

**SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK AUTHORITY
DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
ADVICE SHEET**

Project	3.1 – Site 68 – ecove Development
Presentation / Review Date	21 August 2014
Panel Present	Peter Poulet Bill Tsakalos Caroline Pidcock Prof Linda Corkery Prof Peter Webber Garry Fielding Darren Troy
COI Declaration	None
Also Present	David Martin - SOPA Ben Woods - SOPA
Presenters	Guy Lake - Bates Smart Mathieu Le Sueur - Bates Smart Mike Horne - Turf Design Studio Samantha Wilson - Urbis Bassam Aflak - ecove
Documents made available	Power Point Presentation and hard copy presentations
Inherited decisions	N/A
Previous relevant SOPA Advice	Nil
General Observations/ Overall Comment	<p>Guy Lake provided an outline of the proposal to date, identifying that changes to the design had occurred in response to the Jury's comments. He noted that some of the points are still a work in progress.</p> <p>The DRP noted the ongoing development of the design and advised the proponent should be commended for responding so positively to the recommendations of the Jury.</p>
Positives	<p>The DRP supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The additional slot to each level and the increase in their usable size. It was also suggested that balconies or window seats be provided on the levels above to act as casual meeting spaces on all levels. The increased activation of the ground floor which includes the addition of a re-oriented lobby/foyer, bicycle storage, meeting rooms and a Café. It was however suggested that the café should be pushed further around to provide passive surveillance over the foyer area as well as maximising views to Bicentennial Park. Generally it was felt that 'Option 2' of the various options for vehicular access at ground level provided the best resolution. The slight inflection of the bicycle/pedestrian pathway provided separation from vehicles but did not compromise movement through the site. Further refinement of an all weather drop off should be considered, and tested in combination with wind modelling; an extended simple glazed cover might be a solution to both issues, and it is important to ensure that there is protection from wind impacts at the base of the building
Issues	<p>The DRP had the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel felt that garden walls to each slot may not necessarily be achievable/sustainable, with perhaps the use of large planting (statement tree) on the base of the slot being

**SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK AUTHORITY
DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
ADVICE SHEET**

	<p>worthy of consideration. Consideration to other means of adding warmth to these areas should also be explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel did not feel it was their place to resolve the colour pallet for the façade. It was however noted that the addition of the aluminium was not ideal and provided a loss of materiality. Similarly the elementary approach to the use of colour did not seem appropriate. The Panel suggested the façade should be subtle as residential buildings should not be iconic in this precinct, but an element of playfulness should also be provided to ensure it does not have a 'commercial' appearance. It was noted that there are a number of highly exposed balconies, particularly on corners in relation to wind, and privacy is an issue for lower level balconies. Appropriate treatment should be provided in response. Garbage management within the building needs to be well thought out and resolved for ease of use by residents. Similarly, loading facilities for removalist vehicles, furniture deliveries etc. need to be provided with easy access to the building and lift. Consideration to travel paths within the building should occur.
Recommended Supporting Action	<p>The DRP recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further refinement/treatment of the slots should be undertaken. Continued resolution of the façade and other issues raised above.
Circulation of Advice	SOPA, proponents

Procedural note – The proponent noted the tight timeframe that they had for lodgement of the DA and requested the outstanding matters be resolved through the DA process. In order to maximise the advice from the Panel it was agreed that the proponent would submit drawings to the Panel to be distributed for comments out of session. This would enable a further review of the proposal prior to lodgement.