

**Wollongong Design Review Panel – Council Administration Building & MS Teams**  
**Meeting minutes and recommendations**

<b>Date</b>	26 August 2022
<b>Meeting location</b>	Wollongong City Council Administration Offices & MS Teams
<b>Panel members</b>	David Jarvis (Chair) Tony Tribe (Panel member) Marc Deuschle (Panel member)
<b>Apologies</b>	Jerah Fox – Strategic Project Officer Felicity Skoberne – Landscape Architect Andy Goldie – Senior Landscape Architect
<b>Council staff</b>	Mark Adamson - Manager Development Assessment and Certification Pier Panozzo - City Centre & Major Development Manager Rebecca Welsh - Senior Development Project Officer Nigel Lamb - Senior Development Project Officer Joel Thompson - Coordinator Heritage - Strategic Project Officer Kate Rintoul - Strategic Project Officer
<b>Guests/ representatives of the applicant</b>	<u>In person attendees</u> Steven Turner (ColonySix) Shaun Doyle (ColonySix) Omaira Kola (ColonySix) Roger Jasprizza (Oculus) Leny Lembo (BVN)  <u>Online attendees:</u> Edward Green – Urbis Andrew Harvey - Urbis Chris Bickerton – BVN Andrew Lancaster – Win Group Chris Halios-Lewis – WIN Group Phillip Rossington - BVN Ciaran Durney Julian Bott Joe Gallace Justin Leo Ninotschka Titchkosky
<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	None
<b>Item number</b>	2
<b>DA number</b>	DA-2021/957
<b>Reason for consideration by DRP</b>	Design review as per Clause 28 of SEPP 65 and Design Excellence as per Clause 7.18 of WLEP 2002
<b>Determination pathway</b>	Southern Regional Planning Panel (SRPP)
<b>Property address</b>	City block bounded by Crown, Keira, Burelli and Atchison Streets, Wollongong.
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing structures, retention of heritage facades, tree removal, excavation for basement car parking and construction of a mixed-use development at the street block bound by Crown, Keira, Burelli and Atchison Streets, comprising three (3) residential towers (shop top housing), one (1) commercial building, retail shops, entertainment facilities (cinema, exhibition / performance space) and a wellness centre (pool, gym, and health services)
<b>Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel</b>	The meeting was conducted in person and by video link between the Panel (Council offices) and some of the applicants' team (remote).
<b>Background</b>	The Panel have previously visited the site on several occasions and reviewed design proposals for the site on three separate occasions (21/8/2020, 15/10/2020 and 18/11/2020) prior to the proposal being lodged as a development application. The DRP

	reviewed the design post lodgement on 15/10/21 and 7 April 2022.
<b>Design quality principals SEPP 65</b>	
<b>Context and Neighbourhood Character</b>	<p><u>Future Urban Context</u> WLEP 2009 design excellence criteria requires that the proposal is considered within its future context:</p> <p><i>“The location of any tower proposed, having regard to the need to achieve an acceptable relationship with other towers (existing or future proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form”.</i></p> <p>Given that the proposal will contain the tallest tower in the city it is essential to demonstrate that the proposal (particularly tower 1) contributes to an equitable and cohesive pattern of development on surrounding sites.</p> <p>A contextual study has now been provided, documenting potential future building forms on neighbouring sites that realise council permissible GFA controls and demonstrate compliance with ADG building separation requirements. A sunlight analysis has also been provided. The analysis demonstrates that solar access to the site immediately to the south of the subject site (site 5) will be challenging, particularly to the lower levels of the development. However, there appears to be sufficient flexibility to develop ADG compliant solar access to future residential towers located above podium level.</p> <p><u>Overshadowing of MacCabe Park</u> Council’s sun plane protection restricts over-shadowing of MacCabe Park, no overshadowing is allowed between 9am and 2pm, mid-winter. In response to the Panel’s previous comments building mass fronting Burelli Street has been redistributed to comply with Council’s overshadowing objectives. The Panel endorses the proposed redistribution of the building mass fronting Burelli Street.</p> <p>It is noted that the currently proposed building form remains noncompliant with Council’s building height control. However, the now minor noncompliance helps to facilitate a rational distribution of building mass and no longer has a negative impact upon the public domain.</p> <p><u>Connecting to Country</u> The Panel is pleased that a Connecting with Country Framework has now been included. With the specialist consultant coming onto the team late in the design process - and acknowledging that the Government Architect NSW Draft Framework was first released after the project commenced - it is not surprising that much of the work is a high-level endorsement of the current design.</p> <p>While many suggestions: use of local language in wayfinding, integration of artwork in the public domain, integration of local indigenous ecologies in the landscape; need not be fully documented for a DA, very little evidence of the architecture or landscape design, and how it relates to Country is currently evident.</p>
<b>Built Form and Scale</b>	<p><u>Height transfer between tower 2 and 3</u></p> <p>See comments above (over shadowing of MacCabe Park). The redistribution of the built form fronting Burelli Street has addressed the concerns raised by the Panel without compromising the</p>

