

SANDSTONE PRECINCT

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL - ADVICE 10

MEETING NO. 11

4 October 2019

PANEL

Brian Zulaikha

Peter Mould

APOLOGY

Kerry Clare (review of documents and reporting only)

EDUCATION BUILDING

DISCUSSION

The project team presented material for the upcoming Modification 6 relating to the design development of the Education Building.

The Panel notes that subsequent to the presentation the project team advised that:

"In relation to the presented façade material and design changes of the rooftop areas, we have taken your comments on board and as such wish to advise that for the purposes of the upcoming Modification 6 the facades as presented will not be put forward, rather the design of the facades will remain per the current approval for the Education Building and as agreed with the DRP at previous meetings. We recognise that further analysis and design work is required, and will discuss any future changes to the facades with you at a future DRP meeting, to be arranged at an appropriate time".

For reference the Panel has provided commentary on these issues within this advice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

GUEST ROOM CONFIGURATION.

The guest room accommodation has been revised, with rooms introduced to the lower ground level and other rooms enlarged such that their impact in terms of services is lessened as is the impact on the existing fabric. The Panel supports these moves.

LOFTUS STREET LANEWAY.

The laneway entry will now serve the multiple functions of public entry, accessible entry and service entry. The proposal to use high quality finishes is supported but more detail is required about how the proposed materials all come together. Elevations or renderings showing this are required, more than reference sample photos.

ACCESSIBILITY.

The accessibility strategy was outlined relying on both planning and management. The Panel questioned the lack of accessible entry to Farrer Place but was briefed by the accessibility consultant that the proposed strategy will meet DDA requirements. It notes that where alternative entries are provided they will be obvious, managed, and of equal design standard to non-assessable entries.

SUBSTATION.

The Panel notes the restrictions in the placement of the substation under Farrer Place, and accepts the proposed relocation and associated changes. It would like to see the resolution

of the proposed changes to the openings in the sandstone façade and their detailed treatment, before sign off.

POOL AND GYM.

The Panel notes the introduction of columns through the building to support the pool on Level 5 and believes their placement has been considered and is appropriate. The Panel understands the general strategy of incorporating these into walls or furniture items and requests further detail of their treatment within the spaces on each level when this is developed.

The Panel accepts the strategy to modify the heritage door to the Gym on Level 5 to allow a contiguous floor level to the gym. It notes that this can be achieved by the removal of two rows of glass panels and the changing of the proportions of the glazed panels, which match the height of the level change.

FACADES

The Panel does not support the changes proposed to the cladding treatment (ie. flat panels with powder coat treatment as opposed to fluted reconstituted stone and anodised framing). Any such changes must be well developed and clearly modelled so the full impacts can be assessed if such changes are to be proposed. They must also be considered as part of the whole assemblage of elements they relate to not just as isolated items (see note in DISCUSSION above).

COOLING TOWERS

The Panel notes the change in size of the cooling towers and that the external envelope to the surrounding walls will not change except where it faces the internal courtyard.

INTERNAL COURTYARD

The Panel notes the following changes:

- . The internal walls to the courtyard will be full height glazed panels, the window planters have been deleted,
- . The precast roof beams have been replaced with steel beams clad with charcoal toned PPC aluminium finish.
- . The lift shaft cladding has been replaced with charcoal toned PPC aluminium finish, with incorporated ventilation panels.

The Panel believes that the full height glazing needs to be better aligned with the new room layouts, the alignment of mullions with walls should be tested, and the reliance on blanked out panels with backing material should be minimised. The potential for the dark glass in the DGU to provide good natural light at the lower levels of the courtyard is questioned, as is the reflective quality of the glass, its potential impacts on client privacy and amenity and consideration of the visual performance of the tinted glass at night (transparency to the outside and reflectivity within the corridors). Any future presentations should also show the impact of changes to the cooling towers.

