

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: 191211

Date:	12 December 2011
Meeting No:	Meeting 4: Design Development Presentation
Location:	Rozelle Village Information Centre, Rozelle
Time:	1.00pm
Attendees:	Panel Members Ken Maher (KM) – Chairman, Hassell Alec Tzannes (AT) – Director, Tzannes Associates Helen Lochhead (HL) - NSW Deputy Government Architect Tony Caro (TC) – Director, Tony Caro Architecture Property Developers Ian Wright (IW) - Rozelle Village Pty Ltd Alex Yasumoto (AY) - Rozelle Village Pty Ltd Architects Frank Stanisic (FS) - Stanisic Associates Jason Nowosad (JN) - Stanisic Associates (scribe)
Apologies:	None
Attachments	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 3: Design Development Presentation were accepted.

5.0 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

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

5.1 Selected envelope options

- FS tabled three selected envelope options that distributed 55,000sqm (6.7:1) on the site, 30,000sqm residential and 25,000sqm non-residential uses.
- FS commented that an aeronautical engineer (Ambidji Group) have been advising on the Obstacle Height Limitation for the site, who have advised that the maximum height for the site, subject to confirmation, is AHD 145.00 (26 storeys above the platform / 30 storeys overall height).
- HL questioned what the maximum building height was for envelope options presented in previous weeks. FS commented that the maximum building height in previous weeks was AHD 175.00.
- FS confirmed that all options presented today have a maximum building height of AHD 145.00.
- FS reminded the panel of the key principles that underpin each option:
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - high-rise (lower) form could be a transition between low and high rise forms.
- IW commented that this PRP has been a process of discovery, identifying other building form options for the site.
- FS commented that all options include a high-rise form (24 storeys residential above platform) and a smaller transitional high-rise form (12 storeys residential above platform).
- FS tabled option J:
 - FS commented that this option includes a taller high-rise form (24 storeys above platform) parallel to Waterloo Street and a smaller transitional high-rise form (12 storeys above platform) adjacent to Victoria Road. FS added that the transitional high-rise form is the area that was removed from the single tower option – approximately 6,000sqm.
 - TC questioned whether the transitional building form needed to be setback from the northern boundary of the site. KM + FS commented that this would increase overshadowing to properties along Waterloo Street.

- AT commented that as the taller high-rise form is more parallel with Waterloo Street, more properties to the south of Darling Street are overshadowed.
- TC commented that option J is more slender when viewed from the street. HL agreed with TC that option J has less visual impact than option L from the vantage points shown but suggested the visual impact of the high-rise forms may be different from other vantage points. AT commented that the way people view buildings is more complex than from a vantage point and that what you perceive is not just what you see, but what is in your mind. AT commented that whether there are 2 or 3 forms there are big impacts and that he is more comfortable with the option with the lesser impact.
- FS tabled option K:
 - FS commented that this option includes a taller high-rise form (24 storeys above platform) that aligns with Waterloo Street and also with the city and a smaller transitional high-rise form (12 storeys above platform). FS added that this option has a large central void space.
 - HL commented that in terms of the key principles, this option is the most logical as a built form as the high-rise forms respond to the street, site and views, but result in a bulky form.
 - AT + KM commented that they were not convinced by opening up the taller high-rise form.
 - FS commented that there is an increased cost in this option due to additional infrastructure height required including additional stairs and more effective facade. AT commented that he didn't appreciate the increased cost and that this option would be better suited to a split core.
- FS tabled option L:
 - FS commented that this option includes a taller high-rise form (24 storeys above platform) that orientates east-west to minimise overshadowing to surrounding residential properties and a smaller transitional high-rise form (12 storeys above platform). FS commented that the taller high-rise form needed to be modified and rotated towards the west so that solar access can be achieved to units facing the city and so that units to the north of the form adjacent to Waterloo Street can see past the smaller high-rise form and achieve reasonable building separation.
 - KM questioned which option impacts the least number of properties by overshadowing. AT commented that option L is slightly better.
 - TC questioned why option L is preferred over option J. KM + AT commented that option L maximise views from the site and minimises overshadowing to surrounding residential properties. AT added that this option supports the principle that the high-rise form is disconnected from the podium and the street.
 - TC commented that the visualisations from the street show that option L presents a broad face of the taller high-rise form to Victoria Road and Waterloo Street.
 - TC questioned whether the taller high-rise form needed to be reconsidered and made more compact with a central core. FS commented that a primary concern has always been to ensure that the mass on the skyline is minimised. FS added that by breaking the taller high-rise form in two reduces the mass on the skyline. FS added further that this strategy also introduces fresh air into the building and reduces the reliance on air conditioning.
 - All panelists agreed that option L is considered the best of the options for the site and it is worth exploring variations to this option to address the slight awkwardness of the smaller high-rise form.

