

## Design Review Panel No. 1 Advice

<b>Meeting Subject:</b>	600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern  Design Review Panel Meeting No. 1		
<b>Location:</b>	In person: Ethos Urban – 180 George Street, Sydney  Virtual: Teams		
<b>Date:</b>	21 November 2023	<b>Time:</b>	9:00am – 12:30pm

This letter summarises the Design Review Panel's (DRP) commentary on the material presented by Hayball and Aspect at the first DRP session held on 21 November 2023. The focus of the meeting was on the overall design concept, the public domain approach, and key matters associated with the social and affordable housing buildings in the 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern project.

The DRP session was held in person at Ethos Urban's office and was attended by the DRP, the design team of Hayball and Aspect, as well as the Proponent and the process manager. Representatives from the Department of Planning and Environment and Land and Housing Corporate were present virtually.

The DRP for 600-660 Elizabeth Street comprises five members as set out below.

Panel Member	Role/Position
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair)	Director Design Governance, GANSW
Emily Wombwell	Director, SJB
Graham Jahn AM LFRAIA	Director City Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney
Ingrid Mather FAILA	Director Landscape Architect, JMD Design
Liz Westgarth	Managing Director, Hassell

### Panel Feedback

The advice of the DRP is outlined in the table below. Overall, the DRP recommended that the approach to the entire site design be presented in the next DRP session, including presentation of the guiding principles and co-ordination with the community facility and market/key-worker housing building. The DRP felt this holistic approach was required to understand the intention of the scheme, and therefore provide more detailed comment or advice on the specific components which may have more technical elements (e.g. waste collection).


Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site-wide design principles are required to be presented for the Panel to understand the intended outcome and successfulness of the proposed design.</li> <li>Connecting with Country principles should be considered early given the project is at the 'creation of spaces' phase where influence can occur.</li> <li>The Panel recommended the tenure blind objective be brought forward as a social objective.</li> <li>Coordinated drawings are required across the entirety of the site to understand the project as a whole and comment on more detailed matters.</li> <li>Coordination of all buildings, the ground level, basement, and landscape design will allow for clarity on the proposed approach and resolution of matters presented (e.g. waste strategy, deep soil, communal space, public domain etc.).</li> </ul>

Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
Central communal Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel recommended the character of landscaped spaces be defined in the context of the broader site's proposition. The establishment of site-wide principles will influence urban character and the scale of the buildings on the site, therefore these principles should be clearly defined.</li> <li>• Solar analysis should be considered in the design and intended use of the communal open spaces on the site. For instance, the functional utility of the southern pocket park is to be clearly understood and reflected in the proposed design.</li> <li>• Based on the current material, the Panel questioned the provision of one long linear space within the centre of the site and how this would function. The intention of these spaces as a communal open area for residential or publicly accessible space needs to be defined and intentional design completed. The Panel's understood the central communal open spaces to be publicly accessible in perpetuity, potentially at conflict with their use as communal open space for residents.</li> <li>• Further clarity on the treatment and management of the communal spaces is required, in particular how a tenure blind approach can be achieved and how interaction occurs with the east-west through-site link.</li> <li>• The Panel noted there will be a requirement for private open space for the residential buildings and this requirement should be accommodated.</li> <li>• The project team is encouraged to understand whether the residents will feel more comfortable with tenure-specific communal open space. It was noted the Key Worker and Market Housing building includes private communal open space.</li> <li>• The Panel noted the Social Housing building did not include a roof garden and it was understood this was LAHC's preference. If separated communal space was to be provided, the rooftop of this building could include communal space.</li> </ul>
Waste and Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current waste strategy and collection point from Walker Street was not supported based on the information provided. The design team need to provide further review and consideration in the context of the overall loading and servicing strategy for the project, and in the context of the site-wide principles</li> <li>• The Panel was concerned with the co-location of the waste collection point and the building entry, and how this may be treated. Further consideration of how this solution could positively contribute to the streetscape and resolve adjacency issues is required.</li> <li>• Coordination with a waste consultant and Sydney City Council is required to establish the best waste strategy, particularly considering the different residential tenures and other uses proposed. The collection of various waste streams from the different uses should be understood and accommodated.</li> <li>• Further detailed analysis is recommended to establish the strategy for waste collection points for each building, aligning with the location of cores. For instance, the Panel acknowledged the need for the southern core of the Affordable Housing building to be amended to provide access to the basement.</li> <li>• The coordination and transport of waste across the site requires further analysis and resolution. For instance, the Panel did not support the movement of waste through the Social Housing building foyer.</li> <li>• A comprehensive servicing and loading strategy is recommended, identifying how each building will be serviced, including how activities such as moving-in/moving-out will occur.</li> </ul>
Deep Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The options analysis of the basement design and deep soil was acknowledged, and the Panel understood the desire for a condensed basement for reduced excavation and enhanced sustainability. However, the intention for the deep soil to deliver an accompanying resilient tree canopy was not demonstrated.</li> <li>• Further consideration of deep soil is recommended once the site-wide principles are established, and coordination occurs across the various buildings. This further analysis may include options of deep soil in the centre of the site.</li> </ul>
Through-site Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel were not able to provide detailed advice on the east-west through-site link given the need for coordinated plans across the entire site.</li> <li>• The Panel requested a ground floor plan showing all buildings and their interface to the through-site link.</li> <li>• The Panel noted the change in level across the site may deter some pedestrians but thought some people may still utilise the link to access the bus stop on Elizabeth Street.</li> </ul>

Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel highlighted the need for safety and security to be considered in the through-site link. A clear understanding of the intended use and design of the communal open spaces is required as these will significantly influence the suitability of the through-site link. In particular, the consideration of fenced outcomes of these spaces (whether proposed or anticipated in the future) and the potential impact on the through-site link.</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relationship between the ground floor and the adjoining footpath level on the street frontages is required to be resolved.</li> <li>Information is to be provided on the existing and proposed canopy cover on the site.</li> <li>Information is to be provided which clearly communicates the proposed design, such as coordinated drawings, sketches, montages, 3D model views, dynamic models, flythroughs etc.</li> </ul>

### Chair of Panel Endorsement

This letter summarising the DRP's commentary from the first DRP held on 21 November 2023 relating to 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern on the material presented by Hayball and Aspect has been reviewed by the DRP and has been endorsed by the Panel Chair.

Name	Signature
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair) - Director Design Governance, GANSW	
	29/11/2023

## Design Review Panel No. 2 Advice

<b>Meeting Subject:</b>	600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern		
	Design Review Panel Meeting No. 2		
<b>Location:</b>	In person: Ethos Urban – 180 George Street, Sydney		
	Virtual: Teams		
<b>Date:</b>	30 January 2024	<b>Time:</b>	9:30am – 12:30pm

This letter summarises the Design Review Panel's (DRP) commentary on the material presented by Hayball, Yerrabingin, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller at the second DRP session held on 30 January 2024. The focus of the meeting was on the overall design concept including the urban design and site layout, landscape and public domain of the proposed development at 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern (the site). The session also incorporated the S1 Community Facility Building, S2 Affordable Housing Building, S3 Social Housing Building and S4 mixed-use building.

The DRP session was held in person at Ethos Urban's office and was attended by the DRP, a representative from Hayball, Yerrabingin, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller as well as the Proponent and the Design Excellence Process manager. Representatives from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, NSW Land and Housing Corporation and members from each of the respective design teams were present virtually.

The DRP for 600-660 Elizabeth Street comprises five members as set out below.

Panel Member	Role/Position
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair)	Director Design Governance, GANSW
Emily Wombwell	Director, SJB
Graham Jahn AM LFRAIA	Director City Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney
Ingrid Mather FAILA	Director Landscape Architect, JMD Design
Liz Westgarth	Managing Director, Hassell

## Panel Feedback

The advice of the DRP is outlined in the table below. The DRP commended the design team on their generally co-ordinated documents and presentation; and acknowledged that the co-ordinated design vision for the site was coming together well subject to the waste and servicing redesign being addressed.


Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
Waste and Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to the meeting, the concept design's approach to waste was referred to the City of Sydney waste and traffic teams who found the location of the loading dock on Walker Street unacceptable for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large vehicles reversing over the pedestrian footpath present a safety risk, particularly since the loading dock is adjacent to the residential lobby entrance.</li> <li>The plans submitted show the waste truck protruding over the landscape strip, indicating it cannot fit wholly within the loading dock.</li> <li>The 3-point turn arrangement is considered to conflict with the existing parking on Walker Street and if there was a truck within the loading space, no other truck could undertake a 3-point turn.</li> <li>The mezzanine configuration is odd and should be avoided since it makes moving goods throughout the basement difficult.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Council's waste and traffic teams recommended that loading, deliveries and servicing be provided within the basement and that the collection be in accordance with the relevant standards.</li> <li>The Panel requested the design team explore alternative waste management options and these be discussed with technical staff at Council. This may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basement waste collection – noting that this would likely result in a reduction in yield for the S2 building. Options to redistribute the lost yield should be investigated, such as including some built form within the proposed Phillip Street pocket park.</li> <li>At-grade waste collection within the confines of the site – provided safety concerns and manoeuvring can be accommodated and a high-quality ground plane achieved. This option appears challenging.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Through-site Link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel acknowledged the design team's desire for fluctuating levels across the internal courtyard and respected the desire to minimise basement area and excavation. However, the proposed levels are likely to result in obscured sightlines that could cause CPTED issues. The Panel asked that the design team explore how intuitive wayfinding could be improved through the site, with a clear hierarchy of spaces. The Panel suggested the design team explore the widening of the space between S2 and S3, or moving S3 further south, which could have the added benefit of a more direct through-site link.</li> <li>Further information is required detailing the interface of the residences and the internal courtyards.</li> <li>The inclusion of the winding narrow pathways leading to the various building entries were believed to result in CPTED issues and need to be further resolved.</li> <li>The Panel questioned how desirable the through-site links will be if pedestrians have to traverse level changes across the site. It was noted that the fluctuation in level could be used to define communal spaces as opposed to the through-site links themselves.</li> <li>The imagery of vegetation inspiration used by Architecture AND does not seem to align with the deep soil allowance made by Aspect. The Panel recommends that the documentation aligns with a consistent vision for vegetation and that the minimum unobstructed deep soil areas be achieved.</li> </ul>
Urban Design & Site Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel acknowledge the building footprints and arrangements have remained unchanged since the first DRP and that the open space has been refined.</li> </ul>
Landscape and Public Domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel commends the development in the character of the landscaped spaces, but more work is required.</li> <li>It is understood the publicly accessible links will blend into the ground level communal spaces and that the delineation between the public open spaces and private open spaces will be defined through the use of materiality and level changes. The strategy and design of these spaces should be further developed.</li> <li>Access to communal areas is to be further explored noting that Buildings S3 and S4 will be reliant on the internal courtyard for communal open space. It is acknowledged that a rooftop communal space will be provided on Building S4.</li> </ul>

Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel acknowledged the natural presence of water on the site and recommended it be incorporated as an element into the design.</li> <li>• Clarity of the Elizabeth Street streetscape is yet to be presented to the Panel and should be explored as part of the next DRP, including a street tree management/ replacement strategy for the entire frontage.</li> <li>• Further clarity on the number of retaining walls identified along the Walker Street frontage and how they impact unobstructed deep soil and the retention of street trees . The need for the proposed number and extent of retaining walls, terraces and balconies was queried.</li> <li>• Safety should be further considered in the central communal spaces, particularly for children, general users and members of the public.</li> <li>• Level differences between hardstand pathways and surrounding deep soil/landscaped areas was not made clear, particularly through the use of precedent imagery. Further consideration should be given to the impact of multiple pathways on soil volumes, consider use of porous pavement and buildability.</li> <li>• The Panel noted the provision of narrow paths within the site was restricting open space areas between the buildings and could result in safety concerns. The selection of plants should be accounted for when considering views, sight lines and safety impacts.</li> <li>• The Panel have concerns with the proposed Phillip Street pocket park which is perceived to be an unsafe space, from the use of a windy footpath setback from the street footpath and the precedent image showing a lush landscape. It is recommended further consideration and design development is undertaken with respect to the pocket park, if it is to continue.</li> <li>• The Panel recommend the design team explore the inclusion of lighting in the next DRP.</li> <li>• The Panel invite the design team to start to consider issues such as the use of public and private open space by pets, opportunities for landscape treatments to extend into building design in areas such as foyers, and conversely how architectural elements extend into the landscape as part of developing the design.</li> </ul>
Connecting with Country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel raised the potential for custodianship to form an important part of the Connecting with Country approach. Bridge noted their commitment to allowing for spatial provision for Aboriginal households on the site and the potential for ongoing consultation to result in meaningful outcomes for residents. The Panel acknowledged the opportunity for ongoing custodianship to be fostered once residents are living at the site.</li> </ul>
Building S1 (PCYC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel generally commended the design approach and presentation for S1.</li> <li>• The Panel recommend the design and client team explore the potential desire for the PCYC venue to become a high performing centre that accommodates an alternative user base to what the PCYC currently accommodates. Accommodating the needs of alternative users may require consideration of different access arrangements to the site beyond typical PCYC operations.</li> <li>• It was acknowledged the eastern elevation of the PCYC building is the backdrop to the internal courtyard space and it was recommended Architecture AND explore opportunities for incorporating visual transparency while also balancing the amenity impacts on the neighbouring residences through materiality. Acoustics must be managed.</li> <li>• Internal unprogrammed spaces need to be planned in a way where different social and age groups can co-exist without interference, through interior treatments or furniture arrangements.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that the roof will form part of the building's character as a fifth façade and will be highly visible from the surrounding residences and its design should consider overlooking.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that material selection, fit out and specification should consider cost, noting escalation of construction costs and the nature of the project, with the need to take a cost effective approach.</li> </ul>
Building S2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The panel commended the Silvester Fuller team and noted that the intent of the competition winning scheme has been maintained.</li> <li>• It is recommended the design team further investigate the impact of prioritizing street trees on residential terraces in the Walker Street setback and consider if further shaping of the terraces is required.</li> <li>• The Panel appreciate the defined the entry thresholds at each end of the internal street.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that changes to the waste, delivery and servicing management would be likely to impact building S2 and could alter the yield.</li> </ul>

Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
Building S3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The S3 residential lobby is generously sized but is larger than the S4 lobby. In consideration of a tenure blind approach, the Panel recommend that a more generous lobby to S4 and/or a reduction of the S3 lobby be investigated. Corridor widths outside lifts openings should be more generous for manoeuvrability and prams.</li> <li>The Panel noted that any change to the waste, delivery and servicing management strategy would impact building S3. If yield were lost in other buildings, opportunities for S3 to accommodate the yield should be investigated, for example expanding built form into the location of the proposed pocket park as the planning controls allow.</li> <li>The Panel request further detail is provided in relation to S3, including how it addresses the surrounding publicly accessible areas at the next DRP.</li> </ul>
Building S4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The S4 lobby is smaller and less generous than the S3 lobby. In consideration of a tenure blind approach, the Panel recommend that a more generous lobby to S4 and/or a reduction of the S3 lobby be investigated. Reduction in S3 lobby may support the opening-up of the through-site link open space between S2 and S3.</li> <li>The Panel acknowledged the opportunity for through-apartments in S4 to naturally ventilate to the open corridor via the front door. The interface between doors that may be open and the lift exit points should be further considered to improve visual privacy.</li> <li>The Panel noted that the corner apartments require further refinement considering their visual prominence on the corner of Elizabeth Street and Phillip Street and any implications of layout. Further the street interface of the corner is to be explored and particularly how the treatment and its contiguous relationship to the PCYC building. The Panel requested the Elizabeth Street façade and interface of the building with the street be presented at the next DRP.</li> <li>The Panel noted that the S4 building has a relatively prominent corner to Elizabeth Street and Phillip Street. Further detail on how the design treats this corner is requested for the next meeting.</li> <li>The material provided did not give clarity on how S4 meets Elizabeth Street. Further detail is requested in regard to how the landscape and building elements and are to be provided in the next DRP meeting.</li> <li>It was acknowledged that Building S4 is higher than the PCYC building and so the northern apartments will have greater opportunities for northern light while the lower-level apartments may warrant alternative planning. Further detail should be provided on the solar access and natural ventilation strategies for S4 more generally.</li> </ul>

### Chair of Panel Endorsement

This letter summarising the DRP's commentary from the first DRP held on 30 January 2024 relating to 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern on the material presented by Hayball, Yerrabingin, Aspect, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller has been reviewed by the DRP and has been endorsed by the Panel Chair.

Name	Signature
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair) - Director Design Governance, GANSW	
	06/02/2024

## Redfern Place – Design Review Panel No. 3 Advice

<b>Meeting Subject:</b>	600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern  Design Review Panel Meeting No. 3		
<b>Location:</b>	In person: Ethos Urban – 180 George Street, Sydney  Virtual: Teams		
<b>Date:</b>	12 March 2024	<b>Time:</b>	9:30am – 12:30pm

This letter summarises the Design Review Panel's (DRP) commentary on the material presented by Hayball, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller at the third DRP session held on 12 March 2024. The focus of the meeting was on the overall design development including the urban design and site layout, landscape as well as the S1 Community Facility Building, S2 Affordable Housing Building, S3 Social Housing Building and S4 mixed-use building at 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern (the site).

The DRP session was held in person at Ethos Urban's office and was attended by the DRP, a representative from Hayball, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller as well as the Proponent and the Design Excellence Process manager. Representatives from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, NSW Land and Housing Corporation and members from each of the respective design teams were present virtually.

The DRP for 600-660 Elizabeth Street comprises five members as set out below.

Panel Member	Role/Position
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair)	Director Design Governance, GANSW
Emily Wombwell	Director, SJB
Graham Jahn AM LFRAIA	Director City Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney
Ingrid Mather FAILA	Director Landscape Architect, JMD Design
Liz Westgarth	Managing Director, Hassell



## Panel Feedback

The advice of the DRP is outlined in the table below. Overall, the DRP commended the design team on their documentation and presentation, acknowledging significant work had been undertaken to resolve key components of the overall proposal that were raised as issues in previous meetings.


Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
Urban Design and Site Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel supported the key moves taken since the last DRP, noting the scheme has improved and better aligns with the Design Guide.</li> <li>Visual permeability through the aligned east-west connection was supported by the Panel.</li> <li>The elongation of the S2 building form was considered to result in a better proportionality and opportunities for quality apartment planning.</li> <li>The Panel supported the removal of the south facing pocket park and believes the frontage to Phillip Street appears to be a safer response to the street, particularly with the S3 building lobby activating the street.</li> <li>The relocation of waste and servicing to within the basement was supported, and the significant amount of ground level activation resulting from this move was noted.</li> </ul>
Landscaping and Public Domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel supports the site plan and how it distinguishes between different landscaped areas.</li> <li>The Panel supported the provision of deep soil, but further detail and refinement is required to demonstrate that the deep soil will not be fragmented by obstructions such as retaining walls and footings (for example within the terraces along Walker Street), resulting in the functioning of the deep soil being compromised.</li> <li>The Panel questioned whether the use of materials and changes in the levels do enough to delineate between the communal and public spaces giving clarity of territorial reinforcement.</li> <li>The Panel supports the use of permeable paving where proposed.</li> <li>The Panel suggested a complete landscape buffer around the perimeter of the S2 building to the courtyard could be explored.</li> <li>The Panel acknowledged The Finery case study, but suggested careful consideration of planting to ensure a biodiverse planting palette that will support local fauna, specifically bird life, within the area through use of endemic species.</li> <li>The Panel noted that where balconies occur above gardens, a setback to the pedestrian accessible area is generally required to protect pedestrians below from objects accidentally being dropped from overhead balconies.</li> <li>The Panel requested sun's-eye diagrams to show sunlight to the through-site link and courtyards throughout the day and year-round.</li> <li>Where ground level private open space is provided as concrete slabs or similar (e.g. on Walker Street), the Panel recommend cantilevered/ suspended structures or decking so that deep soil volumes can be conserved.</li> <li>The Panel requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the design team prepare a series of sections showing the relationship between the basement and the through-site link levels across the site.</li> <li>recycled and reclaimed materials be incorporated where appropriate.</li> <li>a materials palette to understand the connection between public domain and the buildings.</li> <li>further clarity on how the landscape will define the transition of public spaces and the private open space (courtyards) while also considering CPTED principles. The Panel noted there are opportunities to limit but enhance entries into these landscaped areas.</li> <li>a coordinated approach to all streetscapes, considering coordination with existing trees, through-site link, building entries to optimise CPTED, intuitive wayfinding and public domain amenity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Building S1 (PCYC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel commended the work for Building S1, noting the design development was thoughtful and positive.</li> <li>The Panel supported the scalloped façade articulation, noting it had reflected a thorough analysis of the context and had benefits such as concealing the substation. The intention for the façades curvature to break up the length of the built form was positive.</li> <li>In respect of the Elizabeth Street frontage, the Panel noted the scalloped façade coming to ground, but recommended the design team study an alternative compliant solution maintaining the required 2m setback and still positively comes to ground.</li> <li>It is unclear how the exposed concrete edge relates to the façade and footpath. Better coordination is required to resolve the interface with the public domain.</li> </ul>

Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel felt the inclusion of the concrete projection to the north made the northern entry feel compressed. Further investigation of the entry arrangement, materiality and expression is recommended.</li> <li>• It was recommended the design team explore an enlargement of the external arrival area to allow for gathering.</li> <li>• The Panel acknowledged the Design Jam feedback, but agreed it would not be appropriate to have bifold openings to the court given the sound of basketball play.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned whether the circulation spaces will have views to the courts. Further clarity is sought to understand the intentions for visual links, art, murals and how they contribute to the experience of the building.</li> <li>• The Panel supported the use of photovoltaics on the roof and the set-down plant enclosure. The roof was acknowledged as an important fifth façade, therefore the design team is encouraged to balance costs, function, and visual amenity for residents overlooking.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended that easy roof access for regular maintenance and cleaning be provided.</li> <li>• The Panel requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a section drawing be provided showing the depth of the façade.</li> <li>- internal views to understand the internal quality of the space.</li> <li>- further detail on the design of the Elizabeth Street streetscape to illustrate how high level projections into the 2m setback zone would work.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Building S2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was confirmed by the design team that the intention was to only partially enclose the pitched roof forms to provide for plant ventilation. It is to be noted the expressive pitched roof forms were a particular selling point for the DRP as part of the design competition.</li> <li>• The Panel raised concern for acoustic amenity given the proximity of mechanical rooftop plant and the adjacent rooftop communal areas. There can be no low-level cooling towers in the vicinity of resident's windows.</li> <li>• The Panel queried the small amount of in-apartment storage and whether more storage could be provided.</li> <li>• The Panel suggested the design team explore opportunities for screening elements within the area between the outer wall of bedrooms and the open corridor to provide for external storage that could be used for bicycles, etc. or other ways to create a sense of ownership and personalisation for tenants near their front doors.</li> <li>• The Panel requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further detail in relation to the design of the pitched roof needs to be provided at the next DRP including the consideration of the use of perforated material to enable plant ventilation rather than 'cut outs'.</li> <li>- further clarity on the open corridor's interface with the courtyard and how this meets the ground plane.</li> <li>- further detailed work on the internal layouts of the "live-work" apartments on Ground Level.</li> <li>- further exploration into the provision of internal and external storage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Building S3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel strongly supported the relocation of waste collection into the basement and the removal of the at-grade loading dock.</li> <li>• The change in siting and design results in a better street frontage to Phillip Street, providing a strong street address which was considered a positive move.</li> <li>• It was recommended that opportunities for a sense of ownership and personalisation within the open corridors be explored, possibly taking cues from Building S2.</li> <li>• In relation to the last three apartments on the ground level, it was considered a stretch to get from the terrace, down stairs to the public footpath. Consider whether a better outcome may be achieved without a staircase and potential additional tree planting in their place.</li> <li>• The Panel requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further design refinement is undertaken for the Phillip Street frontage to ensure it does not read as a series of walls.</li> <li>- further design refinement is undertaken in relation to the internal layout of the narrow apartments to achieve cross ventilation other than the high-level bedroom window, such as a fly screen security door.</li> <li>- further consideration be given to increasing the unencumbered deep soil to the Walker Street footpath from some of the ground level apartments by removing terrace access to footpaths from some terraces.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Focus Areas	Panel Commentary
Building S4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel questioned the use of a chamfered edge on the building's southwestern corner when site has a curved corner. The corner is considered to be the 'front door' to the precinct and the resolution and attention to detail is critical. The commercial entry was acknowledged as important, but the Panel felt the initial sketches made it feel overstated and considered further consideration was required to achieve a strong, yet contextually appropriate, architectural expression to this important corner.</li> <li>• The interaction of the building with the ground plane needs further refinement.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned what was governing the ground level of S4 which was creating a significant level change between the building's commercial frontage to Elizabeth and Phillip Streets as well as the through-site link. The Panel requested the design team explore alternate levels for S4 which takes into consideration flood levels as well as connectivity to the site's ground plane, however it was acknowledged that the levels as proposed may be more desirable.</li> <li>• It was acknowledged that the S4 building is subject to complex level changes, however, the general address (to assist wayfinding) needs more clarity. It was noted all the other residential buildings have very clear entries, however the entry points at S4 could be difficult to locate.</li> <li>• It was questioned whether the lack of awnings on the western elevation would impact glare and summer heat load to the commercial space. External shading should be considered.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended the design team consider protection from inclement weather and the fenestration to the entries and outdoor corridors.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that the rhythm of the built form was working well on the upper levels, however, needed further thought at ground level.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned the acute angles of the balconies and whether the shape would restrict the usability once furnished.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned whether utilising the fire stairs was the best way to access the ground level communal outdoor space, but noted this was subject to further development from the design team.</li> <li>• It was acknowledged that the roof resolution should also be carefully considered.</li> <li>• The Panel requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further refinement of the building's interaction with the ground plane</li> <li>- further resolution of the building's entry points.</li> <li>- exploration into façade treatments for protection from inclement weather and summer shading</li> <li>- further refinement of built form at ground level.</li> <li>- further refinement of acute angles of the balconies.</li> <li>- further detail regarding structure, waterproofing and finishes be provided in the next DRP to ensure that appropriate allowance has been made in the design.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Other items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration of waste disposal from residents is recommended, particularly to ensure convenient methods of disposal are available for less able residents.</li> <li>• The Panel reiterated that the project should continue to adopt a tenure blind approach across all buildings, including within internal circulation spaces and the inclusion of clear widths for less abled people and protection during inclement weather.</li> <li>• The Panel noted the design team should consider requirements for specific housing planning that culturally accommodates s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community needs.</li> <li>• The Panel noted that the PCYC building is more resolved than the residential buildings and that the way all buildings are expressed within the precinct should be considered as the architectural detailing of the residential buildings develops.</li> </ul>

Chair of Panel Endorsement

This letter summarising the DRP's commentary from the third DRP held on 12 March 2024 relating to 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern on the material presented by Hayball, Aspect, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller has been reviewed by the DRP and has been endorsed by the Panel Chair.

Name	Signature
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair) - Director Design Governance, GANSW	 21/03/2024

## Redfern Place – Design Review Panel No. 4 Advice

<b>Meeting Subject:</b>	600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern  Design Review Panel Meeting No. 4		
<b>Location:</b>	In person: Ethos Urban – 180 George Street, Sydney  Virtual: Teams		
<b>Date:</b>	16 April 2024	<b>Time:</b>	9:30am – 12:30pm

This letter summarises the Design Review Panel's (DRP) commentary on the material presented by Hayball, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller at the fourth DRP session held on 16 April 2024. The focus of the meeting was on the overall design development of buildings S4, S3 and S2, with a design update on building S1. The public domain and landscape design were also presented and discussed.

