

## Meeting Minutes - Peer Review Process: Architecture Design Review Panel

### Rozelle Village

Redevelopment of Balmain Leagues Club - Victoria Road, Waterloo Street and Darling Street, Rozelle  
V2: 051211

---

<b>Date:</b>	28 November 2011
<b>Meeting No:</b>	Meeting 3: Design Development Presentation
<b>Location:</b>	Rozelle Village Information Centre, Rozelle
<b>Time:</b>	4.10pm
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Panel Members</b> Ken Maher (KM) – Chairman, Hassell Alec Tzannes (AT) – Director, Tzannes Associates (arrived 4.15pm) Helen Lochhead (HL) - NSW Deputy Government Architect (arrived 4.45pm) Tony Caro (TC) – Director, Tony Caro Architecture <b>Property Developers</b> Ian Wright (IW) - Rozelle Village Pty Ltd Alex Yasumoto (AY) - Rozelle Village Pty Ltd <b>Architects</b> Frank Stanisic (FS) - Stanisic Associates Jason Nowosad (JN) - Stanisic Associates (scribe)
<b>Apologies:</b>	
<b>Attachments</b>	Design Development Presentation

---

A power point presentation was given by FS and A4 record copy provided to the panelists.

## MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes from Meeting 2: Design Development Presentation were accepted.

### 4.0 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

This section references the Design Development Presentation prepared by Stanisic Associates attached at **Attachment A**. Each sub-heading references a corresponding section of the agenda and presentation.

#### 4.1 Rationale

- FS referred panelists to the Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report (PEAR) included as part of the briefing material and noted that it included a Development Capacity Report prepared by Inspire with input from Leyshon Consulting. FS referred to the Section 5.2 – Opportunities for Balmain Leagues Club Site and Section 6.0 – Conclusion.
- TC commented that the panel has talked enough about the development capacity for the site. KM added that the Panel will comment on the design and will not comment on density.
- TC commented that density will be part of the consideration when the project is submitted for EA.

#### 4.2 Envelope studies

- FS tabled seven envelope options, highlighting that the study looked at how to distribute 55,000sqm (6.7:1) on the site. FS added that in all options, the pedestrian interface to streets was consistent.
- FS commented that there is approximately 8,000sqm (2 storeys) of non-residential uses below the Darling Street level (RL 39.57), and that added that heights in all options are from the Darling Street level, i.e. approx RL 40.00.
- FS commented that the proposed development when compared to the previous DA refused by the JRPP, primarily increases the amount of non-residential on the site, with a small increase in residential area.
- KM questioned whether the envelope study has altered the way the forms on the site had been previously viewed. FS commented that there has been a slight shift where there may be potential for two high-rise forms (taller and lower) on the site, rather than a single high-rise form. IW added that this peer review process has revealed other potential options for the site.