FINISHES GENERALLY

The Panel has in the past been presented with very detailed presentations of the internal finishes and their interface with, and response to, the heritage fabric and setting. The current proposed designs seem more generic and less context specific. There is concern too in the use of materials such as antique mirror glass, especially in public areas. The Panel requests further presentation of these changes and the current approach to finishes and detailing generally, and the strategy for finishes in the public areas.

The issue of the colour of blinds behind clear glass and the overall impact on the external reading of the building needs further consideration. The Panel believes that the outer face should not be white but a darker more recessive colour, especially on the new upper levels so that the detail of the fenestration pattern can be read and it does not read as a simple white box.



Brian Zulaikha



Kerry Clare



Peter Mould

SANDSTONE PRECINCT

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL - ADVICE 11

MEETING NO. 12

29 November 2019

PANEL

Brian Zulaikha

Peter Mould

Kerry Clare (by conference phone)

APOLOGY

EDUCATION BUILDING

DISCUSSION

The presentation focused on responses to the Panel's recommendations from Meeting 11, with the intention to include them in the MOD 6 submission.

RECOMMENDATIONS

INTERIOR FINISHES

The Panel was shown photographs of the guest room accommodation mock up, as well as renderings of the future design intent. The Panel noted discrepancy between the two with the finishes in the mock up seeming to be better resolved, however neither addressed the fundamental issue of how the fit out interfaces with the existing fabric of the building and the limitations and opportunities it presents. Earlier presentations of the design intent were explicit in this regard and the generic fit out shown does not demonstrate sufficient regard to the existing building. Further demonstration of the resolution this aspect is requested.

SUBSTATION.

The Panel notes the proposed treatments to the substation external openings and supports the strategy; subject to inspection of samples for "the new custom perforated screen", and finally agreed finishes with Ausgrid. Should the agreed finishes change the Panel requests review of the agreed proposal.

LOFTUS STREET LANEWAY.

The proposal to use high quality finishes is supported but there remains ambiguity between the drawings and the rendering, The rendering shows timber cladding to the service cupboards and entry to the lobby but is unresolved for finishes to the wall in between (north face). The plan also shows a large swing door recessed into this face, and to the east a metal (unspecified?) door with "etched fish scale pattern". It is difficult to put all these together as a design package.

LOWER GROUND EXTERNAL TENANCY

This change of use is supported.

LEVEL 5 GYM.

The planning changes and the reuse and relocation of the heritage door is supported.

FACADES

The Panel notes that: "In relation to the presented façade material and design changes of the rooftop areas, we wish to advise that for the purposes of the upcoming Modification 6

the facades will remain per the current approval for the Education Building and as agreed with the DRP at previous meetings. We recognise that further analysis and design work is required, and will discuss any future changes to the facades at a future DRP meeting, to be arranged at an appropriate time”.

INTERNAL COURTYARD

The Panel supports the realignment of the courtyard glazing.

The latest courtyard package does not fully explain the architectural detailing and the Panel requests updated details of the facades (glass, metal, etc), and sectional details of the glass roof.

LANDS BUILDING

DISCUSSION

Planning updates were presented which showed a rationalisation of the back of house service areas, and some minor changes of uses to some rooms and the entry and general circulation strategy. The Panel is supportive of these updated changes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

COURTYARD SLOT

The Panel appreciates the investigations of options for this element. It believes that re-establishing the masonry wall is important whilst recognising that a total reconstruction is not appropriate. The option that presents the punched wall with re-established cornice line is preferred (Fig 1 & 2). The Panel supports the proposed large openings to each floor and the arched element set into the dome.



Fig 1



Fig 2

DOME LINKS

The roof's edge soffit slanting to face the courtyard presents a too dominant element and the Panel suggests revised detailing to present a thinner edge. The Panel supports the deep recess noting that shading provided by the overhang may still be required and should be checked. A darker ceiling could be considered here to make it more recessive.

