

Wollongong Design Review Panel (Via MS Teams)
Meeting minutes and recommendations

Date	25 February 2021
Meeting location	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices
Panel members	Brendan Randles Tony Quinn Marc Deuschle
Apologies	Nil
Council staff	Pier Panozzo – City Centre & Major Development Manager Anne Starr – Senior Development Project Officer Hayden Knobel – Development Project Officer
Guests/ representatives of the applicant	Luke Rollinson - MMJ Wollongong Andrew Burns – Andrew Burns Architecture Joseph Di Girolamo – Held Property Peter Hickey – Held Property
Declarations of Interest	Nil
Item number	1
DA number	DA-2020/1490
Reason for consideration by DRP	SEPP 65 and Design Excellence under Clause 7.18 of WLEP 2009
Determination pathway	Southern Regional Planning Panel (SRPP)
Property address	37-39 Burelli Street, Wollongong
Proposal	Demolition of existing structures and construction of a multi-level hotel development
Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	This meeting was conducted by MS Teams (video link) between the Panel (Council Administration Building) and the applicants' team (remote)
Background	The site was previously inspected by the Panel on 24 August 2020 pre-lodgement under DE-2020/52. The principles in SEPP 65 have been used as a guide.
Design quality principals SEPP 65	
Context and Neighbourhood Character	<p>As noted previously, the Panel supports the proposal for a new hotel, with active ground floor, in this location. As demonstrated at the last meeting, the local context of the site is well understood, described in informative diagrams, and illustrates how positive the proposal could be for the precinct and adjacent streetscape. However, the Panel also noted that the immediate context was less well described, with the proposal appearing not to fully embrace the many additional opportunities the existing streetscape and adjacent lane present to the proposal, nor addressing some of the difficult issues arising from this context which require further resolution</p> <p>Many of the suggestions made by the Panel have been addressed by the Applicant; significant constraints prevent moving the driveway for example (which would have allowed the adjacent plinth to be directly engaged); it was also demonstrated that rotating the tower would not result in an improved built form with higher amenity to individual rooms. While actual amendments to built form are generally supported (see Built Form below), some items remain of concern and require further consideration:</p> <p>The pedestrian access lane adjacent to the proposal – while on Council property and NOT activated in any way by adjacent internal spaces – is well used by the public. However, neither the west elevation nor the section on DA-300 illustrate that the lane's amenity will be improved by the proposal.</p> <p>With an additional podium level further constraining light access, and solid lower levels, how will it not be made worse in fact (darker,</p>

	<p>less safe, neglected etc)? More consideration should therefore be given to the Lane's activation - opening up driveway space for passive surveillance for example, introducing space for pop-up café outlets (such as in Sydney CBD), working with Council to establish objectives for opening up their building etc.</p> <p>While the Panel understands that the lane and its potential uses are difficult to conceive, it needs to be demonstrated that the Lane's open space amenity, engagement and safety can be improved over time, rather than further constrained.</p>
Built Form and Scale	<p>The Panel generally supports the amended built form, including the relocation of the tower, the articulated massing of the podium, the location of the communal garden and the use of brickwork at lower levels. It is noted that although the podium is one level higher, the proposal no longer breaches the height plane. The Panel supports the proposed Burelli Street setback as it aligns the building with the existing Council building.</p> <p>The built form has been well conceived generally, with an abundance of diagrams explaining how built form has been derived and articulated, how Panel comments have lead to changes, how windows have been located and distributed, impacts mitigated on adjacent buildings etc. This is to be commended. As discussed at the meeting however, there are some built form items that require further resolution :</p> <p>Although the building part is quite clear, the entry and circulation strategy within the built form is not. With entries provided to both streets (and accessibility issues forcing the "main entry" onto the less-favoured Corrimal Street), it is not actually clear where hotel clients enter, how accessibility is incorporated (without bias), where buses stop, how drop off on level one is enabled, how the entry is incorporated into and contributes to the public domain (i.e.. Burelli Street) etc.</p> <p>A clear movement diagram is therefore crucial as this could impact significantly on the proposed layout and built form. The movement diagram should consider how the entry can be better integrated with Burelli Street's public domain (well described in the documentation), how the proposal can benefit from the adjacent pedestrian Lane, and how the arrival of buses can be successfully achieved. In addition, the Panel recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main entry to Hotel (and dining/bar/restaurant) should be from Burelli Street (this should be emphasised with built form; - it may be better to relocate bar and terrace to achieve this outcome) - accessibility ramp would be better located along the vehicular ramp edge – not only for clarity, but also equity - void and stairs to upper levels may be better located to align with the entry lobby to improve clarity and wayfaring - bar, lounges and restaurant may be better located facing the less pedestrian friendly Corrimal Street - secondary access to dining/bar/restaurant only to and from Corrimal Street, adjacent to Kitchen perhaps to optimise engagement with public domain - a reappraisal of the level one drop off is required to ensure that vehicular circulation and pedestrian circulation is safe and amenable; this may require revising the parking layout

