

PEMULWUY DEVELOPMENT (Precinct 3) – Design Review Panel Meeting No.6

DATE: 10/04/2017

TIME/LOCATION: 3.00pm to 5.00pm, Department of Planning & Environment – L24 (Blue Gum Room), 320 Pitt St, Sydney

APOLOGIES: Diana Snape (George Savoulis proxy panel member)

MINUTES BY: **Notes:** Diana Snape (OGA) **Final Report:** Olivia Hyde

PRESENT:

Name	Ab.	Organisation	Contact	P
Kim CRESTANI	KC	Order Architects DRP Chair	9016-5526 kim@orderarchitects.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tony Caro	TC	Tony Caro Architects DRP Member	0413 154533 tony@tonycaroarchitecture.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Olivia Hyde	OH	Office of the Government Architect	Olivia.hyde@planning.nsw.gov.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
George Savoulis	GS	Office of the Government Architect	george.savoulis@planning.nsw.gov.au	
Michael Mundine	MM	CEO Aboriginal Housing Company	9319 1824 ceo@ahc.org.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lani Tuitavake	LT	GM - Aboriginal Housing Company	9319 1824 info@ahc.org.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Greg Colbran	GC	Deicorp	8665-4100 gcolbran@deicorp.com.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Nick Turner	NT	Turner - Director	8668-0000 nturner@turnerstudio.com.au	☒
Dan Szwaj	DS	Turner – Design Team	8668-0000 dszwaj@turnerstudio.com.au	☒
Georgia Jezeph	GJ	Scott Carver – Design Team	Georgia Jezeph <georgiaj@scottcarver.com.au>	

MINUTES

ITEM	Action/Outcome	Date
5.1 Welcome		
5.1.1	The Panel acknowledged this would not be the last review session.	
5.1.2	Additional review session (#7) to occur a week prior to submission. Date to be advised by Turner Studio.	
5.1.3	Disclaimer: the panel are not an approval body for this or any other proposal. No member of this panel or the Office of the Government Architect was consulted in the development or analysis of the SEARs reference scheme for this site. Consequently, it should be understood that any support given by the panel for design direction that includes departure from the SEARs should not be taken to be indicative of likely approval.	
5.1.4	George Savoulis attended for Diana Snape	
5.2 Previous business arising		
5.3 Design Presentation		
5.3.1	Design development of project presented to DRP, including presentation of landscape concept by Scott Carver team.	
5.4 Panel Discussion/Recommendations		
5.4.1	The presentations today were a great development since the last meeting.	
5.4.2	DPRM6 to be the final review and the scheme good to submit pending the following suggestions.	

5.4.3	Secondary (student) entry to building. Footpath along Everleigh street is narrow. Provide a pause point at the entry via a recess in the glazing that currently sits flush with the site boundary. Suggest a seat and planting to soften the entry and provide additional footpath circulation space.	
5.4.4	<p>Facade. The façade design along the low-rise section of the building remains too horizontal in emphasis. Further articulation and emphasis of the vertical is required to meet the stated design objective of relating to the finer grain and scale of the adjacent terrace housing.</p> <p>Suggest a green ‘eyebrow’ along the roof edge of the low rise to soften edges.</p> <p>The low rise is to have its own architectural language.</p> <p>Ensure the terracotta and proposed tile cladding is part of the cost plans.</p>	
5.4.5	View from Caroline Street – further emphasis of the main entry on axis with Caroline Street is recommended.	
5.4.6	Improve the connection between the street / public open space and the ‘family room’ on the ground floor. This ‘edge’ to be investigated.	
5.4.7	<p>Facade materials. The grey patchwork façade was felt to be too busy. This element of the façade could read as a more neutral piece, providing a point of calm and contrast with the busier terracotta façade elements.</p> <p>Suggest simplification of the grey façade i.e. via vertical articulation only, one colour/type with larger panel areas</p> <p>Consideration to be shown for the cleaning methods of the façade.</p>	
5.4.8	Architectural Presentation: add ‘blue outline’ of proposed building to precedent examples.	
5.4.9	The pedestrian access on the ground level is supported.	
5.4.10	Windows along railway line to be minimised and indicated on plans and elevations.	
5.4.11	SEARS dotted line to be introduced to plans and elevations as to indicate the change in movement / adjustment in diagram.	
5.4.12	In the architectural report, clearly argue the case for moving away from the SEAR’s envelope. I.e. improved cross ventilation, light to internal corridors, better amenity to shared spaces, etc.	

5.4.13	The landscape is improved, however to fully understand the scheme and to map out opportunities, Pedestrian Access Plans/Diagrams (i.e. ant trails) are required	
5.4.14	The materiality workshops with local artists in regards to the landscape to continue.	
5.4.15	Landscape. The Indigenous meaning of the spaces – and the connections between these through larger spaces is well done and supported.	
5.4.16	Consultation with Professor Michael Tawa to continue.	

Distribution: All Present