---

overarching design intent (strengthen grain and tactility) outlined by the applicant. The rationalised height of the lower portion of tower 3 has also created a stronger, more consistent expression of the building base to the Burelli Street frontage, resulting in a more legible street scale. It is also noted that the reconfigured towers will result in better amenity for more residents.

Separation between residential towers.

The separation provided between residential towers largely complies with the numerical requirements of the ADG. However, there are isolated areas where ADG separation distances have not been achieved. To address these non-compliances, the applicant has proposed privacy screening that maintains the outlook from habitable rooms but prevents a direct visual connection between habitable rooms of neighbouring residential buildings. The Panel agrees that the provision of appropriately designed privacy screens as outlined by the applicant will address the objectives of the ADG, mitigate potential privacy issues, and provide an acceptable design response.

To ensure that the design intent outlined in the applicant's presentation is realised, detail design (1:10 detail showing materials dimensions of and spacing between louvers / blades) of the privacy screens should be provided as part of the DA documentation package.

Separation between Tower 3 and The Grand Hotel.

Lower-level units of tower 3 will overlook the external terrace / beer garden servicing the Hotel. To address this issue a pergola has been provided over the terrace. The applicant also advised that residential windows will be acoustically treated, and privacy screens provided.

The terrace will receive good solar access (around lunch time), providing a very amenable space to enjoy a midday meal / beverage. Any structure proposed above the terrace should seek to maintain solar access to the space during the day but allow the terrace to be more enclosed during the evenings. A flexible design should seek to address potential privacy issues, whilst maintaining the quality of the space.

Details of the terrace roof structure and screens to windows should be provided as part of the DA documentation package.

Separation between wellness center and residential towers

The information provided by the applicant shows that separation between the residential towers and wellness center has been increased. However, further detail information is required to understand the detail resolution of interfaces between the lower level of the towers (particularly tower 2) and the wellness center.

Details of windows and screens to the gym should be provided to demonstrate that potential privacy issues (visual and acoustic) are mitigated.

Burelli Street developments

The street level interface has been developed with a scalloped form that provides an additional 2m setback from the street. This strategy contributes to a more generously proportioned footpath that is now serviced by a continuous awning. This development now allows street trees to be provided along Burelli Street.

The 2m deep scalloped brick work will provide an interesting feature to the building that will provide a positive contribution to the street. The height, width and transparency of the awning needs to

---

---

be finessed to ensure the scalloped brickwork is not completely concealed by the awning. Awnings must also provide effective weather protection and light to this highly exposed, sunless pedestrian way. Their design should include co-ordination with street tree planting and mature growth projections.

Details of awnings should be provided as part of the DA documentation package, as should clarity as to where trees are in relation to high / low scallops to ensure adequate space for trees to grow.