The sequence of travel through level 3 walkways between function rooms is past toilets, with movement through the central space to access male and female toilets on either side. The Panel suggest replanning plant and toilets to avoid this crossover and enhance the arrival sequence.

NORTHERN DOME AND TERRACES

These spaces have the potential to be quite remarkable. The Panel is concerned that the

entry level may seem cramped with a low ceiling. The rendered section is hard to interpret and simple dimensioned architectural sections are requested for the next presentation.

The new handrail to the terraces should be set inside the edge planter. This will remove conflict with the heritage handrail and visual conflict when viewed from Macquarie Place. Glass or steel blades could work in this solution, but it needs further testing.

COURTYARDS

The courtyard paving is different in the plan and the render. For such a small space a simple unified paving treatment is preferred. The Panel believes there is the opportunity to use similar treatment to the Education Building, eg. the setts in the Loftus St entry, to unify the two buildings and simplify the design approach. This should be investigated.

STAIRS AND CORRIDORS

The Panel supports the strategy to align the new handrail with the screen but believes that the screen framing should be as visually light as possible and adjusted to more carefully align with the existing scroll pattern. Could the top frame align with the existing handrail for example, and the bottom rail not cut through the scroll pattern, or could the mesh be stiff enough to avoid the framing and the visual complexity it generates? This is a difficult design issue as the existing balustrade is so elaborate, and any infill needs to be as light and transparent as possible. The Panel supports supporting the new frame off the existing frame if possible to avoid another post to the floor.

There are many difficult junctions, turns and levels associated with the balustrade design and the full range of details that need to be resolved should be discussed in a single package.

The Panel supports the detailing and services strategy to the corridors.

CLUB SUITE

It is difficult to gain the full intent from the renderings, but there is the potential for the suites to become too cluttered with ceiling fans (are these necessary?), screens, rugs, pot plants, and a variety of furniture elements. The current proposals seem to lack the calm sophistication of earlier studies, and could potentially distract from the integrity of these spaces.

LEVEL 2 FUNCTION ROOM CEILINGS

The dropped ceiling approach may be necessary to deal with services distribution, but the Panel believes alternative services distribution and air handling should be investigated. If the vaults are to be pursued these should be mounted as high as possible to maximise the room volume and should be as shallow as possible to be close to the existing vault shapes. The repeated gables within the vaults should be reviewed and 'less busy' options considered. The Panel requests further presentation of the room fit out especially wall treatments. The renderings show mirrored glass cupboards, curtains, screens, etc (see commentary for Club Suites above).



Brian Zulaikha



Kerry Clare



Peter Mould

Minutes of the Design Review Panel Meeting No. 11 – Sandstone Precinct.

4 October 2019. 9.00am-11.00am

Design Review Panel members:

Peter Mould (PM)

Brian Zulaikha (BZ)

Also present:

Leland Kwee (LK), Pontiac

Joan Plouviat (JP), Pontiac

Johnathan Bryant (JB), Urbis

James Joy (JJ), Essence

Kylie Chu (KC), Essence

Chris Mury (CM), Make Architects

Eden Fong (EF), MGAC

Chris Curtis (CC), Ethos Urban

Apologies

Kerry Clare (KC)

Alexis Cella (AC), Ethos Urban

Overview of the meeting

- Meeting commenced at 9.01am
- Mod 4 has been lodged with only minor comments received back from agencies.
- This DRP is related to Education design development changes only with a modification application to be lodged soon.
- CM provided a general overview of the structure of the presentation, which will touch on guest room configurations, lower ground guest rooms, Loftus St laneway and DDA access, substation changes, facades, cooling towers and courtyard internal designs