5.2 Final envelope option

- IW highlighted that the final envelope option (preferred option) is option L.
- FS commented that the taller high-rise form has been orientated to the city. FS added that although the city is 3km away, the taller high-rise form disengages with the street and engages with the city, supporting the principle that the high-rise form belongs to the city.
- AT questioned where the location of the entry to the transitional tower will be. FS commented that the lifts would connect the residential units with the basement carpark but the pedestrian entry would be from the main lobby along a bridge connection from the taller high-rise form at Waterloo Street. FS added that the bridge connection would be one storey above the recreation level.
- AT commented that there should be a residential lobby along Victoria Road to provide direct access to the smaller high-rise form.
- HL commented that the single high-rise form and low-rise platform had clarity, which is lost with a high-rise form and transitional building.
- AT commented that the three forms on the site may be an aberration but they are interesting if they are considered to be in some kind of conversation. AT added that it is critical that the architectural detail minimises the bulk of the three forms when read together.
- KM commented that the scale and form of the low rise platform and smaller high-rise form should have more in common with the local context. KM added that the smaller high-rise form has an awkward presence.
- KM questioned how absolute is the height constraint of AHD 145.00. IW commented that the site is directly below the flight path. FS commented that the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) is not an issue as planes are still quite high above the site. FS added that it is understood that radar is a critical constraint which determines the obstacle height limitation.
- TC questioned whether the lift core should be moved into the portion of the high-rise form that faces the city. FS commented that the intention is that there is no infrastructure in this form and that there are pragmatic reasons for keeping the lift core in the portion of the form adjacent to Waterloo Street e.g. maximising the supermarket clear floor plate, entry and egress to the street.
- KM commented that it may be worth exploring whether the footprint of the smaller high-rise form is increased whether the height of this form could be reduced in a "boot-type arrangement". KM added that this would

strengthen the address and identity of the smaller high-rise form and create a strong and clear spatial connection. AT added that the “boot” or connecting element did not need to be restricted to the base of the high-rise forms. AT commented that a connecting element could also be higher.

- AT commented that consideration needs to be given to where people will access and egress the site. AT added that Victoria Road will change over time. KM agreed and added that it would be convenient to enter the site from Victoria Road. AT added further that putting people on Victoria Road will make it less hostile.
- TC questioned whether the smaller high-rise form should be reduced in height by lowered and the height of the platform increased in height. AT commented that it does not help to reduce the height of the smaller high-rise form by a few storeys.
- AT questioned what established the height of the platform. FS commented that the platform can’t support any more capacity. AT added that there does not appear to be any reason why the height of the platform should be increased in height.
- AT commented that the smaller high-rise building should be strengthened by increasing its height. AT added that in order to maintain the same floor space, the portion of the taller high-rise form adjacent to Waterloo Street is reduced in height which would reduce the overshadowing to properties south of Darling Street. AT added further that this option might present an interesting sculptural inter-relationship between the ensemble of high-rise forms where the 3 forms are read together rather than 2 dominant forms and one less dominant form. AT commented that more bulk and height to adjacent to Victoria Road is offset by reduced amenity impacts to surrounding properties.
- HL agreed that it is a better outcome to move away from a “me” and “mini-me” ensemble of forms.
- TC commented that the higher form should be facing the city and the lift core should be integrated into the form.
- FS added that a lower high-rise building results in a reduced lift overrun and the lift overrun would be integrated into the building form.