#### Keira Street building amendments

The building located on the corner of Crown and Keira Street has been developed to provide a clear built form / retail presence by infilling the previously proposed undercroft. The revised building form provides a stronger retail presence on the corner. The reconfiguration of the street corner is generally viewed as a positive development by the Panel. However, the building interfaces with the street would benefit from further refinement to provide a stronger connection with Wollongong's primary retail street, Crown Street mall.

The revised seating (meeting) steps to the Crown and Keira Street corner may contribute to an appropriate solution. However, more detail is needed to support this in becoming an activated space as anticipated. Its location means it is heavily impacted by issues such as traffic noise, constant vehicular movement, solar exposure, and steep footpath grades, all of which need addressing.

The creation of a stronger, more consistent building base to Keira Street (as depicted in sketch perspectives) will contribute to the character of the street. However, this will be dependent upon the quality of materials used. There appears to be a significant extent of face brick work proposed. This is considered to be an appropriate material selection if a high-quality face brick is used. To ensure quality, finishes should be reflected in conditions and plans.

There is a large area of inactivated street level façade, spanning between the street corner (Keira and Crown) and the cinema entry. Detail resolution of the façade should seek to demonstrate how this interface provides a positive contribution to the street. Cinema display graphics shown in perspectives appear to be providing a positive contribution to street in this location. The display areas should be developed as an integral part of the design and shown on elevations. Detail resolution of the street awning and lighting will also contribute to the quality the street interface.

The addition to the hotel has been refined to provide a more appropriately scaled addition to the existing street façade. The external terrace (level 2) has also been relocated to the southern side of the building to benefit from an outlook across the park and minimise potential privacy issues with the residents of tower 3. The level 2 addition has been expressed with metal screening that encloses both the terrace and the internal exhibition space. Detail resolution of the screening system should seek to ensure that screens do not compromise the quality of the terrace. The terrace should feel like an open external space not an enclosed / caged area.

#### Crown Street development, including public plaza

The mass of the Wellness Center has been redistributed to provide a more consistent two storey street wall fronting Crown Street and provides greater separation between the Wellness Center and tower 2. The proposed redistribution of mass of the wellness center

---

	<p>is a positive development.</p> <p>The triangular plaza to Crown Street has now been established as a public plaza addressing Crown Street and located close to bus stops / shelters, and the meeting steps at the corner of Crown / Keira Streets. Its location creates a good connection into the site and has the potential to create visual connection from the street to the central square. See also 'Landscape'.</p> <p>The alignment of the central laneway along Crown Street creates a good connection into the site. However, the spatial quality of the lane is unclear, from the information provided it appears to be a narrow inactive space consisting largely of blank walls. Retail tenancies should address the lane. At a minimum, windows should be provided to tenancies to provide casual surveillance of the lane. Further information should also be provided to document how the wellness centre entry contributes to the quality of the lane.</p> <p>Elevations of all proposed lanes must be provided and included in the DA documentation package.</p> <p><u>The lane connecting the public square to Crown Street</u></p> <p>The lane connecting the public square to Crown Street is 8m wide and serviced by awnings on both sides. The extent, height, solidity, and materiality of the awnings appear to be enclosing the lane, creating a space that presents as an internal space that may lack natural light. Further refinement of the awning is recommended.</p> <p>Connecting with Country Framework, should be reflected in the quality and detail of these spaces.</p>
<b>Density</b>	<p>Building mass has been distributed in a reasonable manner to respond to the immediate context of the site. The FSR should be checked and confirmed once a finalized set of DA documents has been provided.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>To meet council's design excellence requirement, the proposal must address the principles of ecologically sustainable development. Given the scale and prominence of this development, this proposal should aim to be an exemplar of environmental sustainability.</p> <p>The applicant has outlined that they will not follow the usual accreditation pathways, however, will still meet outlined sustainability targets by committing to a carbon neutral development. The commitments will include both the construction and ongoing operation of the development. Carbon neutral commitment would need to be independently reviewed and verified on an annual basis in a process acceptable to Council</p> <p>If these commitments are made and captured within the development consent, design excellence requirements will have been addressed.</p> <p>Long term sustainability is contingent on an ownership and management structure which ensures commitments are met on an on-going basis, regardless of change pressures. It is unknown whether the application includes such documentation.</p>
<b>Landscape</b>	<p>The Panel appreciates the effort made to respond to previous commentary related to the landscape and public domain of the project. The retention of all street trees surrounding the site, inclusion of additional plane trees to Burelli Street, and provision of</p>