Guest Room Configuration

- CM outlined that the re-configurations of the guest rooms are a result of the changes to Lands. The team reviewed the rooms arrangement and sought to create more generous rooms more appropriate to the standard of hotel.
- Overall the arrangement remains the same, with Level 1 upwards containing the bulk of the accommodation. BOH and public domain spaces are still generally located at street level areas.
- The number of keys is dropping from 229 to 192, consistent with that originally approved.
- There are no longer suites in the Lands Building so these are now being introduced in Education through the redesigned larger spaces. Level 6 now has much larger rooms.
- PM queried the size of the rooms, with JJ confirming they're about 58sqm. JP mentioned that from a hotel position you want a good number of suites with the larger sizing, and the design seeks to bring the grand guest experience into Education.
- On Level 8 there is one large suite (the Capella Suite) which is a redesigned presidential suite. JP mentioned this might be used as a hospitality suite for product launches for corporate firms, in addition to its use for guest accommodation.
- CM noted there is a consistent palette of materials throughout the building.
- Changes to Level 9 include the southern face of this level, with the reconfigured larger rooms.
- CM in making changes from Level 1 upwards, the team have also looked at introducing guest rooms on LG.
- The team looked at a range of scenarios including the north-western corner of the building (at the corner of Bridge and Loftus) with this identified as the most appropriate location. This location provides more sunlight access to the rooms due to this part of the site being lower set than other areas based on the topography.
- CM for privacy, these rooms will have solid door sets at the end of the access corridor. These will be used for fire egress and DDA, but will be shut all the time otherwise. JB mentioned they are QLD maple doors.
- PM asked how do you get from reception to this area? LK replied that guests will enter off Farrer Place on Ground Level which is now the library/check in area, where guests and the public will separate. Guests will then move through this space to the lifts and go down one level. The library area becomes more of the transition area into the private sections of the hotel for guests.
- JB mentioned that the design team are now getting a lot more operational involvement in terms of design development.
- PM queried where the heritage wall was, and JB confirmed it is still present. PM then asked where this wall is facing in that was it facing towards the bathrooms? JB confirmed that yes it is now facing towards the bathrooms, however is still being retained. A portion of the wall is being removed due to buildability and safety issues, however, will be re-built using a dry-pressed process. This has been the recommendation.
- PM commented that the team needs to think about how this is worked through as the design now exposes the eastern face of the wall compared to the previous scheme which was the western face.

