

5 April 2022

DESIGN INTEGRITY PANEL BRIEFING AND COMMENTS

Briefing

On Wednesday 23 March 2022 Gurner and its consultants briefed the Design Integrity Panel in relation to the design changes arising between the PTW winning mixed use BTS tower and the proposed mixed use BTR tower.

Noting that the application for a BTR will become State Significant Development, two jurors of the original Design Excellence Competition Jury (run via City of Parramatta) met to review the proposal, arranged via the Government Architect NSW Office.

Design Inte:

- Rory Toomey (GANSW)
- Kim Crestani (City of Parramatta)

Presenters:

- Gurner
- PTW
- Think Planners

Outcome

The Design Integrity Panel were supportive of the proposal and have requested additional information to be prepared prior to confirming that design integrity is retained and that the project can move to SSD lodgement. The comments and queries from the Panel were confirmed on 4 April 2022 and include:

Communal spaces:

- Given there is a significant increase in the number of apartments is the delivery of communal amenity commensurate with the increase in residents? What is the ratio of area when comparing the design excellence winning scheme to the revised BTR scheme?

Lobby and ground plane:

- Provide additional information that compares the changes to the design excellence scheme lobby spaces to the revised BTR scheme.
- Proposed substation – where was it within the design competition scheme and details of the new location?

Podium

- Summarise the key changes to the podium. What are these changes and how has design excellence been retained?
- The podium design seems to comprise a higher level of glazing, please clarify and explain design implications.

Glass linking bridge

- Provide additional explanation of why this has been introduced.
- Has this retained the essence and design quality of the design competition winning scheme which was awarded on the openness, volume and high quality public domain response? Does this result in design benefits or improvements?

Northern site setback

- Provide details of what the DCP setback is, what was accepted at the competition winning scheme, and what is proposed under the revised BTR scheme.
- Provide an interface diagram which explains the buildings to the north and if there are any resultant impacts coming from the reduced setback.
- Northern façade balconies – are there privacy issues resulting from the placement of balconies proposed in the revised BTR scheme?
- Provide details of the materiality of the balconies (previously were inset and now glazed) and how wind mitigation is being incorporated within the scheme.

Apartment mix

- Comparison table of the DCP apartment mix compared to the design excellence scheme compared to the revised BTR scheme.

Social impacts

- The design excellence was award on the basis of a different typology of dwellings with the competition scheme was based on a residential flat building. This has now changed to BTR and there is a differing social dimension/ public outcomes stemming from the proposal.
- Details of the contribution to the city and intensity of the development to be further explained.

Planning compliance

- Provide a comparison table of key measures and figures such as apartment numbers, open space areas, mix, setbacks, etc.

During our discussion with Rory and Kim on 4 April 2022 both Jurors emphasised that their preference is to have the pack returned to them as an annotated Compare and Contrast document. For example, a single opening would provide the ground floor plan of the winning scheme adjacent the proposed scheme, with annotations of the differences.

Once the Jury receives this revised pack, we anticipate that sign off will be prompt.

Regards



Adam Byrnes
Director
Think Planners Pty Ltd