	<p>new street trees to Crown Street in particular will have a positive impact on the development and surrounding streetscapes.</p> <p>We also appreciate that the site has a difficult interface with the existing levels of the surrounding streets to deal with. This has been relatively well resolved allowing people to enter the site at grade, or via a lift, from the 4 major corners of the site. Concerns exist about accessibility off Keira Street given the grades of the street prior to accessing the lift.</p> <p>It is also commended that the attention to both hardscape detailing and planting design is of a high standard and should result in a quality public domain. Planting in particular responded to Country even prior to a connection with country framework being established which has grounded the project in place more than any other aspect of the development to date.</p> <p>While these aspects are leading to project to a quality outcome, several high-level issues remain of concern for the Panel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The major function of the landscape appears to be to service the retail and commercial offerings, resulting in spaces that predominantly consist of circulation and seating.</li> <li>- Besides the 'incidental' playground there is no landscape-driven program in the development.</li> <li>- There is no program that could supplement the COS of the residential towers, noting this could also simultaneously activate the public domain throughout the day.</li> <li>- Solar access across the public domain is highly constrained, and areas that do receive solar access in mid-winter, besides the beer garden, are generally circulation or secondary spaces. Even the playground is mostly overshadowed.</li> <li>- Canopy cover appears to remain at &lt;20% when it was a core principle at the start to achieve &gt;35%.</li> </ul> <p>Detailed commentary for key spaces is as follows:</p> <p><u>Burelli Street</u></p> <p>The additional 2m setback and scalloped lower floor facades allow existing plane trees to be retained and new plane trees to be established. This is a positive outcome for the Burelli Streetscape.</p> <p>The detailing of the building façade, particularly how the scallop height and awning interfaces with the street trees is still unclear. Tree growth must remain unimpeded.</p> <p>Detailed issues remain within the small 'public' spaces along Burelli Street and need to be addressed; these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bicycle parking at the western end is accessible only via a narrow, zig-zag pathway along the building edge. This constrains access and will cause pedestrian and bicycle movements to clash. Bins are also located behind where bikes are parked making them inaccessible.</li> <li>- It was discussed in the meeting that the playground was not suited to being cascaded down the slope but rather would stretch further north when developed in detailed design. The Panel would suggest that any such change needs to be reflected in the DA documentation. Previous comments about the playground being able to take advantage of the slope and becoming a site drawcard (especially for residents above) remain.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bicycle parking within the central space clashes with proposed seating, making seats unusable when bikes are parked. Given the wider public footpath further east, perhaps more bike parking could be provided there to allow the space in question to be better resolved for public use.</li> <li>- The upper central space appears to have seating as its only programmed function. The Panel would urge more program to be placed into spaces like this, especially given it is less encumbered by circulation being a dead-end.</li> <li>- The eastern space, adjacent to a 7m high retaining wall appears to have become a dead corner. This space needs to be better resolved, perhaps with additional planting to screen the high wall behind, and additional bike parking to free up usable space as noted above.</li> </ul> <p><u>Keira Street</u> Footpath grades should be indicated to demonstrate that a universally accessible path of travel is possible to the relocated lift between the cinema and hotel.</p> <p><u>Crown Street</u> As previously noted, the current approach to the corner of Crown and Keira Street is supported in principle in that it provides a stronger presence to the corner than previous iterations. The Panel acknowledges that the levels around this corner are possibly the most difficult to resolve on the entire boundary, and that a terraces approach is a logical one. Further refinement is still required to make this corner function better which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A stair connection up and into the retail tenancies</li> <li>- An external balcony from the tenancies connecting to this edge</li> <li>- Art or activation specific to this corner</li> <li>- A canopy or shade cover given the highly exposed nature of this corner.</li> </ul> <p>In detail it appears the terraces are not evenly spaced with one at 400mm and the next at 600mm. This should be resolved.</p> <p>How this corner relates to the next space along Crown Street, the public plaza should also be considered; for example, could the language of the large seating steps and smaller stairs be unified, or could planting connect the two spaces?</p> <p>The public square on Crown Street deals with some difficult levels which have been resolved via a staggered set of stairs and level lawn with trees. Given the northerly aspect the lawn should do well, and the trees will provide a nice canopy for the space over time. Consideration should be given to how the universal path of travel from the lower eastern side of Crown Street could lead more directly into the central space, and how the usable space could be maximised. For example, could the lawn be extended to the boundary, and separated by a walkway from ~RL21.000-370, that slopes gently up into the site? The required curtilage around the bus shelters could remain but more of the plaza would become usable.</p> <p>The inclusion of new trees along Crown Street is supported and it is the Panels understanding the species is in line with Council's recommendation. More clarity should be provided as to how the paved blister in which these trees are planted functions. The tree location suggest it is not a footpath widening, though it is also not shown as a spill out space for F+B. If there is no intended function,</p>
--	---

