

Attachment 6 - DRP Notes of Meeting - 20 January 2020

Wollongong Design Review Panel Meeting minutes and recommendations

Date	20 January 2020
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
Panel members	David Jarvis Tony Tribe Marc Deuschle
Apologies	Pier Panozzo – City centre & Major Development Manager
Council staff	Nigel Lamb - City centre & Major Development Manager (Acting) Anne Starr – Senior Development Project Officer
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Hong Huang – Brewster Murray Pty Ltd Jason Lee - Brewster Murray Pty Ltd Lauren Turner - MMJ Wollongong David Dai – FR Project 2 Jake Li - FR Project 2 Felix Zhang - FR Project 2
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	1
DA number	DA-2019/748
Reasons for consideration by DRP	Clause 28 SEPP65, Clause 7.1/8 WLEP 200
Determination pathway	Southern regional Planning Panel
Property address	264-268 Keira Street and 23 Kenny Street Wollongong
Proposal	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	
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 and 20 January 2020. Applicable notes from the previous Panel Report are shown below in italics with additional comments below where relevant.
Design quality principals SEPP 65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	<p><i>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 "Plan that synthesises and interprets the context, streetscape and site documentation into opportunities and constraints that generate design parameters"</i></p> <p>In response to the Panels previous comments a more detail analysis of the site, its context and potential future context has been provided. The panel is concerned this documentation pre-empts the design proposed not the existing site and context constraints and opportunities giving rise to design options and decisions. The sparsity of detailed information on site and its physical and title encumbrances is noted (e.g Dwg A007/H) In response to this information the Panel provides the following comments:</p> <p><u>Future built forms on neighbouring sites</u> The proposal will establish a building form to which neighbouring sites must respond, ultimately creating a pattern of development for the city block. Drawings A012/B, A013/B, A015/B, A016/B, A018/B, A019/B and A017B. Provides a built form study of the potential future context on adjoining sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The adjoining site to the north should be set back from its southern boundary to address the laneway proposed on

	<p>the subject site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solar access to the building forms proposed on neighbouring sites should be quantified to demonstrate the potential to comply with the minimum requirements of the ADG. - Potential building forms studies on neighbouring sites should be expanded to demonstrate potential FSR compliant (or close to compliance) with council controls. - Solar studies (A018/B and A019/B) appear to be demonstrating that the majority north facing units (up to level 5, of the current proposal) will receive little to no solar access once the neighbouring property to the north is developed, this is not acceptable. Future built form studies should aim to demonstrate equitable and cohesive development can be achieved. All buildings should aim to demonstrate compliance with ADG solar access requirements whilst maximizing the potential FSR on each site. No site should be unduly burdened by the pattern of development created by this proposal. <p><u>Title encumbrances and physical constraints</u></p> <p>The panel supports the use of the drainage reserve as a quality public space and link between Kenny Street and McCabe Reserve; but remain concerned that the detail treatment of the open space to the north of the building does not yet successfully address the physical constraints of the site to create a successful lane. Design emphasis should prioritise the quality of the public domain experience and aesthetics over engineered solutions.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian entries and movement systems at the ground and elevated ground levels are unnecessarily complex, particularly as main entrances are remote from both streets. Detailed consideration of pedestrian volumes, desire lines, most convenient access paths and conflicts for occupants, visitors, public through traffic including for prams and wheelchairs would lead to a more legible, simpler and convenient solution.</p>
<p>Built Form and Scale</p>	<p><u>Sub-Ground works</u></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><u>Ground and Street Level</u></p> <p><i>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. In response to the Panel's previous comments further detailed studies and design development has been undertaken, however the Panel remain concerned that the proposal appears simply hydraulic-engineering driven solution that lacks the necessary comprehensive, coordinated design approach to achieve a high quality, high amenity, functional, safe place to be in, pass through and overlook.</i></p> <p>Comments on the plans presented included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steps have now been aligned with residential entry lobbies, providing an improved connection with the proposed future laneway / cross site link. It is recommended that the extent to which these steps extend into the cross-site link is reduced. This could be achieved by partially recessing the steps into the raised walkway

and refining the detail treatment at the base of the building.

