



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

DATE: 27/02/2017

TIME/LOCATION: 3.00-5.00PM, Department of Planning & Environment – L30 (Dainun Room), 320 Pitt St, Sydney

APOLOGIES: Dillon Kombumerri (Olivia Hyde proxy panel member)

MINUTES BY: **Notes:** Diana Snape (OGA) **Final Report:** Olivia Hyde

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"/>
Olivia Hyde	OH	Office of the Government Architect	Olivia.hyde@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 info@ahc.org.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Greg Colbran	GC	Deicorp	8665-4100	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

			gcolbran@deicorp.com.au	
Nick Turner	NT	Turner - Director	8668-0000 nturner@turnerstudio.com.au	☒
Dan Szwaj	DS	Turner – Design Team	8668-0000 dszwaj@turnerstudio.com.au	☒
Ingrid Shi	IS	Turner – Project Architect	8668 0000 ishi@turnerstudio.com.au	☒

MINUTES

ITEM	Action/Outcome	Date
3.1 Welcome		
3.1.1	Noted that Kim Crestani is on the panel as independent architect, not representative of City of Sydney. Noted that Olivia Hyde was panel member as proxy for Dillon Kombumerri.	
3.1.2	NOTE: the panel are not an approval body for this or any other proposal. It is also noted that no member of this panel or the Office of the Government Architect were consulted in the development or analysis of the SEARs reference scheme for this site. Consequently, it should be understood that any support given by the panel for design direction that includes departure from SEARs should not be taken to be indicative of likely approval.	
3.2 Previous business arising		
1.7.10	<i>Presentation to City of Sydney ATSI Advisory Panel 1/3/2017 to be further considered</i> – note that points 1.7.10 and 2.4.22 are struck from previous minutes as these issues were not discussed with the proponent team. The panel note however that the issue of integrated public art is an important one for this project. (amended minutes will be distributed)	
2.4.3	Note that point 2.4.3 is amended to reflect that the Turner concept exceeds the SEARs reference scheme by 2 floors (amended minutes will be distributed).	
3.3 Design Presentation		

3.3.1	Design development of project since DRP2 presented to DRP.	
3.4 Panel Discussion/Recommendations		
3.4.1	The panel notes that the site organisation of the current scheme provides significantly improved amenity in relation to ground level entry and shared spaces as a result of revised set-backs. The panel strongly supports the overall response to the communal and residential amenity requirements of the building.	
3.4.2	Overall, the panel supports the revised response to the scale of Precinct 1 and 2 buildings and to the intent of the SEARs - in particular to the scale of Eveleigh Street. This was a marked improvement from the previous DRP meeting #2 and the transitions in scale have improved in relationship to the context.	
3.4.3	Height of the SEARS reference scheme was confirmed at 16 storeys maximum. The current scheme proposes 19 stories at the highest level which extends approx. 50m along the site. This results in a more slender form when viewed from the north and south of the site, which the panel support. However, it also results in significantly increased visual bulk when viewed from the east and west. Additionally, the formal expression of the additional height is at odds with the intent of the stepped form of the SEARs reference scheme. Whilst the stepped (waterfall) effect is in the SEARS- the panel does not necessarily consider that this is the optimum nor only solution to the built form. The panel recommends further exploration of strategies to break up the perceived mass at the top of the east and west elevations. The panel notes that it will be incumbent on the proponent and design team to justify any departure from the stepped form of the SEARs reference scheme.	
3.4.4	Whilst acknowledging the yield ambition of the project and the challenges of the site, the scheme should aim for a yield that also ensures appropriate urban design outcomes are incorporated relative to the visual bulk.	
3.4.5	Whilst the Panel supports the single loaded plan layout and resulting benefits to residents by way of improved internal amenity, a consequence is increased visual bulk when the built form is viewed from the east or west. The panel therefore recommends that further work be undertaken to mitigate the visual bulk of the current scheme, and note this should be informed by further benchmarking and height testing relative to the wider precinct and Sydney metro-wide aspirations for increased density at transport nodes.	
3.4.6	The panel noted that the SEARs reference scheme envelopes could result in a diminished residential amenity that the revised scheme addresses successfully.	

3.4.7	However, the panel also notes that to assist in justification of departures from the SEARs envelope, comparative shadow diagrams for the current scheme should be presented at the next session.	
3.4.8	The panel reiterates its previous recommendation to accentuate the vertical expression of the building as part of a strategy to mitigate visual bulk and to better integrate its overall form into the context. This project is likely to be seen as a signal building within an important precinct and as such it will be critical that the architecture represents the opportunities of the concept and is appropriately bold in quality and ambition.	
3.4.9	The panel notes that an integrated public art strategy might usefully inform a 'heroic' architectural expression and may offer opportunities to address the imposing bulk of the east and west elevations.	
3.4.10	The panel suggests that the proposal would benefit from developing a stronger narrative around the site and its cultural history.	
3.4.11	Whilst the panel acknowledges the risks in challenging the SEARs envelope the proponent is encouraged to continue its ongoing consultation with the community and the City.	
3.4.12	Overall the panel offers qualified support the current design direction, acknowledging that the current scheme represents a significant deviation from the SEARs envelope. However, the panel strongly recommends that further work is required to mitigate the visual bulk of the east and west elevations – either through design or adjustments in yield and/or height. The panel also recommends that the benefits of the current scheme must be carefully analysed against the SEARs reference scheme in order to justify the proposed changes to height and form.	
3.4.13	Note that several points from DRP02 were not discussed but remain relevant: <i>2.4.18 & 2.4.19</i> <i>2.4.20</i> <i>2.4.21</i>	

Distribution: All Present