---

could the blister be planted to provide a buffer to the pedestrian footpath?

#### Bike Parking

It should be demonstrated that bike parking, when in use, will not impact the path of travel along the footpath and circulation corridors, or negatively impact adjacent spaces, throughout the development. Specific concerns include (but are not limited to):

- Burelli Street west – access path of travel
- Burelli Street central – clash with seating / space
- Keira Street south – encroachment on footpath
- Crown Street – encroachment on footpath
- Public Square – location at knuckle / change of direction
- Central Laneway west – space could be used more efficiently / provide better program

#### Central Public Domain

It should be noted that since the first review of this project the extent of public domain appears to have been reduced significantly. The original concept of an inviting central space that acts as the 'Green Heart' of the project (the competition winning centrepiece) has been lost which is a shame.

As noted earlier, the bigger concern is that the space that remains has minimal inherent program, its main amenity provision is circulation and seating, and the distribution of winter solar access is poor.

#### Crown Street Plaza Alley

Leading into the site from the triangular Crown Street Plaza (NE corner of site) this alley consists of two accessways of 4m (upper) and 4.2m (lower) with a central planter of 3.8m. Awnings over will limit daylight in this space and should be reviewed. Likewise, if food and beverage offerings are intended along this section, could the space be reviewed to allow breakout spaces between the trees in some areas?

#### Public Square

The public square was originally a civic-type space activated by the cinema entry and exhibition spaces. These both still exist but have been shifted to the north-eastern and south-eastern corners respectively. As a result of the Keira Street built form widening, the space has shrunk, further reduced by circulation corridors along all edges. The resolution of levels has also resulted in a disconnected 'square', with ramps, stairs and planters creating several distinct zones. Being the largest outdoor / public domain space on the development, it seems like a lost opportunity to not develop this area as a drawcard of the landscape as originally conceived.

#### The Laneway

Consideration should be given to limiting the extent of the laneway to only the western end to allow a larger public square to be established. The design consists of two walkways on either side of a central strip consisting of paving, planters, pots and bike parking. The Panel feels that this laneway could be a more programmed space, potentially with some uses that supplement the rooftop COS for residents. The current arrangement underutilised the space.