For example, when considering the steps servicing lobby 2. The egress door in the north west corner of the café could be pull back in line with the lobby 2, this space could then be dedicated to the café allowing the northern wall of the café to be relocated further south to increase the width of the walkway without decreasing the size of the café. The steps could then be recessed into the walkway helping to define the café seating area on the northern face of the walkway, without creating a tight pinch point between the café and the steps.

- Consider treatment to existing adjacent walls to north or new 'green wall' on boundary as a temporary measure that remain in place until the neighbouring site to the north is developed.
- Extend proposed design treatment to kerbs in Kenny and Keira Streets
- Developments to the north eastern corner of the walkway have created improved potential for café seating. However, the ramp in the north eastern corner creates an overly long access path. Further development should seek to provide an accessible point of access closer to Keira Street.
- The parking easement is now more clearly defined in the documents provided. However, it should be better integrated with the proposed cross site link. Surface materials should provide some visual continuity with the rest of the cross-site link and the proposed fence defining this space should be replace with bollards to allow some shared pedestrian movement, but restrict vehicular access.
- The planter boxes proposed to the edge of the walkway are a positive development that will assist in concealing the undercroft created for the drainage overflow. However, further development is recommended to integrate the planters with the structure of the building (as opposed to hanging lightweight planters to the edge) and further reduce sight lines to the drainage undercroft. The proposed bench seats along the base of the walkway are considered to be less successful.
- The incorporation / concealment of the undercroft created for the drainage overflow is essential if a successful cross-site link / laneway is to be created. Drawings A302/1, A303/C, A304/C and A305/B document the detail treatment of this area. These documents should be expanded to show a large-scale detailed elevation that provides critical dimensions of maximum openings along the entire length of the walkway. Detail treatment of the edge of the walk should be further refined to minimise the visual impact of the undercroft when walking through the cross-site link.

Low Rise Apartments / base

The building form has been expressed as a tower that sits upon a defined podium base. This is considered a reasonable / appropriate built from strategy (pending further contextual detail analysis / refinement).

	<p><u>Tower</u></p> <p>The Kenny Street tower form is clearly driven by LEP heights and ADG building separation standards. In response to the Panels previous comments, an analysis (A016/B, A017/B, A018/B and A019/B) comparing a rectilinear tower and a splayed tower has been provided. The study concludes that the splayed form is preferable. The panel recommends that the contextual studies provided are expanded and further analyzed, as outlined above (Context and neighbourhood Character). The form of the proposed building must facilitate equitable and cohesive development on neighbouring sites, creating an appropriate pattern of development for the remainder of the city block.</p>
<p>Density</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>See: Aesthetics</i></p>
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p><u>Cross ventilation</u></p> <p>Unit 103, 203, 303, 403, 503,704, 804, 904, 1004,1104, 1204 and 1304. Are indicated as cross ventilated in drawing A502/H, but fail to meet ADG criteria for cross ventilation. 50% (54 of 107 units) of units are cross ventilated. The proposal does not currently meet the minimum ADG requirement of 60%.</p> <p><u>Solar access</u></p> <p>The proposal is orientated to provide good solar access to the majority of units, when the proposal is considered in its current context. However, when the adjoining site to the north is developed there will inevitable be an impact upon solar access to the subject site. This issue must be examined in greater detail. The contextual study of future built form on the adjoining site to the north must be further developed as outlined above (Context and neighbourhood Character). Once a clear understanding of this context is understood further refinements may be necessary to maximise solar access.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to controlled solar access to the large areas of glazing proposed. Facades should be developed in detail and tested to ensure that each façade responds appropriately to its orientation.</p> <p><u>Water reuse</u></p> <p>Opportunities to harvest rainwater for use in maintaining any plantings established on the building or the site should be accommodated. Other water minimization measures should be considered. The reuse of rainwater for toilet flushing and washing machines should also be considered.</p> <p>Photovoltaic panels have been provided on the roof as suggested by the Panel. The function of these panels should be clarified. Is the power generated for use in common areas or individual units?</p>
<p>Landscape</p>	<p><u>Public Domain</u></p> <p>The panel acknowledges the design is starting to show evidence of the importance of the through site link as a valuable public space for the city, but is driven not by its importance in this role, but rather by the satisfactory engineered amelioration of the 1:100</p>

