

**Meeting Minutes - Peer Review Process: Architecture Design Review Panel**  
**Rozelle Village**  
**Redevelopment of Balmain Leagues Club - Victoria Road, Waterloo Street and Darling Street, Rozelle**  
**Final issue: 111111**

---

**Date:** 28 October 2011  
**Meeting No:** Initiation Briefing Meeting, and Site Visit  
**Location:** Rozelle Village Information Centre, Rozelle  
**Time:** 11.00am  
**Attendees:**  
***Panel Members***  
Ken Maher (KM) – Chairman, Hassell  
Helen Lochhead (HL) - NSW Deputy Government Architect  
Tony Caro (TC) – Director, Tony Caro Architects  
***Property Developers***  
Alex Yasumoto (AY) - Rozelle Village Pty Ltd  
Ian Wright (IW) - Rozelle Village Pty Ltd  
***Architects***  
Frank Stanisic (FS) - Stanisic Associates  
Jason Nowosad (JN) - Stanisic Associates (scribe)  
**Apologies:** None  
**Attachments** Briefing Package in A4 ring binder

---

A Briefing Package was previously provided to all Panel Members comprising Major Project Application, Preliminary EA Report (Project Description), Appendix A: Quantity Surveyor's Report, Appendix B: Development Capacity Study, Pear Supplemental A (Supplemental A), Major Project Declaration, DGRs, Location Aerial, Site Aerial, Survey, NSW DP&I Letter, Peer Review Terms of Reference, Proponent's Covering Letter to ARAP Panelists

## **1.0 INITIATION, BRIEFING AND SITE VISIT**

- FS provided a brief overview of the contents of the Briefing Package and answered questions.
- FS + IW provided a brief overview of the project's recent history:
  - 07 July 2010: JRPP Application rejected (3 tower + large public square option)
  - Jan 2011: Request for project to be declared as State Significant
  - 15 Feb 2011: Project declared to be Part 3A
  - 05 April 2011: DGRs issued
  - August 2011: SAA was engaged to comment on outline Concept Plan that accompanied Request for Declaration
  - August 2011: meeting with the DP+I (DG and Deputy DG) to confirm that there was flexibility in the DGRs to examine alternative building forms for the site. DG confirmed that a Peer Review Process with an Architectural Design Review Panel would be appropriate to review alternative building forms.
- FS confirmed that the development brief was for 50,000 - 60,000sqm GFA (p.14 PEAR) and diversity of uses - based on Development Capacity Study by Inspire. IW confirmed a commitment to returning the Balmain Tigers Leagues Club to the site.
- FS indicated that the building form was not prescribed anywhere in the DGRs and that it would need to be derived from urban design, architectural and development principles.
- FS indicated that they canvassed a single tower/stepped podium option in a preliminary presentation to the DP&I.
- FS confirmed Agenda for Concept Design presentation.
- FS commented that of the total floor space, approximately 50% will be residential. TC commented that the residential density for this site would be in the order of 3.5:1.
- FS provided a brief overview of the Peer Review Panel's Terms of Reference.
- FS commented that the focus of the panel was on architectural, built form, ESD and amenity issues identified in the DGRs.
- KM questioned whether the panel would also comment on SEPP 65. FS confirmed that the panel should also comment on SEPP 65.
- TC questioned whether the final panel report would form part of the EA submission to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. FS confirmed that the report would be considered by the project team and addressed in the EA submission.

**HL ARRIVED 11.25am**

- KM questioned whether FSR was defined in the DGRs. FS confirmed that the Development Capacity Study, submitted as part of the PEAR concluded that an FSR of 9.6:1 would be feasible for this site. FS noted that amount of floor space for the site needed to be tested to confirm whether this FSR would be suitable and achievable.
- HL questioned what the FSR was in the JRPP submission. IW confirmed that the floor space was 3.96:1, but stressed that this submission was quite different to what was proposed and primarily comprised residential uses.
- IW confirmed that the key issues with the three tower/large public square (JRPP) concept that needed to be addressed were:  
traffic, overshadowing and residential amenity.
- IW noted that two additional strategic sites had been purchased since the declaration had been given, in order to facilitate better access to the site.
- KM requested the existing planning controls for the site as well as previous submissions in order to assess traffic and yield for the site.
- FS commented that the DGRs require that there is consideration for a Metro adjacent to the site and to allow for and accommodate a rail corridor.
- IW noted that the site specific LEP and DCP for the site had recently been revoked by Leichhardt Council.
- HL commented that the ground had changed for this project:
  - the site was declared a state significant project.
  - SAA was engaged to consider other concepts for the site.
  - additional sites were purchased that unlocked the site and facilitated better access that would address the short comings of previous submissions
- TC noted that FSR may not have been a reason for refusal.
- KM stressed that it was the PRP was to consider the proposal based upon merit as outlined in the terms of reference.
- IW commented that the JRPP proposition was a compromised position and would have been a missed opportunity if it had been approved.
- KM questioned the existing planning controls for the remainder of the block. FS confirmed that the rest of the block has a Business Zoning and the buildings adjacent to Darling Street were within a Conservation Area and it was not expected that these buildings would change significantly in the future.
- HL questioned the ownership patterns for surrounding sites. IW confirmed that at the intersection of Darling Street + Victoria Road a site was owner by Sydney Metro, the remainder were individual owners.
- SAA, IW and AS accompanied KM, HL + TC on a walk around the entire perimeter of the site, with guide site plans.

**End of meeting 11.45am**