#### Trees

Tree species proposed for the development are generally native and many are locally endemic to the region; this is commended. Some issues to consider moving into detail include:

- Could there be more deciduous trees in the central zone
-



	<p>and other confined areas to ensure good solar access during winter (this does not discount the fact that all public spaces should be afforded good solar access during the winter months).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use of Illawarra flame trees within the central space is a good choice and in keeping with the original intent expressed about using endemic species to celebrate the area's culture.</li> <li>- The use of <i>Banksia integrifolia</i> and <i>Elaeocarpus reticulatus</i> as feature trees within the public square is questioned. Neither tree is known for its beautiful or ornamental growth, nor straight or feature trunks / crowns; these should be reconsidered.</li> <li>- One of the key principles noted by the Proponent is that canopy coverage would be a minimum of 35%. While a specific number is not noted in the review package the design appears to still only achieve ~17.3% as previously noted. Maximising the urban canopy, particularly in summer, should be prioritised and the original rate of 35% achieved.</li> <li>- Several sections (e.g., 18 / L723) show soil depths and widths that do not look adequate for the healthy and sustained growth of the proposed trees.</li> </ul> <p><u>Planting</u></p> <p>The extent of rooftop planting is commended and supported. It is questioned if this could be extended to include all buildings on Crown Street. Concerns remain about the viability and maintenance of the planted awnings throughout the site.</p> <p><u>Art</u></p> <p>Public art for this development should aim to be interactive and engaging, not static. Locations should be considered to draw people into the public spaces.</p> <p>Connection to Country may be expressed in parts via artworks, however this must not be the totality of its expression within the project as noted in previous commentary.</p> <p>The landscape itself should aim to be artistic and engaging.</p> <p><u>Communal Open Space (COS) to Residential Towers</u></p> <p>Additional COS has been provided to each tower, ensuring each tower now reaches minimum area requirements.</p> <p>It is unclear from the landscape drawings which area is open to the sky and which is undercroft. Some of the communal open space contained within south facing undercrofts may be colder and darker than is optimal. It is suggested the south facing under crofts are developed to provide internal communal rooms serviced by well-proportioned balconies / terraces.</p> <p>There are 18 trees proposed on the communal rooftops – there is an opportunity here to increase the shade for residents and provide a higher overall canopy cover by increasing this number.</p> <p>With seats located beside several edge planters, and as parapet levels are not included on plans, safety with regards to climbability is unclear but remains a concern.</p> <p>There are several 'integrated play elements / active play zones that show little detail as to what they are, or how children can play with them. Do they require fall zones and therefore is there enough</p>
--	---

	<p>space for them as proposed?</p> <p>The raised lawns and some decks will not be accessible to all and should be resolved.</p> <p><u>T1 (Marcus Clarke Building)</u> Detailed issues that require further clarity / resolution include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the program available on the lower rooftop space?</li> <li>- Why is there a kitchenette in the play zone? It's location seems to encroach on the usability of the space.</li> <li>- The location of the sculptural art seems to minimise the usability of the lawn.</li> <li>- Why does the upper level have a separate kitchenette and BBQ? The kitchenette arrangement results in most of the rooftop becoming circulation. Consideration should be given to moving the BBQ / kitchenette together and into a corner to allow more usable space overall.</li> <li>- Some planters are extremely narrow and will become unworkable – resolve.</li> </ul> <p><u>Tower 2</u> Detailed issues that require further clarity / resolution include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are the sunroofs for solar only or also for ventilation – how will this impact privacy?</li> <li>- Is a conversation nook beside an exercise area a good co-location? Perhaps there should be more distance between these for privacy / acoustic buffering.</li> <li>- What is active play – it looks like paving only.</li> </ul> <p><u>Tower 3</u> Detailed issues that require further clarity / resolution include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feature elements like the table tennis tables would be better suited to the ground floor as a shared asset for the residents and public.</li> </ul> <p>The above commentary is limited based on the provided documentation to date. Coloured plans were shared during the meeting, however the Panel has only reviewed landscape DA documentation. The Panel would strongly advise that renders be provided as part of the DA package that indicate the spatial quality of each landscape space to allow a better assessment as to the quality and characteristics of each space.</p>
Amenity	<p><u>Public Domain: Crown &amp; Kiera</u> The extensive weather protection awnings now incorporated to surrounding streets, with occasional breaks, are commended. However, in this latest iteration, the least protected area is now the busiest pedestrian connection, potential meeting place and CBD landmark. (i.e. from the Crown Street/Kiera Street intersection west along Crown Street to the main site entry.) It is strongly recommended that the design of this area be finessed to ensure the highest possible all-weather public amenity and civic presence.</p> <p><u>Bus Stop: Crown St</u> The design and integration of the bus stop and shelters remains an outstanding, but critical, issue pending Transport for NSW inputs.</p> <p><u>Internal Public Walkways</u> The L1 undercroft to the west of the office building is potentially the busiest pedestrian thoroughfare. Its width after protruding columns and escape doors is 2 metres. Adequacy and safety should be</p>