- KM, TC + HL suggested that low rise is 4 storeys, mid-rise is 8 storeys and high rise is 9 storeys and above – contrary to that shown on the envelope studies.
- FS commented that in all option there is approximately 8,000sqm of non-residential uses in the basement.
- FS tabled option A:
  - FS commented that this option accompanied the PEAR and that there is no adjustment of the podium to the streets.
- FS tabled option B:
  - FS commented that this option is a refinement of a previously shown proposal, but with a stepping building along Victoria Road, rather than had a flat top.
  - HL questioned the footprint area of the high-rise building in this option. FS confirmed that the footprint is approximately 1,000sqm GFA, but stressed that the form shown in a block form and not a building.
  - HL questioned how a footprint in excess of 800sqm could deal with bulk and scale. FS commented that this footprint is approximately the same footprint as Horizon Apartments – 184 Forbes Street, Darlinghurst. FS added that although the proposed footprint in the same, the type is a split block form, not a central core block form. FS commented that the split block form is one way of dealing with bulk and scale.
- FS tabled option C:
  - FS commented that this option is a variation to option B, but with a 9 storey block edge building along Victoria Road for residential.
  - HL questioned the length of the building along Victoria Road. FS confirmed that this building is approx 90m long. KM added that this form could be two buildings that step down Victoria Road.
  - FS commented that the first four storeys would be non-residential uses, including one full story for the Balmain Leagues Club.
  - HL commented that the form along Victoria Road could break above the four storeys so that the form could be scaled to the street.
  - FS commented that it is proposed that there are loggias or ‘winter gardens’ for residential apartments, not balconies. HL questioned whether loggias would increase the bulk of the building. FS commented that through the use of glazing, you can articulate the form to reduce bulk and get variation in the facade such as Lumiere, 101 Bathurst Street, Sydney. FS added that double glazed units (DGUs) produce better environmental outcomes (acoustic/thermal) and have recently decreased in price and are now affordable.
- FS tabled option D:
  - FS commented that this option moves the high-rise form to Victoria Road, decreasing the height of this building and increasing height of mid-rise forms along Waterloo Street.
  - HL questioned whether the primary residential entry could be from the laneway adjacent to Darling Street. FS commented that the existing laneway is in fact an easement of adjoining properties is not part of the development site.
  - TC commented that a criticism of this option is that there is increased bulk and scale along Waterloo Street. HL disagreed, commenting that the mid-rise form is setback from Waterloo Street and the low-rise form along the street is an appropriate scale.
  - TC commented that the high-rise form on Waterloo Street is better with mid-rise form along Victoria Road.
  - HL requested that additional views are shown from street level.
  - KM commented that the the high-rise form is not as dominant as the high-rise form in option B as the footprint is smaller.
  - AT commented that in Sydney, there are a number of larger buildings located adjacent to larger infrastructure i.e. Macquarie Street, Pacific Highway, St Leonards, Parramatta Road, South Dowling Street – but that they were not really good models.
- FS tabled option E:
  - FS commented that this option was based upon the site specific DCP for the site but with increased floor space. FS added that this option maximises solar access to Waterloo Street with two high-rise forms, the taller form adjacent to Darling Street.
  - KM commented that the central space between the two forms will receive solar access from the east and west, in the morning and afternoon.
  - TC questioned the depth of the forms. FS commented that the forms were approximately 14m deep and each with a footprint of approximately 400sqm.
  - KM commented that a building type in this form could be a gallery type. TC added that the building type could also be a central core.
  - TC commented that this option is much more slender than other options and has a better interface with Victoria Road. TC added that the lower form could be turned 90 degrees, parallel to Victoria Road. HL agreed that it would be better to pursue two different forms, not a high-rise form and a mini-me.
  - HL commented that she was more comfortable with a single high rise form, but found this option with two high rise forms compelling due to their smaller footprints and slender appearance.
- FS tables option F:
  - The panel did not see any potential in this option.

- FS tabled option G:
  - KM commented that the residential address did not need to be from Waterloo Street.
  - TC commented that the entry forecourt was interesting and that the residential address in this option is from Waterloo Street and Victoria Road.
- AT questioned what principles underpinned the envelope studies. AT added that a principle could be to locate the taller building along Victoria Road adjacent to infrastructure i.e Victoria Road.
- FS commented that a key criteria to assess the merit of each envelope, is the residential address and was concerned that Victoria Road would not be an appropriate address due to traffic noise.
- AT questioned whether a view analysis had been prepared and what the price point people are prepared to pay for an apartment in this development. FS confirmed that a view analysis has been prepared in addition to receiving property advice. FS confirmed that the advice that has been received is that view, is a key criteria in determining the price point for the apartments. FS added that at approximately level 9, you can see the icons of the city and possible Sydney Heads, at higher levels.
- TC commented that Horizon Apartments is not resolved at the street and questioned whether there is more flexibility if the high-rise form responds to solar access, views and minimising overshadowing and wind impacts, with the low-rise form resolving the interface with the street. AT agreed and added that the high-rise form needs to consider criteria such as views and solar analysis.
- HL + AT commented that the high-rise form may appear more slender and less bulky if some form is removed from the base of the high-rise form where the financial return is less and then relocated on top of the form.
- KM questioned whether there could be an option where there is a mid-rise form running east/west and a high-rise form running north/south.
- AT observed that the lowest solar impacts coincide with the best views from the site.
- AT commented that he is comfortable with a taller building that no longer deals with the geometry of the street, that maximises return to the developer and minimises overshadowing to surrounding residential properties and the public domain.
- AT suggested the following principle: the high-rise form belong to the city and the low-rise forms belong to the community
- AT commented that at a city wide scale, a high-rise form would mark a point along Victoria Road.
- KM commented that a dominant high-rise form should be located on the north-south axis. KM added that if you take option E, the high-rise form should be rotated to be north-south and the mid-rise form should be rotated to face Victoria Road.
- All panelists agreed with the following key principles should be adopted for the development:
  - low-rise forms along Waterloo Street, and slightly higher low-rise form to Victoria Road that steps with the topography
  - high-rise (lower) form could be a transition between low and high-rise forms
  - high-rise forms do not need to respond to the street, should maximise views from the site and minimise overshadowing to surrounding properties.
- AT commented that none of the options presented address the key principles above.
- FS tabled the public/private benefit matrix:
  - KM commented that SEPP 65 compliance is public benefit as better designed buildings are a better outcome for the community. AT agreed that many of the private benefits are also public benefits. TC agreed that a well-designed building is a public benefit.
  - AT questioned whether the 'private benefit' criteria is better considered as 'financial benefit' criteria. AT added that the location of the loading dock can be considered a public benefit.
  - AT commented that the the method for assessing the envelope options is ok but the results show that the criteria used need to be enriched to better differentiate between the options.
  - AT recommended that the criteria used to assessing the envelopes is enriched to take on board the principles discussed and also include architecture at a metropolitan scale, bulk and scale and character.
- KM suggested that the envelopes are narrowed down to two or three options and these options are analysed in more detail.
- AT commented that there is a gap between the high level environmental and social impacts with the actual physical impacts. AT added that the analysis could fill this gap and demonstrate how the proposed form deals with this physical impact.