	<p>west of the reception and the loss of some car spaces</p> <p>While the Panel supports the zero setback to Corrimal Street, it results in a very flat east facing façade. This is not only visually confronting (as recognised by Council staff) but also inconsistent with the proposal's language of articulated volumes. As a major departure from the DCP, the zero-setback proposed needs to be well justified and highly refined. It is therefore recommended that the north facing landscape setback on Level 2 be extended along its eastern façade to provide a clearly articulated break.</p> <p>Alternatively the north facing vertical slot at the end of hotel corridor could be used to further divide the massing into three vertically articulated volumes (the parking module, the west facing rooms and the east facing rooms), with the west facing massing coming to ground along Corrimal Street. The advantage of this approach is that it could reinforce the primacy of the Burelli Street entry through the articulation of built form.</p> <p>The Panel understands the flooding issues that relate to the site and how this prevents the ground floor being proposed at grade (a Council preference).</p> <p>Given parking and hotel uses essential to its operation, the Panel supports the podium depth proposed.</p> <p>See notes above in Context regarding the amenity and safety of the adjacent pedestrian lane.</p>
Density	<p>Council advises that the density proposed is consistent with the WLEP 2009.</p>
Sustainability	<p>The Panel supports the built form proposed, especially in terms of outlook, access to light and air, amenity of individual rooms, the provision of a landscaped terrace and the use of brickwork and unpainted concrete (which reduce maintenance costs).</p> <p>In this submission, the Applicant has committed to green steel and sustainable concrete, low water use landscape species, high performance glazing and minimum standards of wall and roof insulation. The Panel notes the reduction of west facing rooms, the use of hit and miss brickwork to the podium (facilitating better air movement) and provision of solar panels.</p>
Landscape	<p>As noted above, the adjacent pedestrian laneway needs to be considered as part of this stage of design. How is it addressed - can it be activated and if so, how?</p> <p>The existing planting in the laneway also needs to be considered with regards to construction along this boundary, will it be protected, replaced or enhanced and how does this factor into the proposed art along this edge and the southern edge?</p> <p>A detail should be provided to show how the perimeter planting at the ground floor will be achieved; it should indicate minimum depth, width, subgrade treatment and any provisions proposed for healthy and sustained plant growth.</p> <p>The level five podium garden needs to be better considered. Currently it is addressing the basic requirements of creating a buffer to the edges and providing some 'green' to view from the interior and above, but it has not been well considered spatially. The large expanse of paving will impact on the comfort of guests through an exacerbated urban heat island effect. Extent and</p>

	<p>finishes should be carefully considered. In conjunction with the operator and the rest of the design team, the space should be considered with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how it can contribute to the attractiveness to the hotel, - how it can add value to the amenity and program provided, - how the space could be sub-divided into several spaces which each address a type of use (i.e. events / F+B or relaxation / quiet recreation or active uses / sport / fitness as examples to explore), - how surfaces could be varied to complement the proposed uses and help mitigate the UHI effect, - how thresholds could be squeezed between the spaces to create a sense of enclosure and help define space - how space is serviced – are breakfast or late night drinks provided? How are impacts controlled? <p>The small event space on the south needs further development and clarification. If it is to be an event space it needs to be explained how it relates to the adjacent rooms.</p>
Amenity	<p>See comments above regarding :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - amenity and safety along the pedestrian laneway - entry, accessibility and circulation at ground level - entry and vehicular drop off at level one - open space amenity at courtyard level
Safety	<p>It is not clear how safety along the adjacent pedestrian laneway can be enhanced by the Proposal.</p> <p>The level one drop off appears cramped and requires reversing adjacent to pedestrians; it is therefore potentially unsafe.</p>
Housing Diversity and Social Interaction	<p>The Panel supports the uses proposed in this location and believes that it will promote increased social interaction.</p>
Aesthetics	<p>The Panel supports the aesthetics of the buildings, including its arrangement of forms, its brick and concrete materiality and articulation, both into upper and lower forms and along the streetscape.</p> <p>The arrangement and distribution of tower windows is supported, including the articulation of concrete panels and composition.</p> <p>Due to the sheeress of the Corrimal Street façade, the Panel believes that additional articulation between the podium and the tower at level two is required – see noted above in built form.</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>Yes – however, additional articulation between the podium and the tower at level two is required.</p>
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will	<p>Yes – however, entry and movement requires clarification and refinement</p>

improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	Images included in the documentation indicate that the proposal will not detrimentally impact on view corridors.
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,	Streetscape positive – however, additional articulation between the podium and the tower at level two 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,	Acceptable
bulk, massing and modulation of buildings	Acceptable
street frontage heights	Acceptable
environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity	Acceptable
the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development	Acceptable
pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements	Level one drop off requires revision. It is not yet clear if bus drop off is acceptable.
impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain	Acceptable; however, entry and circulation require refinement
Recommendations	<p>Incorporate required refinements into proposal and proceed.</p> <p>Although the Panel does not require an additional meeting, Council should discuss amendments and refinements with Panel remotely.</p>