	<p>assessed.</p> <p>Planted concrete awnings to south of Gym/Pool buildings work well for apartment overlooking, but potentially mean dark, sunless shopping environment. Occasional 'skylights' worthy of consideration.</p> <p><u>Circulation</u></p> <p>The proposal has been developed to provide accessible points of entry close to the four corners of the site. A further accessible point of entry has been provided at the centre of Crown Street.</p> <p>The relocation of the lift and stair from the eastern edge of Burelli Street to the southern end of Keira Street has eliminated conflicts with the hotel terrace / beer garden. However, the new lift location may hinder accessibility due to the steepness of the grade along Keira Street itself. Perspectives also appear to indicate that the roof above the new stairs significantly restricts sightlines between the public square and street. Further refinement of the extent, height and materiality of the roof above the stairs should seek to improve sightlines and increase natural lighting to the stairs.</p> <p><u>Servicing</u></p> <p>A loading dock has been provided on the eastern end of the site. The dock provides convenient servicing access to the northern retail block, the cinema, the wellness center, the hotel, and the commercial building on the corner of Crown and Keira Street.</p> <p>However, the Marcus Clarke building and retail / commercial units in the southern block are not serviced by the loading dock. It is unclear how these units will be conveniently serviced. It is of particular concern that the viability of the Marcus Clarke building may be impacted by its lack of a convenient servicing strategy.</p> <p><u>Solar access</u></p> <p>The suns eye view diagrams provided do not appear to be providing a true and accurate representation of the location of the sun. An accurate solar study must be provided to allow ADG solar access requirements to be assessed. Suns eye view diagram should also show the extent of solar access to the full extent of the public domain within the development.</p> <p><u>Natural cross ventilation</u></p> <p>The proposal does not meet cross ventilation requirements as outlined in part 4B of the ADG. The proposal is reliant upon ventilation through narrow slots within the building with a depth to width ratio far lower than 2:1, as specified by the ADG. To address this issue a report has been provided outlining that the development meets the objectives of the ADG by incorporating specific design initiatives to facilitate natural cross ventilation.</p> <p>If ADG compliance is to be accepted, the Panel recommends that site specific modeling is undertaken to demonstrate that ADG objectives can be met. The "clear opening sizes" of all windows relied upon for natural ventilation should also be documented.</p> <p>Apartment type comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2F- entry direct to living area</li> <li>• 1C 1+2 Torturous journey Bed to Bathroom</li> <li>• 3G 1+2- Internal kitchen and journey to bathroom via kitchen.</li> <li>• SP1+2- Laundry (has window) accessed via study...better reversed?</li> <li>• 1A 1+2, 1B 1+2- Bed-Bath journey</li> <li>• 2C 1+2- Internal Kitchen...Thoroughfare</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1E- Bed/Bath remote</li> <li>• 3B- Bathroom 2 open to kitchen/living</li> </ul>
<b>Safety</b>	<p>The applicant previously advised that the central landscape areas and laneways will remain open 24 hours a day, effectively becoming part of the public domain. Casual surveillance of these spaces must be maximised and other Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles should be developed. Safe travel through, and egress from, different use carparks need to be resolved in conjunction with title/ownership/management strategy.</p> <p>As previously noted, sustainable ownership and management plans need to include egress and fire-fighting issues.</p> <p>There remains an uneasiness with the single carpark entry serving extensive multiple uses. Internal safety aspects and the lack any off-site roadworks warrants verification.</p> <p>Apartment tower detail design sections highlight issues having design impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flat plate slabs with step-up to balcony level access and waterproofing issues. A slab detail that steps down to balconies, to accommodate a level threshold and appropriate water proofing is encouraged.</li> <li>- Full height glass walls have potential BCA spread of fire/ separation issues. Appropriate detail resolution should be demonstrated at DA stage.</li> </ul>
<b>Housing Diversity and Social Interaction</b>	A reasonable mix of uses has been proposed. Consideration should be given to providing some affordable housing within the development.
<b>Aesthetics</b>	Detailed documentation provided to date generally demonstrates a well resolved architectural aesthetic and appropriate material selection. However, as previously noted DA documents are yet to be finalised.
<b>Design Excellence WLEP2009</b>	
Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved	The documentation provided to date indicates the potential for appropriately high standard architectural design, materiality, and detailing, to building types and locations. The finalised DA documents should reflect the additional details requested in these notes
Whether the form and external appearance of the proposed development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,	Developments to the form, massing and public domain interfaces provide an improved contextual response. However, further refinements / detailed information as outline in this report are required.
Whether the proposed development detrimentally impacts on view corridors,	
Whether the proposed development detrimentally overshadows an area shown distinctively coloured and	Tower 3 has now been developed to eliminate over-shadowing of MacCabe Park before 2pm mid-winter. The proposal now complies with Council requirements.