Loftus Street Laneway

- CM outlined that DDA access initially used a lift mechanism at the Farrer Place entrance. The impact of putting this lift on the heritage fabric caused issues, including adverse non-reversible impacts to the fabric of the historic marble staircase in the Farrer Place lift lobby. Recent experience attempting to salvage similar marble fabric at the northern end of the lobby has proven how challenging it would be to salvage the marble treads and risers and alter them to accommodate a sesame lift, including the actual weight of the lift itself. JB mentioned that the treads of the stairs at this entrance have also worn unevenly which created access concerns. CM described that the manufacturer of the particular lift that would be required isn't located in Australia so this would cause maintenance issues.
- EF added that the second stairs in the Farrer Place entrance, particularly the smaller set, created the scenario that when the lift was being used this held up anyone else entering or exiting the building.
- CM mentioned that the team is looking to retain the stairs here in their current state as much as possible, except for two new handrails per current requirements. Everything else will remain as close to current state as possible.
- PM asked what is happening from a DDA access perspective? CM mentioned the team had looked at the other entrances - Bridge St has stairs, however Loftus Street has stairs but also a flat entrance and a lobby type space before the lifts. JB mentioned this space also acts like an airlock.
- CM confirmed that entry on-grade from Loftus Street does still require assistance to the lift lobby to take you up to the main levels of the building. JB mentioned this entrance can also be used for VIPs, and that it is not a backdoor but another main entrance. JP said that the hotel want to encourage the access from Loftus for hotel guests walking back from Lands Building.
- PM queried if this entrance was level the whole way through to the lobby and CM confirmed yes, it was and therefore makes sense from an access perspective.
- The finishes will be the same quality as the main entrance and include the use of cobblestones in the area as permanently open. JB commented that this doesn't result in losing the fact that it was a former car way. CM mentioned that there will be good signage. A range of scenarios as to how this will work in terms of access into the hotel were then presented.
- EF mentioned that DDA was always tricky with this building as it has to meet the BCA and Premises Standard. As equal and as safe as the other entrance is a necessity. The idea with this is to do a combination of design and management.
- There are three groups of users for the entrance.
- The first group is hotel guests who would be booked into the hotel and not just coming off the street. Their arrival point is in Farrer Place. These guests would then be escorted down to Loftus St. JP mentioned that there is the drop off space within Farrer Place, which will have a number of bellmen there to assist people going the right way – this is the first impression guests would have of the hotel so is critically important. Guests would then enter the Loftus St lobby space and go up in the lift.
- PM mentioned this is a good way of getting around DDA issues, as having a bellman there doesn't leave people wondering where to go when they are dropped off.
- BZ asked how many drop off spaces there are, and JJ confirmed there are 3 spaces. BZ then asked if the CoS is allowing these spaces for the exclusive use of the hotel, and LK responded that it is a general drop off zone so anyone can use the spaces.
- EF then outlined the second group and scenario – being those people attending for a function, noting these would all be pre-booked function guests. If a guest arrived at any entrance they would be escorted to their destination. They'd pass through the passageway at LG, and the doors would be kept open during the function hours – all on-grade access.
- EF addressed the final scenario noting it was possibly the toughest one to address, and that is for persons who enter on a whim. The Loftus St will be managed and will be staff there at all times.
- EF confirmed that Loftus St is the most superior entrance in terms of grading, and when combined with the benefits of the management system presents a great entrance option.
- PM asked about the rooms at LG as it was mentioned that the main corridor doors will be closed off for privacy, yet guests will be passing through this for their function.
- CM mentioned that the hotelier has card swipe access for people who requires access.
- PM asked further how does someone get to the function rooms through those doors? CM replied that at the moment it is card access to that space with assistance.
- PM asked where the other function rooms that you need to get to are located, with CM responding these are all on ground floor, so access through the Loftus St lifts is the option.

Substation Proposal

- The substation was originally proposed as being subterranean in Farrer Place however this required a lot of work to get it to work with the authority's requirements. JB noted that Ausgrid were still insisting on 2-2.5m tall vents which is not an appropriate look for Farrer Place.
- A kiosk arrangement was presented to the CoS, however it was confirmed by CoS that this option could not happen in Farrer Place.
- CM confirmed the team is now looking to bring the substation wholly into the Education building specifically into the front bar area (destination bar). Venting the substation would occur through the façade at the Loftus St elevation.
- JB acknowledged that there will be heritage impacts however the team has been looking at those with the least level of impact.
- PM asked what now happens to the venting and exhaust if the substation is in the building. JB response this now exits via a shaft to vent out. CM confirmed the venting, both intake and outtake, happen at the head of the archway and then onto the mitre of the building at Ground Floor. From an Ausgrid perspective this is a good solution as it provides maintenance access. This does however require that the archway is broken up to be brought down to the ground level to create a new doorway.
- BZ asked whether this change makes it too similar to the Loftus St entrance and does this mean the DDA access is downgraded as next to the substation? JB replied it is likely different in terms of what does the VIP get the impression of, through coming in next to a substation. PM asked could the substation access be through the Loftus St entrance rather than separate? BZ then asked how often access was needed. JJ confirmed most likely once a year by Ausgrid, and BZ suggested design the access with a removable door that doesn't look like a door for Ausgrid. JJ confirmed, and responded to PM's query that Ausgrid don't want that type of access - they want immediate access direct from the public domain.
- JP confirmed that to meet Ausgrid standards there needs to be one exclusive entrance.
- BZ suggested to make both the entry and exit look industrial in style. Both openings, rather than make them look like part of this old building, gives them some character. CM confirmed the team essentially looked around the base of the building and there are only a few doors sets around the base with these being generally solid doors with articulation. This could be interpreted into the openings, and from an appearance point of view would be consistent with the base of the building.
- PM asked what are the finishes in the public entry and do both openings need to be ventilating? CM confirmed these are completely open, and yes.
- PM queried if it was a personal escape/fire escape shown using the stairs? CM confirmed yes this is in the southern corner. The existing window is full height and will be changed to a door. PM asked what will the finish of the door be for the big red area as marked? CM mentioned this would be kept consistent with the building, but that it has to meet Ausgrid requirements as it is an access door. JB commented it will probably be a steel set with articulation.
- PM asked how wide the archway is, and CM indicated 2.4m, noting this is still a proposal and the detail has to be resolved before progressing to Ausgrid assessment.
- JB mentioned that the other advantage of this option is the archaeology sensitive nature of the site, noting the previous Farrer Place option required further excavation right at the back of the former judges house.
- CM noted the raised floor level where it will require grading off the footpath locally, and also that on the corner there will be local regrading to accommodate the threshold.
- PM sought clarification on the elevation, in that there will be double doors, then you come across another door then two windows. Those two doors are at different levels externally so how do you get across the difference internally? CM mentioned this is related to the existing slope inside that will require a minor change to get the levels right.
- PM asked that the treatment of the door be considered further.

