
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	See notes on Context and Public Domain.
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	The panel supports the public use of the drainage reserve, but the design process needs to further demonstrate it will be a high quality, high amenity, functional, safe people place to be in, pass through and overlook.
Key issues, further Comments & Recommendations	<p>The proposal needs to further demonstrate design decisions based on analysis and synthesis of the existing and future neighbourhood context, and physical site, title and infrastructure conditions.</p> <p>Particular attention is drawn to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground Floor and Drainage Reserve treatment • Tower form configuration and fit with likely future neighbouring development. • Facade treatments demonstrating incorporation of preliminary structural and BCA inputs, and providing a more realistic representation of the proposals.