5.3 Key criteria

- FS commented that the key criteria used to assess the final envelope option will be: overshadowing, SEPP 65 (sun, ventilation and daylight), visual connection to the city from the site, streets interface and height. FS added that height is now a key constraint for the site.
- FS commented that the desired view from the site is to the city skyline which is approximately parallel with Kent Street, Sydney.
- FS tabled a view analysis drawing, showing that the axis of the desired view is with Observatory Hill. AT requested a copy of the view analysis drawing. FS confirmed that he will issue a copy of this drawing to the panel.
- FS commented that the view and SEPP 65 solar access requirement do not exactly coincide in order for 3 hours of solar access to be achieved to units facing the city in option L. FS added that in order to achieve 3 hours of sunlight, the high-rise form adjacent to Victoria Road would need to rotate more to the north west. HL added that the view from the site to the city must be balanced against amenity.
- FS questioned whether the solar access requirement for the site should be 2 hours or 3 hours and whether the site is considered a dense urban environment. AT commented that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure have published a discussion paper proposing amendments to SEPP 65/ RFDC and suggested that FS reads and understands the implications that this may have on the solar access requirement for this site. AT added that this discussion paper distinguished between density and that there may be more stringent controls for this site, given that it is not in a dense urban environment.
- FS questioned whether the hours could be extended from 8am to 4pm in min-winter. AT referred FS to the DoPI discussion paper on SEPP 65/ RFDC
- HL commented that the site is unconstrained and that SEPP 65/ RFDC compliance is expected.
- FS commented that an amended option L, where the taller high rise form is rotated towards the west will result in 0% south facing units, 70% solar access to units and 60% cross ventilation – satisfying minimum SEPP 65 requirements.
- AT questioned whether there is a point on Darling Street in Balmain where you can see the final envelope option added that it could be argued that by seeing the high-rise form, you may diminish the village character. FS commented that previous view studies to the site, indicated that you could see the building approximately 0.5km away along Darling Street. FS added that location at Balmain Village (Beattie and Darling) will be studied and confirmed in the Environmental Assessment Report. FS commented that from this location, it would be expected that you can’t see the final envelope option high-rise forms.
- AT questioned whether the bio-filtration strategy or “fresh air approach” is incompatible with this site given that it is underneath an aircraft pathway. FS referred AT to studies undertaken by Cundall, provided to the panel in previous presentations. FS added that outside air comes into the lobby space and with some mechanical assistance, is infiltrated into units through a plenum space above the lobby. FS added further that Cundall have gone some way into developing this strategy and that the preliminary advice is that the temperature within the units is capable of being reduced by 8 degrees in summer without the need for air-conditioning.
- TC questioned how the bio-filtration system deals with acoustic attenuation. FS commented that attenuation takes place within the ceiling of the lobby space and not within the unit.
- FS commented that it is likely that the bio-filtration system is possible due to the yield of unit on this site and that it is expected that for 80% of the time evaporative cooling is possible, reducing the energy consumption of the building.
- TC commented that option L will present a broad face when viewed from the harbor bridge. KM commented that by reducing the height of the smaller high-rise form, the bulkiness of the building when viewed from the harbour

bridge would be reduced. HL commented that there is a lot of visual clutter between the harbour and the site. AT commented that there should be a strong articulated form so that you don't see a wall from this vantage point.

- AT commented that there is an obligation to explore a sculptural form so that the three high-rise forms are part of an ensemble due to the fact that it will be a building with a high visual impact. AT added that if the buildings are not sculptural it may end up looking like one of the high-rise forms in Redfern.
- IW thanked the panel for their advice and attendance. IW added that this process has led to an evidence based approach which required that numerous options were explored for the site, ultimately leading to a better design outcome.
- HL questioned whether any options explored a level change between the high-rise forms. FS commented that given that the high-rise forms, compared to previous option, have been reduced in height, it is not cost effective to have a great difference in height between high-rise forms, but a two storey difference may be investigated.
- TC commented that if all options achieve minimum SEPP 65 compliance (sun, ventilation + daylight) then the focus should be on overshadowing.
- FS tabled overshadowing diagrams at mid-winter for the three selected envelope options.
- KM questioned whether there is a difference between overshadowing in each option. FS commented that the leading edge of the envelope to the north is same in each option, where the shadow of the smaller transitional high-rise form falls on the taller high-rise form at 12pm in mid-winter.
- FS commented that the shadow of the single high-rise form option (38 storeys) presented in previous meetings fell on Callan Park in mid-winter. FS added that the reduced height of the high-rise form (options J, K + L) does not reach Callan Park in mid-winter. HL added that there may be a child care centre in Callan Park that could be affected.
- TC commented that the focus of the overshadowing analysis has been on properties in Waterloo Street and suggested that the focus should be on the number of properties affected rather than focusing on a single property in Waterloo Street.
- FS highlighted that the overshadowing analysis has revealed that in all options presented, all surrounding residential properties receive a minimum of 3 hours of solar access.
- FS commented that the overshadowing criteria for Leichhardt is extreme, for a low density context, does not anticipate high or medium-rise forms and is an unreasonable standard in this case. FS added that by comparing overshadowing criteria from other local government areas i.e. Kogarah and Marrickville, it appears that a reasonable criteria is that 50% private open space from a living area should receive a minimum of 3 hours solar access in mid-winter. KM agreed that a reasonable overshadowing criteria needs to be established.

5.4 Panel reporting

KM and HL left at 2.45pm

- FS referred panelists to the Terms of Reference and requested a report from the panel on the preferred option – option L - within 7 days following this meeting. FS added that this report will be incorporated into the Environmental Assessment Report that will be submitted to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.
- FS suggested that the report could be up to 6 pages.
- FS commented that the terms of reference may allow the DP+I to invite the panel to comment on the EA,
- AT commented that at this stage there are no plans, sections, SEPP 65 analysis and that the panel is commenting only on the concept and envelope proposition. AT added that the panel would be compelled to comment on the EA.
- AT added further that the panel will focus on the concept and principles but not the outcome.
- IW agreed and added that the DP+I is seeking a high-level commentary so that the design team can take these comments on board when developing the proposition.
- TC commented that the panel will comment that the starting point is 6.7:1 density.
- FS commented that the panel will be provided with a digital copy of the EA.

End of meeting: 3.00pm