Pool and Gym – Level 5

- CM explained this is further design development based on the structural impact of the pool on the heritage fabric. The position has been taken that the pool needs to be fully supported by its own structure and as such it is now fully independent.
- BZ asked if this is the case all the way to the Ground? CM confirmed yes, and JB noted some of the most interesting rooms are directly below the pool.
- CM noted that certain elements of heritage have to be taken into account. JB mentioned that the design actually has approval to remove marble from the columns and re-case them, however this new design is a better way to support the pool without impacting these areas.
- CM showed the highlighted heritage zones to be protected and with the columns extending right to the ground. JB noted the team will be salvaging the marble where possible.
- PM asked if the new columns are concrete and 300mm square and if they are tied to the walls or freestanding? CM responded that they're 450mm square, and are independent, carried up through the floor plates. PM asked further if they are tied through the floor plates? CM mentioned that the design hasn't yet been refined to this detail. JB explained that the slabs are fairly thin as this is the 1915 section of the building. The engineers wanted to go through the middle of the boardroom with the columns but were advised this was not possible by the design team so the design now avoids that space.
- CM said that with the bulk of the building now being guest rooms, these have been slightly re-shuffled to align with these new columns.
- CM said that another element with the gym area previously had two levels and was higher at the pool level and lower at the existing floor level. To make this one level, they've looked at the heritage door, and to create the single floor level and maintain the door, the team is proposing to remove two rows of glazing and lift it up to raise the floor.
- JB outlined that the choice is to remove the whole door and put into storage or alter it on-site so that it is seen in some manner.
- PM asked is the level difference exactly the same as the window panel rows, as he could go either way with the two choices, and it seems to be between the underside of one panel row or potentially matches perfectly in terms of the height. CM mentioned that the height is restricted on the head as well and the team prefer to keep the door, with PM commenting that it could be trimmed slightly but there isn't much room to play with, and if this is 30-40mm then seems ok, but if half a glazing panel then this is not such a good outcome.
- JB said that in order to store it would need to be disassembled and it is likely that once this happened the door would never come back again. BZ mentioned the door had nice proportions in this location, but can understand the overarching desire to make the room one level.

