

**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:** Meeting 1/2: Concept Design Presentation  
**Location:** Rozelle Village Information Centre, Rozelle  
**Time:** 11.45am  
**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** Concept Design Presentation

---

A power point presentation was given by FS and A4 record copy provided to the panelist.

## **2.0 CONCEPT DESIGN**

This section references the Concept Design presentation prepared by Stanisic Associates attached at **Attachment A**. Each sub-heading references a corresponding section of the presentation slides.

### **2.1 Location and Site**

- FS highlighted key attributes of the site:  
Prominent site located on a ridge, adjacency to Victoria Road, 360 degree views, highpoint at the intersection of Victoria Road + Darling Street, RL 40.00 AHD, 9m fall on Victoria Road and 6m fall on Waterloo Street, within Rozelle main street shops
- FS tabled development brief.
- KM commented that the DGRs are silent on FSR. FS noted that DGR 2 requires that an EA addresses built form, height and FSR. KM commented that the FSR for the site would need to be considered by a merit based assessment.
- KM questioned whether there was a mix for the site. IW confirmed that the current mix is 80% 2B units. FS added that the mix would be post-GFC and would also include compact 2B, 1B and dual key units..
- HL/ TC questioned what the average size of a 2B unit would be. FS confirmed that the target is 75sqm for 2B units with 2 bathrooms.
- TC requested that consideration is given to expand upon urban design in the development brief.
- HL commented that the development has a regional role and was a destination for broader community and needs to be considered at a regional scale as well as at a local scale.
- TC questioned what public spaces were needed in Rozelle. FS confirmed that the concept is to create a pedestrian environment that is an expansion of the existing public spaces – not additional public space.
- IW commented that there has been some discussions about an overhead bridge across Victoria Road. TC commented that an overhead bridge would provide better access across Victoria Road and connect the broader context including Iron Cove down to the foreshore. TC requested that a study of pedestrian desire lines around the site is undertaken to identify whether a fine grain is necessary. FS replied that visual and physical permeability were desirable.
- HL questioned the population for the site. FS confirmed that the population is approx 1000 people. HL commented that with a population of this size, the ground plane would need to be well orchestrated.
- FS commented that a precedent illustrating the passageway and light court concept is QV2 in Melbourne, not Westfield's Bondi Junction.
- FS indicated that there is no green star tool available for a mixed use development of this type and that Cundall has been engaged to provide advice for this project and to develop a custom tool.
- FS confirmed that 2 additional sites had been purchased by the Rozelle Village Pty Ltd since the project had been declared a state significant site, with a total area of 438sqm. FS indicated that these additional sites were strategic sites, to assist in resolving traffic and access issues highlighted in the JRPP refusal.

## **2.2 Building Mass**

- FS tabled two building mass options for the site:
  - two towers/ flat top podium
  - single tower/ stepped podium
- HL questioned the size of a footprint of the two towers on the flat top podium option. FS commented that each tower has approximately 900sqm, totaling 1800sqm per floor.
- FS highlighted that the two towers on flat top podium option did not adjust to the street interface and was subsequently disconnected from the street.
- KM commented that the two tower/ flat top podium option would struggle to meet SEPP 65 requirements.
- FS commented that two tower/ flat top podium did not appear to have a key urban strategy or key shaping idea.
- TC commented that the two towers/ flat top podium option was not iconic ridge architecture.
- TC commented that two offset towers were good for visual privacy but not for SEPP 65 compliance.
- FS commented that the two tower/ flat top podium option presented a long street wall approximately 100m long.
- HL commented that it would be difficult to achieve a passively designed residential building if it was located adjacent to Victoria Road.

## **2.3 Building Form**

- FS presented a single residential tower/ stepped podium building form for the site focusing on design constraints, tower comparisons, tower concepts, siting options, SEPP 65 amenity, façade concepts and ESD strategy.
- KM questioned how the proposition relates to the existing and future context.
- KM commented that a podium with an equivalent 6 residential storeys could be supported along Victoria Road as long as it has an appropriate interface with the street when consideration is given to the existing and future context.
- KM requested that further consideration is given to sites to the west of Waterloo Street and whether they will remain as residential dwellings or whether they will change over time to mediate between residential dwellings and the Rozelle Village site.
- KM commented that intuitively, the podium should step with the topography and that it would be better to locate height at the centre of the site, rather than at its edges – although he did not support a 'wedding cake'
- TC questioned whether it would be more beneficial to have a higher tower to remove mass from the podium.
- HL commented that a single tower would have a fast moving shadow and if it is accepted that a single tower is the best approach, the height to slenderness ratio is very important and a tower should be done convincingly. HL added that a taller tower may deliver a better slenderness ratio.
- KM commented that his instinct is that the two elements of the tower should have clearly different heights and be expressed differently.
- KM commented that the single tower/ stepped form was a better approach than a two tower/ flat top podium option and is generally endorsed by the panel.
- TC questioned why the FSR for the site is 7:1 rather than 3.9:1.
- KM requested that further consideration be given to the key issues of scale transition, overshadowing and traffic.
- HL commented that the lack of a metro could potentially be offset by foot traffic and buses.
- KM commented that the shift from two towers. flat top podium to a single tower/ stepped podium is obvious and has many positive attributes.

## **2.4 Fabric + Connection (Podium Form)**

- FS presented a stepped podium form for the site with light courts and passageways, focusing on design constraints, light courts and passages.
- KM requested that further consideration is given to the movement networks locally around the site.

## **2.5 Façade Concepts**

- FS presented façade studies for tower showing high performance, coated glass panels in curtain wall with white and grey blue glass.

## **2.6 ESD Strategy**

- FS presented ESD strategy with 5/6 green star strategy and low carbon footprint emphasis.
- FS presented ideas for passive design particularly bio-filtration and cross ventilation.

## **2.7 Issues Summary**

Panel requested that the following issues be addressed.

1. Further consideration is given to local pedestrian movement networks and desire lines.
2. A study is prepared that assesses the potential overshadowing impacts on surrounding residential properties.
3. Further justification is given to support the rationale for the development capacity for the site.
4. Further consideration is given to a stepped and broken podium along Victoria Road that responds to the falls and fine grain pedestrian movement network.
5. Additional information is provided that assesses the traffic impacts, particularly on Waterloo Street.
6. Further consideration is given to the existing and future context on adjoining sites to the west and Victoria Road corridor.
7. Studies to differentiate the two elements of the towers by greater difference in their height.
8. information on existing Leichardt LEP/ draft LEP planning standards for proposed and adjoining sites – zoning, FSR, height and heritage

**End of meeting 1.20pm**

**Next meeting: Thursday 10 November, 8.00am to 9.30am**