<b>numbered on the Sun Plane Protection Map,</b>	
<b>How the development addresses the following:</b>	
<b>the suitability of the land for development,</b>	The proposal is situated in a prominent City centre location ideal for a mixed-use development.
<b>existing and proposed uses and use mix</b>	A reasonable mix of uses has been proposed.
<b>heritage issues and streetscape constraints,</b>	The retention of the Marcus Clarke building, and Grand Hotel, facades is commendable.
<b>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,</b>	The proposal has demonstrated an acceptable relationship with existing and future built forms can be achieved.
<b>bulk, massing and modulation of buildings</b>	The revised massing provides an improved response to the immediate context of the site. The basic massing principles of the development are acceptable.
<b>street frontage heights</b>	The proposed developments have reinforced the two-storey street wall height to Crown Street and provided a more consistent / appropriate street wall datum to Burelli and Kiera Street. Street frontage heights are acceptable.
<b>environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity</b>	An accurate solar study is required. The proposed long-term ownership and management structure need to form part of the application.
<b>the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development</b>	The commitment to a carbon neutral development is commendable.
<b>pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements</b>	Acceptable. Pending, extent of all external road and other works being clarified and indicated on plans.
<b>impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain</b>	<p>Improvements have been made to interface with the public domain, However, the public domain and internal landscape spaces still rely too heavily on activation by the architecture and provide little amenity of their own besides seating and circulation.</p> <p>It is recommended a Staging Plan, clarifying any the extent and timeline of disruption in the public domain form part of any consent.</p>
<b>Key issues, further Comments &amp; Recommendations</b>	<p>The form and massing of the proposal responds to the site and its immediate context in a reasonable manner. Large scale details and material selection and perspectives also indicate that a high-quality aesthetic can be achieved.</p> <p>However, further detail information and design refinements are required to ensure that the proposal provides a high-quality contribution to the public domain, an appropriate level of amenity to residents and a functional servicing strategy to all commercial and retail components.</p>