Facades

- CM mentioned that the façade changes are further design development of these elements. The design was originally a fluted façade, and it is now proposed for these to be flat. This doesn't affect the form of the towers on either eastern or western elevation. Viewed from the street provides a minor visual impact largely due to the distance from ground level. Additional articulation has also been added to break down the mass of the towers.
- PM asked for a run through of what the material is being changed from, noting it was previously champagne in colour. CM confirmed it was a metal pan system of a matching material and colour.
- PM explained there has been a lot of concern about this part of the design in the past. One solution was to break down the mass of the towers by providing the fluting at the time, and now PM is not 100% comfortable to support the change, as it was originally to introduce fluting to give the shadow lines on the towers to break down the bulk.
- BZ asked why is it changing? CM responded to make it consistent with other parts of the building, courtyards etc.
- PM said that the design was also tying in how the window elevations were treated, as the rooftop extension is one of the most visually dominant components. This has been debated for so long and so hard. BZ asked does it make that much difference when you look at it from a distance and how wide are the sheets of the panelling? CM confirmed these are 500mm modules. PM asked how these are attached and if plywood was to be used to stop the panels bowing? CM confirmed plywood was included.
- BZ mentioned he was not overly concerned with the changes however there hadn't been sufficient explanation as to why it was changing, and PM also queried why the change was proposed.
- From Farrer Place there isn't much of a change, only to do with the material. CM stepped the DRP through the physical samples and colours. PM wishes to see this against the champagne that was already approved.

Cooling Towers

- CM explained that the cooling tower systems require changes as a result of the change to the uses in the Lands Building. On the northern façade of the Education there are the cooling tower systems which are now carrying the capacity of the Lands Building in Education, resulting in the units on the roof increasing in size and capacity. As such the team has had to look at adjusting the size and alignment.
- BZ asked what about the weight? CM confirmed that TTW (engineers) have resolved that.
- CM noted there are two elements being the lower and upper levels of the cooling tower. The roof is still accommodating the additional size of the towers through modifying the edge of the courtyards, with the lower level being pulled out towards the courtyard to provide maintenance clearance distances for access.
- The design is trying to minimise the impact and from a distance there works out to be a nominal difference from the views from Bridge Street. There is a slight change in the step up on the rooftop part, but it is very minor. JB mentioned that pedestrians are unlikely to be able to tell from the street.

Internal Courtyard

- CM moved onto the courtyard façade. This originally consisted of a curtain wall system, glazed roof and secondary frame system with planters and mechanical venting. Some access and servicing issues with the timber screens and planter beds were identified.
- This has been refined, and now the design concept strips away the wall system to create a smooth, simple skin that sits back from, and doesn't impose on, the courtyard space. This would be a glazed façade, and due to the height and depth of the courtyard, would bring more light down into the ground area. To do this, in combination with the internal blinds, the glazing system will use a higher reflectance value, allowing light to penetrate down but provide obscurity with the public corridors and neighbouring rooms.
- KC provided a physical sample for review by the DRP.
- CM mentioned the design is now sympathetic to the sandstone material.
- PM asked how much sandstone would you see in the courtyard? JB mentioned that the material is still in this space.
- PM then asked what the glazing itself would be, and also the mullions. CM confirmed there would be clear glazing, with spandrels and back panels to provide the colour. The mullions would be a darkening colour, sitting behind the glass line. The colour would be made from a combination of the back pans behind the spandrels. There would be a 100% blackout blind and a day blind as well for each guest room.
- PM queried if the mullions align with the walls of the guest rooms, as this would be a better outcome.
- CM mentioned the lift core on the western elevation, and PM suggested this is all the more reason to go onto the east to be consistent.
- BZ said it seems to be relying on two sets of blinds for privacy. PM asked if this is the only natural light for these rooms, as it is a fairly dark glass and the bottom of a light well raising a number of issues. BZ mentioned that if there was a very interesting light artwork, maybe guests wouldn't turn the lights on in the room as it would be lit from outside, and CM confirmed there were possibilities.
- BZ made comment relating to if guests are looking at a mirror with the light on, they are not really aware if other people can see in, and if privacy could be created through fritting, or some other device, louvres even, something on the outside of the glass that still allowed light in but created privacy. JP mentioned that the hotel would normally keep the blind down for privacy.
- PM considered this is a different experience as when there is floor to ceiling glass people naturally feel more exposed. CM confirmed the team will look at this further.
- CM then discussed the façade on the lift core, which is now a much simpler design of 500mm panel with perforations in a dark colour. JB mentioned this is based on the highlights of the building. CM showed the design option for the bottom two panels affected by the air intake and showed some precedents.
- The courtyard roof now has alternative beams carrying the gutter, with peaks and troughs across. PM queried if the beams are clad with this confirmed by CM to be over cladding with metal sheeting.
- PM noted that originally the beams were pre-cast. BZ asked about the span, and if this was about 2m, with CM confirmed yes, and these are large pieces of glass.
- PM asked if the roof glazing is proposed to be a double-glazed tinted unit? CM confirmed that it will be double glazed but not tinted, and this will be clear. BZ commented that the joints of the two sheets of double glazed units can become a real problem if using black silicone as it highlights the joints and creates an undesirable detail.
- PM asked if the walls finish below the beams, with CM confirming yes, and this is actually stone in this location with potential for a green wall in this area as well.