year flood.

Breaking up the link into several zones, these aligning with the residential lobbies and commercial/retail spaces, is attempting to link the use of built form and landscape. While a space this size needs more than one use, and therefore the breaking up of space is supported, the current resolution appears to have created a large amount of repetition that caters for little else but seating. There is a vast oversupply of seating in various forms – other program and uses must be considered and included.

Further analysis of the surrounding area, including potential connections and destinations this link services should be demonstrated. This will help provide guidance as to other potential uses for the link / spaces.

The panel still feel that the inclusion of trees is important for this space to succeed and, while it has been explained that trees are not possible to be placed within this zone, evidence should be provided that no alterations to the current engineering are possible to allow this to change. Adding trees to integrated planters along the raised edge could also be explored if not possible at grade.

The structures (seats, planters and shade covers) have been designed to accommodate the flooding issue with thin posts attaching to the ground. These structures 'float' over the required clear volume for flooding, but the aesthetic does not appear to have been fully resolved – what happens to the surface under (given some is turf-paving). Is lightweight appropriate for a heavily trafficked public space?

No consideration seems to have been given to how the neighbours to the north address this space in the future.

Grass-paved pavement seems an inappropriate material for an important space such as this.

The fence between the spaces and the parking area should be reconsidered – this detail, especially between the vertical palisades of the fence, and the horizontal seating will produce a poor aesthetic.

Could level change be used in the through site link without negatively impacting the flood capacity of the space? This would be worth exploring as it has the potential to lift the quality of the space.

Level 01

The resolution of these spaces is more appropriate now. Trees are proposed which is a positive, but the volume provide them by the small planters is inadequate – these should be increased in size to ensure viability and healthy growth is possible. For the POS the trees could be moved to the corners and the planters enlarged in these locations.

Level 03 / 05 (all levels)

Specifically, the choice of species along the east-facing balconies seems inappropriate given the exposed conditions there. All species should be chosen (on all levels including ground) to suits their growing conditions, be low water using (and/or irrigated) and match council's preferred species.

Level 06

The variety of spaces on level 6 is limited with only dining spaces indicated – however only 1 BBQ facilitating 5 spaces is shown.

	<p>More thought needs to be given to the types of users this development will have, and their needs.</p> <p>It should be ensuring that the seating is BCA compliant and that balustrades are not climbable due to the seating around the edge.</p>
Amenity	<p>The plans should include bedroom (ex wardrobes) and living area dimensions to verify that ADG guidelines are met.</p> <p>ADG guideline for Kitchen depth from windows appears exceeded in most instances, dimensions should be provided to demonstrate ADG compliance.</p> <p>There are a number of issues relating to the interface between windows and balconies in the south eastern portion of the building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bedrooms to units 208, 308, 408 and 508 are serviced by high level windows, contrary to the requirements of ADG, Objective 4A-2. Note if the sills on these windows were to be lowered, they would be non-compliant with ADG setback requirements. - The balconies to units 313 and 514 are approximately 3m from the bedroom windows of units 508, 408 and 308. This is likely to create potential for acoustic and visual privacy issues between units. - The main balcony to unit 514 is oriented towards a blank wall. <p>Further development is required to eliminate potential privacy issues and improve amenity. This is likely to require a reduction in the number of windows and balconies orientated into this space. Convenient GF lobby to stair access needs to be provided (power outage/lift maintenance)</p> <p>The extensive indicated basement storage over car spaces is impractical and non-compliant with the ADG.</p>
Safety	<p><i>In its role as a public through site link and providing entry to a significant number of apartments the design of the drainage reserve (cross-site link / laneway) must include considered attention to safety aspects including lighting, passive and active surveillance.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Potential conflicts between the parking easement and pedestrian cross site link must be addressed. But this must not detract from the open space's role as a cross site link. Refer to comments above (Built form and scale).</i></p>
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	<p><i>A wide mix of apartment sizes is proposed. This will potentially provide an appropriate contribution to this precinct.</i></p> <p><i>It is noted that no 'affordable' or social housing is included.</i></p>
Aesthetics	<p>The building base has been articulated to mediate its broad northern elevation, creating a rhythm that flows through to both street elevations. However, materials still appear consist predominantly of painted finishes. The introduction of a good</p>

