



PEMULWUY DEVELOPMENT (Precinct 3) – Design Review Panel Meeting No.2

DATE: 13/02/2017

TIME/LOCATION: 3.00-5.00PM, Lev.7, 1 Oxford Street, Darlinghurst (Turner Office)

APOLOGIES: Dillon Kombumerri (attendance via phone link)

Andy Ludvik

MINUTES BY: **Notes:** Ingrid Shu **Final Report:** Dillon Kombumerri

PRESENT:

Name	Ab.	Organisation	Contact	P
Kim CRESTANI	KC	Order Architects DRP Chair	9016-5526 kim@orderarchitects.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tony Caro	TC	Tony Caro Architects DRP Member	0413 154533 tony@tonycaroarchitecture.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dillon Kombumerri	DK	Principle Architect – GA DRP Member	8217-2007 dillon.kombumerri@planning.nsw.gov.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Michael Mundine	MM	CEO Aboriginal Housing Company	9319 1824 ceo@ahc.org.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lani Tuitavake	LT	GM - Aboriginal Housing Company	9319 1824 info@ahc.org.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alisi Tutuila	AT	Chair AHC Board of Directors	9319 1824	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

			info@ahc.org.au	
Greg Colbran	GC	Deicorp	8665-4100 gcolbran@deicorp.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Andy Ludvik	AL	Deicorp	8665-4100 aludvik@ozemail.com.au	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nick Turner	NT	Turner - Director	8668-0000 nturner@turnerstudio.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dan Szwaj	DS	Turner – Design Team	8668-0000 dszwaj@turnerstudio.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ingrid Shi	IS	Turner – Project Architect	8668 0000 ishi@turnerstudio.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

MINUTES

ITEM	Action/Outcome	Date
2.1 Welcome		
2.1.1	All present – Dillon Kombumerri joined via phone link	Noted
2.2 Previous business arising		
1.7.10	Presentation to City of Sydney ATSI Advisory Panel 1/3/2017 to be further considered – discussed further in minutes below	Noted
2.3 Design Presentation		
2.3.1	Design development of project since DRP1 presented to DRP.	Noted
2.4 Panel Discussion/Recommendations		

2.4.1	The SEARS envelope should be lightly dotted over each of the TURNER envelope drawings and perspective views to clearly indicate areas of divergence.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.2	Representation of both the SEARS and TURNER built form should be consistent (eg. show or don't show floor levels on both, SEARS envelope yellow/TURNER blue etc). Ensure north points on all drawings including shadow diagrams.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.3	Height of the SEARS reference scheme was confirmed at 16 storeys maximum. Whilst the current Turner concept does not exceed this, the extent of taller built form appears greater when compared with the SEARS.	Noted
2.4.4	Whilst Panel supports the single loaded plan layout for amenity reasons, this probably contributes to the additional bulk of built form when viewed from the east and west. This may present an issue with consent authorities, and massing alternatives to address this were discussed at the meeting.	Noted
2.4.5	The Panel suggested a study of limited additional height at the south end (2-3 storeys) in order to lower other portions of the building, with the objective being to create greater steps in the east wing profile and an improved overall form. The Panel acknowledges however that additional height is also likely to be an issue with the relevant authorities.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.6	After discussion it was agreed that any further extension of the length of the wings was not advisable, as this would increase visual mass from east and south.	Noted
2.4.7	Panel recommended that vertical articulation of the two wings to break down their visual mass be investigated, both in the form and materiality. The access corridor on the railway side is an opportunity for a different expression through natural ventilation/partial enclosure, provided that railway requirements and impacts are considered. A focus on this aspect of the scheme should be made for the next meeting. TURNER tabled a small model of an undulating/creased façade which is worthy of further investigation, along with other strategies.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.8	The built form massing when viewed from north and south is developing well.	Noted
2.4.9	The proposed built form resolution at the northern end of the site was also discussed, and in particular the scale and massing relationships with the terrace houses to the north and Pemulwuy Phase 1 and 2. The SEARS envelopes presently integrate more convincingly with adjacent form and heights. This was acknowledged at the meeting and TURNER will review. In particular the stepped end to the western wing should be investigated to more align with Precinct 2 and to	IS 27/2/17

	improve the scale and typological transition to the terraces. A partial double-loaded layout was also discussed as a way of addressing this issue.	
2.4.10	Activation of Eveleigh St is important, and must be balanced with building access and service requirements. Provisions for a dedicated “drop-off” area were discussed, particularly as student residents are likely to have significant luggage	IS 27/2/17
2.4.11	The Panel supports allocation of the cluster unit living spaces at the ends of the wings, as this will create a distinctive image for the development in the evenings.	Noted
2.4.12	<p>A key matter discussed was the provision of a hierarchy of communal spaces within the development. It was acknowledged that most students will benefit from a strong social structure and the ability to form associations with other students within the development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A range of “whole of building” communal spaces and food outlets at the ground and lower levels opening/viewing over the courtyard and “Meeting Place” ○ A common area on each floor near the lift lobby, furnished with a small kitchen and comfortable seating. ○ Small “pop-out” niches or bay elements in the communal corridors for seating and informal meetings 	IS 27/2/17
2.4.13	Various options were discussed for locating these spaces. For the typical floor communal areas it was agreed that the space should be positioned at the south end of the courtyard, as this is close to the lifts and will assist in resolving proximity issues with individual living units in this part of the floor plan. One option was to swap two end living units to the east façade, to allow the communal area to occupy the end of the courtyard with excellent access to view, light and ventilation.	Noted
2.4.14	Design of all communal spaces is a key requirement for the success of the development and the Panel request that further design development of these areas is undertaken.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.15	The capacity to open typical floor common corridors for natural light and ventilation was discussed. Reference was made to the Breathe Architects rail edge development on Melbourne.	Noted
2.4.16	Resolve lifting requirement – two or three lift cars?	IS 27/2/17

2.4.17	Whilst the various intermediate roof levels are not accessible for residents, they should be treated as green spaces (sedum roofs or similar) to reduce urban heat island affect. There is also opportunity for these areas to be used for solar arrays.	Noted
2.4.18	The use and character of the “Meeting Place” was discussed. This is a key interface for the development, and an exciting opportunity to create an inclusive, genuine public space. The overhang of the building creates a dramatic and monumental scale to the space, and care must be taken to avoid it feeling dominating or over-bearing.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.19	The Meeting Place” should be conceived as it is named: it is not a transitory forecourt to a commercial building, but rather a place where many people will choose to pause and spend time together. As such it needs appropriate urban furnishing, substantial landscape, safety, protection from wind, sun and rain, and the supporting edge uses that will create the amenity of a true “local square”.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.20	Consider provision of soundproof music room or rooms.	Noted
2.4.21	Prior to next DRP meeting seek expert indigenous advice on how to integrate cultural design into the architecture, landscape and urban design spaces. A number of consultants were previously nominated who could help with this.	IS 27/2/17
2.4.22	SEARS requires that the proponent provide evidence of engagement with relevant Aboriginal stakeholders regarding cultural design elements, public art, place and building name. A suggestion by the DRP was made that the architect and proponent present the developed scheme to the next City of Sydney ATSI Advisory Panel meeting 1/3/2017. To request a presentation email Ann Hoban , Director City Life, ahoban@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au . There is a sense that the ATSI Advisory Panel will be interested in the social implications of the project.	Noted

Distribution: All Present