The DRP session was held in person at Ethos Urban's office and was attended by a quorum of the DRP, a representative from Hayball, Aspect Studio, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller as well as the Proponent and the Design Excellence Process manager. Representatives from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, Homes NSW (formerly NSW Land and Housing Corporation) and members from each of the respective design teams were present virtually.

The DRP for 600-660 Elizabeth Street comprises five members as set out below. Graham Jahn was absent from this meeting, which proceeded with a quorum of the other four members.

Panel Member	Role/Position
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair)	Director Design Governance, GANSW
Emily Wombwell	Director, SJB
Ingrid Mather FAILA	Director Landscape Architect, JMD Design
Liz Westgarth	Managing Director, Hassell
<b>Apologies</b>	
Graham Jahn AM LFRAIA	Director City Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney

## Panel Feedback

The advice of the DRP is outlined in the table below. Overall, the DRP commended the design team on their documentation and presentation, acknowledging significant work had been undertaken since last meeting. The DRP noted the process to date had resulted in a development that was strong and clear in its alignment with the advice provided.

Due to aspects of the architectural design being further advanced than is typical for DA assessment purposes, the advice of the DRP has been separated into two sections. The first section, provided in **Table 1**, provides the DRP's general commentary to be considered in respect of the SSDA. The second section, provided in **Table 2**, provides more detailed commentary for the design team to consider during future design development as the feedback relates to more detailed elements ordinarily considered post-SSDA.

**Table 1**      *General Commentary from the DRP in respect of the SSDA*

Component	Panel Commentary
Landscaping and Public Domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel supported the principles of the landscape design. It was acknowledged the site's constraints create a complex environment and microclimate for landscape design.</li> <li>The Panel supported the design development around the entries of Building S4.</li> <li>The Panel supported the exploration of recycled materials.</li> <li>The Panel highlighted the need for sun, shade and wind to be further explored to encourage biodiversity in this microclimate and reinforce the principles of Connecting with Country in the landscape design.</li> <li>The Panel noted a potential misalignment between deep soil provision and the location of canopy trees. The landscape design should ensure appropriate soil volume is provided where canopy trees are proposed.</li> <li>The landscaping plans indicate a feature tree in the centre of the site which is expected to require a large volume of soil. The species of the tree should be clarified and adequate deep soil included in its location.</li> <li>The Panel requested detail on the selection of species across the site.</li> <li>The Panel recommend an alternative to the retaining walls at the street frontages of S3 be explored, with an aim to not fragment the deep soil.</li> <li>The rationale for the varying width of the north-south through-site link pathway was queried. Further explanation for this approach was requested as this impacts deep soil provision.</li> <li>The Panel supported the design team's further consideration of CPTED principles and requested the landscape interface with the buildings' breezeways and lower-level balconies be further developed to clarify territorial reinforcement, considering clearly signalling primary semiprivate community entry points while restrict sightlines into ground level apartments.</li> </ul>
Building S1 (PCYC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel commended the design evolution of the entry sequence, alignment of the staircase and the seating nook.</li> <li>The Panel supported the scalloped façade and the light that will be achieved under the façade at the building's primary entrance.</li> <li>The Panel recommended careful selection of landscape species around the building, particularly along the eastern façade to provide height and minimise the scale of the built form as well as the view over the building roof.</li> </ul>
Building S2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel acknowledged a significant amount of design development since the last DRP which was positive, thoughtful and supported.</li> <li>The Panel noted the apartment planning was neat and functional.</li> <li>The development of the rooftop communal park was supported.</li> <li>The development of the materiality and detailing was supported.</li> <li>The Panel recommended privacy be further considered at the interface of apartments and the breezeway.</li> </ul>