Summary

- PM indicated reluctance to sign off on the change to the façade fluting design as this is considered a lesser finish, being flat rather than curved, and the lack of modelling is an issue. These are big components sitting on top of a heritage building. The originally proposed fluting was to help break down the scale including introducing shadowing to contribute to this. This is a really important building with real significance and this change needs to be justified more, not just about the cost. The whole project was going to be a really significant development with a commitment to quality. PM wants to see more work on this including the detail as it can't be supported otherwise.
- BZ mentioned that the change needs to be explained from a design perspective and it can't just be a cost outcome. PM commented that this project wasn't approved based on cost and that the DRP role is design, not cost managers.
- PM mentioned that the DRP appreciate the substation proposal as this seems a sensible solution.
- BZ commented that everything the design team has done has been really exemplary however the façade design changes have not been fully considered and resolved and the DRP needs further detail.
- PM said that anything presented to the DRP needs to show how the window system works with the design changes presented, as this represents consistency and the DRP need to understand that.
- BZ notes the intention to make the internal courtyard beautiful as well. Lining up the mullions and removing the back panels is a good comment from PM and should be further investigated.
- PM mentioned there isn't a major problem with the lift panelling as it can be seen how this works, but it needs to tie in with the broader design. BZ confirmed agreement with this position.
- PM recalled a lot of debate around the courtyard roof when the material changed from steel as it was going to be as light as possible, then it was changed to pre-cast concrete, and now it has changed again. The DRP need to sign off on these changes.
- BZ reiterated the need to watch where the double-glazing panels join together as silicon isn't the only solution. BZ considers that the connection needs to be improved as otherwise it would be seen as quite a dark black line of the silicon. There may be a need to express it with metal or similar.
- BZ commented that the DDA access was really well thought through, no problem with that.
- PM also commented that the bigger guest rooms makes the design much better all better and there is no problem with that.
- CM commented that the design has adjusted the mullions for the guest rooms to suit the larger areas and wet areas are not against the glass rather have been pulled away. BZ queried if this is a clear glass, and CM confirmed yes.
- PM had a final comment about the rooftop extension at the top of the building in terms of blinds, where if a black blind is used, then the extension drops back, but if it is a white blind used, then it becomes a solid white wall in appearance. A concern is that the extension will then look like a white box (southern side of the building). BZ added that the blinds shouldn't be black rather at the very most an off-white colour. PM then finished with if you imagine 3-4 rooms occupied at a time, half the elevation is white, it still looks like a white box but also like a set of teeth and this isn't the desired appearance. This only relates to the outside colour of the blind and is more of a fabric selection issue.

Meeting adjourned approximately 10.45am.

The Design Review Panel issued a separate advice sheet summarising its recommendations.

Signed:



Brian Zulaikha



Kerry Clare

Peter Mould