#### **4.3 Pedestrian environment**

- FS commented that further to the Panel's recommendations, the pedestrian way adjacent to Darling Street and the arcade connecting this way to Darling Street would be publically accessible 24/7, and other pathways would be gated at some time during the night.

#### **4.4 High rise studies**

- FS commented that the Obstacle Height Limitation (OHL) has not been confirmed at this point and that Ambidgi, aeronautical assessment consultant, has been in discussions with Air Services Australia to confirm the maximum height of the building.

- AT commented that further consideration needs to be given regarding how to appropriately communicate the concepts for the high-rise form. AT added that he is looking for an argument in the drawing that shows how the high-rise form fits into the city scale. AT commented that it is not convincing to show a high-rise form within a sea of suburban sprawl.
- AT commented that he is not convinced about having two high-rise forms adjacent to Waterloo Street. AT added in the metropolitan context, the higher forms should be located closer to Victoria Road.

#### **4.5 Low / medium rise studies**

- FS tabled the low/mid-rise studies for Waterloo Street:
  - FS described how the form is broken into a number of smaller forms of two storeys in height and step down Waterloo Street. FS added that there was SOHO addressing the street, gym and child care centre above with a recreation space on the top.
  - AT agreed that there should be a strategy for Waterloo Street and another strategy for Victoria Road. AT added that the broken forms provided punctuation and legibility to the street.
  - HL commented that the stair mid-way down Waterloo Street is good as it provides punctuation. HL added that the scale of the entry was too dominant in the streetscape.
  - KM recommended that further consideration is given to providing a direct address to SOHO from Waterloo Street.
  - AT commented that the solar, wind, scale and bulk is critical when assessing the interface with the street, not the style.
  - TC commented that the interface visualisations shown are more sophisticated and show a better character than the envelope options.
- FS tabled the low/mid-rise studies for Victoria Road:
  - FS described how the form steps from 5 storeys to 4 storeys with the topography.
  - FS tabled option B that included cinemas with a 2 storey form setback from Victoria Road. IW added that based upon the Panel's previous comments it was decided not to pursue cinemas on top of the podium. FS added that the cinema option starts to erode the stepped form along Victoria Road.
- IW questioned whether the low rise component is acceptable. AT commented that it is getting closer.
- FS questioned whether the interfaces to Waterloo Street and Victoria Road are acceptable. KM commented that the interfaces are acceptable.
- KM commented that 9 storeys along Victoria Road is problematic, but if setback from the street, the form above the low-rise can provide a transition in scale between the low rise of the surrounding neighbourhood and the high-rise form. HL commented that a 9 storey form setback from the street could be a linking scale to the tower.
- HL commented that the cinemas could be kept if they are setback from the street.

#### **4.6 Amenity analysis**

- FS commented that the north point on the previous shadow diagrams was incorrect but the shadow diagrams were correct. TC noted the clarification.

#### **4.8 Issues summary**

The Panel requested that the following key issues be addressed for the next meeting.

1. Further consideration be given to two or three envelope options that adopt the following key principles:
  - the low-rise forms belong to the community and should provide an appropriate interface with the street and respond to the geometry of the streets.
  - high-rise (lower) form could be a transition between low and high rise forms
  - the high-rise forms belong to the city and should maximise solar access and views from apartments and minimise overshadowing to surrounding residential properties and the public domain.
2. Further enrichment of the criteria used to assess the envelope options.
3. Preferred building form option, with some street level visualisations

**End of meeting: 6.05pm**

**Next meeting: Monday, 12 December 2011, 1.00 – 3.00pm**