	<p>quality brick into the base of the building should be considered.</p> <p>The composition of the tower is less successful, particularly its broad northern façade, which appears to be expressed with a series of rectangular frames imposed on the façade with no clear purpose. Consideration could be given to a more vertical expression for the tower. The blank, limited fenestration, sunless, south presentation of the tower warrants further careful design consideration beyond patterns of paint colour.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The lightweight nature and design detail of the structures located in the through site link, feel inappropriate for a public space such as this. How will they stand up to the rigours of being in public use throughout the day? They must be capable of withstanding daily use and not be susceptible to potential vandalism.</p>
Design Excellence WLEP2009	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	<p><i>The Design Excellence standards of WLEP 2009 are applicable to this site.</i></p> <p><i>The standard is considered achievable, with further development. The proposal needs to demonstrate that the significant constraints to developing this site have been fully identified, assessed and solutions are practically, legally co-ordinated and workable to meet this standard.</i></p>
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>e.g the 'public domain' quality and function of the through-site link is still considered unsatisfactorily compromised by the single flood management option considered.</i></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,	<i>Compliance is claimed but needs to be verified.</i>
How the development addresses the following:	
the suitability of the land for development,	<i>Yes, subject to satisfactory resolution of constraints.</i>
existing and proposed uses and use mix	<i>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 by creating a cross site link activated</i>

	<p>by retail.</p> <p><i>The wide variety of residential apartment sizes is supported.</i></p>
<p>heritage issues and streetscape constraints,</p>	<p><i>McCabe Park across Keira Street is a Heritage item.</i></p> <p><i>See notes re shadows below.</i></p> <p><i>Further work is required to address visibility and access of elevated ground level uses to the street level. Refer above.</i></p>
<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>	<p><i>The tower location apparently complies with WLEP numerical standards, and APG building separation guidelines (boundary setback)</i></p> <p><i>Further investigation is required into its relationship with other (proposed) towers on neighbouring sites.</i></p>
<p>bulk, massing and modulation of buildings</p>	<p>Further development of future built form context is required.</p>
<p>street frontage heights</p>	<p><i>Appears to address relevant standards.</i></p>
<p>environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity</p>	<p>Further development is required to meet minimum ADG natural cross ventilation objectives. Further analysis of the proposal solar performance within potential future built context is required.</p>
<p>the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development</p>	
<p>pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements</p>	<p>Further development to the cross-site link is required.</p>
<p>impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p>Key issues, further Comments & Recommendations</p>	<p>A significant volume of work has been undertaken in response to the panels previous comments. However, the following issues require further development if the design excellence requirements of this site are to be achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further development and analysis of the future built form context of the site, to demonstrate equitable and cohesive development can be achieved by the subject site and its neighbours. • Detail refinement of the open space to the north to provide a successful cross site link. • Further refinement of the building aesthetic. • Further refinement to improve amenity and demonstrate compliance with the minimum requirements of the ADG.