Component	Panel Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel recommended that appropriate detailing of the façade, particularly where concrete materiality is proposed, is retained where possible.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned the design team's continuation of the pitched roof motif on the lower levels of the building, noting it confused the bold gesture on the skyline as portrayed in the competition scheme.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended the design team explore a flexible rooftop landscaping solution that can be adapted to meet the needs of the residents with flexibility for alternate programming, noting the demand for the community garden is likely to fluctuate.</li> <li>• The Panel supported the design team's integration of feedback from the design jam that had occurred since the last DRP and agreed that the primacy of the kitchen in the apartments was an important consideration in the general arrangement.</li> </ul>
Building S3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel acknowledged the design development since the last DRP was significant and positive.</li> <li>• The simplicity of materials adopted was considered refined and elegant. The Panel recommended that the textural elements were retained, noting they contributed significantly to the façade.</li> <li>• The Panel were supportive of the varied volumetric built form approach.</li> <li>• The Panel noted the breezeway and balconies had developed well and suited the streetscape.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended further consideration be given to the relationship between the central portion and the southern portion of the building and the transition of materiality between the building volumes.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended that façade detailing should be retained where possible so that the building does not read as an expanse of concrete or other materials.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned why the communal terrace area could not comprise the full rooftop space at that level. It was noted that the provision of a terrace space could be considered as "tenure blind" when compared to the other buildings in the development.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended further consideration of the stepped rooftop areas that will be overlooked by apartments.</li> </ul>
Building S4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel commended the significant work that had been undertaken since the last DRP noting the key architectural moves had responded to the Panel's comments.</li> <li>• The design evolution of the Elizabeth and Phillip Street entries was supported.</li> <li>• The approach to materials was generally supported and it was acknowledged that the adoption of natural materials has resulted in a built form that responds contextually to its surroundings. It was queried if the use of lighter, contrasting materials for the upper level was necessary to differentiate from the lower levels given the upper-level setback.</li> <li>• The Panel supported the inclusion of the wider breezeways noting it demonstrated the commitment to a tenure blind approach across the site.</li> <li>• The Panel acknowledged the importance of the Elizabeth Street frontage. The Panel supported the recessing of the building's western façade. It was requested the design team further explore the design of the stepped landscape planters, particularly in consideration of seating opportunities near the bus shelter and potential for accumulation of litter.</li> <li>• The Panel noted the use of materials, and opportunities for seating, along the Elizabeth Street frontage should appropriately respond to the proximity to the bus shelter.</li> </ul>


**Table 2**      *Detailed commentary for consideration during design development*

Component	Panel Commentary
Building S1 (PCYC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel requested further consideration of the southern entrance ensuring that levels and interface with ramping east west link are resolved.</li> <li>• The Panel requested the integration of cooling and heating services be further refined to ensure consistency with the existing “neatness” of the building’s design.</li> <li>• The Panel acknowledged the building’s unique character and being of its place. It was recommended that an alternate signage location be explored to avoid interference with the unique façade treatment which is considered an architectural statement.</li> </ul>
Building S2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel acknowledged further detailed design resolution was required for apartments with kitchen interfaces to the breezeway, in particular ensuring an appropriate sill height is provided for privacy.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended the services provision within apartments provides flexibility to future residents when deciding appropriate layout of apartments (relating to dining and living areas) that suit their needs.</li> <li>• The Panel recommends that careful consideration of the every-day use of apartments is made, particularly for smaller units, including that there is provision for washers and dryers within the units.</li> <li>• The placement of kitchens and larger whitegoods should be considered in the general arrangement of smaller apartments to ensure usability and comfortable sightlines are achieved.</li> <li>• Further consideration should be given to the general arrangement of apartments and furniture to create more usable, practical and enjoyable apartments, particularly in terms of sightlines into small apartments from the front door (i.e. the home arrival sequence).</li> </ul>
Building S3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel noted the ground level circulation space currently reads as a collection of stairs, doorways and corridors. It was recommended intuitive wayfinding be considered in the resolution of detailing to ensure entries and exits are clear to visitors.</li> <li>• While the inclusion of the breezeways is supported, the Panel recommended the design team further consider the arrangement of the communal spaces acknowledging the layouts of apartments and in particular the placement of doorways which may be relied on for cross ventilation.</li> <li>• The Panel supported the inclusion of lobby relief spaces and encouraged consistent application of theses across the building where possible.</li> <li>• The Panel acknowledged further detailed design resolution was required for the apartments with bedroom interfaces to the breezeway, ensuring the sill height is appropriate for use and visual privacy.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended a similar cantilever/popout window treatment be provided to the northern most apartments as per the window treatments located on the eastern and western facades.</li> <li>• The Panel recommended the design team closely consider the arrangement of apartments and furniture to maximise the practicality of the individual spaces and to provide a pleasant entry sequence for tenants.</li> </ul>
Building S4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Panel requested the design team continue design development to resolve the levels and access across the building.</li> <li>• Slab levels and alignment of the finished levels on the rooftop need further consideration.</li> <li>• The Panel questioned whether a recess could be provided to the apartments between the bedroom windows and the breezeway.</li> <li>• The Panel noted careful consideration into the general arrangement of studio apartments should be undertaken to maximise the efficiency, usability and enjoyment of the spaces.</li> </ul>



**Chair of Panel Endorsement**

This letter summarising the DRP's commentary from the third DRP held on 16 April 2024 relating to 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern on the material presented by Hayball, Aspect, Architecture AND and Silvester Fuller has been reviewed by the DRP and has been endorsed by the Panel Chair.

Name	Signature
Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Chair) - Director Design Governance, GANSW	 26/04/2024

---