



PEMULWUY DEVELOPMENT (Precinct 3) – Design Review Panel Meeting No.4

DATE: 07/03/2017

TIME/LOCATION: 3.00-5.00PM, Department of Planning & Environment – L30 (Lilli Pilly Room), 320 Pitt St, Sydney

APOLOGIES: Dillon Kombumerri (Olivia Hyde 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"/>
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"/>
Alisi Tutuila	AT	Chair AHC Board of Directors	9319 1824 info@ahc.org.au	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Greg Colbran	GC	Deicorp	8665-4100	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

			gcolbran@deicorp.com.au	
Nick Turner	NT	Turner - Director	8668-0000 nturner@turnerstudio.com.au	☒
Dan Szwaj	DS	Turner – Design Team	8668-0000 dszwaj@turnerstudio.com.au	☒
Ingrid Shi	IS	Turner – Project Architect	8668 0000 ishi@turnerstudio.com.au	☒

MINUTES

ITEM	Action/Outcome	Date
4.1 Welcome		
4.1.1	Noted that Dillon Kombumerri had sent notes to panel following previous minutes indicating that consultation with Aboriginal cultural advisers yet to occur.	
4.1.2	Noted that the design team request an option for 2 further DRP meetings subsequent to this meeting and the panel agreed.	
4.1.3	Disclaimer: the panel are not an approval body for this or any other proposal. It is also noted that no member of this panel or the Office of the Government Architect were 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 SEARs should not be taken to be indicative of likely approval.	
4.1.4	Olivia Hyde attended for Dillon Kombumerri	
4.2 Previous business arising		
1.7.10	<i>Presentation to City of Sydney ATSI Advisory Panel 1/3/2017 to be further considered</i> – note that point 1.7.10 is struck from DRP1 minutes, however point 2.4.22 is retained (further to Dillon Kombumerri's email notes). The panel note that the basis of an integrated public art strategy is in place and supported.	
4.3 Design Presentation		

4.3.1	Design development of project since DRP3 presented to DRP.	
4.4 Panel Discussion/Recommendations		
4.4.1	The panel notes that floor to floor efficiencies of the current preferred scheme allow 18 floors to be achieved with minor adjustment to the 16 levels indicated in the SEARs reference scheme. However, the panel also anticipates that the next Review presentation will include elevational drawings that show AHD or RL measurements rather than number of levels to clearly demonstrate the variation from the SEARs scheme.	
4.4.2	Whilst the preferred scheme is supported in principle as it provides enhanced amenity and is consistent with the yield of the SEARs, the Panel remains of the opinion that the resulting built form when viewed from the east and west requires further design development to reduce its visual bulk. The panel reiterates the need to further explore means to break up and vary the mass and profile of the east and west elevations.	
4.4.3	Overall, the panel supports the response to the scale of Eveleigh Street, and recommends that the design of the 2 and 3 storey terraces requires further development to demonstrate a clearer relationship to the existing character of the street.	
4.4.4	Acknowledging that the design team's current preferred option is broadly consistent with the maximum height of the SEARs scheme, the panel nevertheless encourage further exploration of Option 2 to determine if additional height could offer demonstrable benefits to residential and public realm amenity as well as an improved overall urban response. This would not appear to require significant revision of floor planning to explore modified built form profiles.	
4.4.5	The panel supports the plan layouts and resulting benefits to residents by way of improved internal amenity over that provided by the SEAR's scheme. These benefits must be clearly identified and argued as part of the supporting documentation for any proposed adjustment to the SEAR's envelope. The Panel has requested a presentation of the justification that should include a comparison of the amenity of the SEAR's scheme compared to that proposed.	
4.4.6	The panel reiterates that to assist in justification of any proposed departures from the SEARs envelope, comparative shadow diagrams for the current scheme should be presented at the next session.	
4.4.7	The panel recommends that the overall form and scale of the proposal should be further justified through provision of relevant precedent projects (such as Moore Park Gardens) that are similar in scale and form and will help to clarify the comparative height and character of the proposal as a combination of tower and slab typologies.	

4.4.8	The panel anticipates further information at the next session to understand the design intent and merits of the “meeting place”, as well as the overall approach to all public space – this information should include a contextual analysis of public domain showing how the proposal will integrate with the streetscape, focussing on the meeting place and demonstrating how the open space adjacent the art wall will function and whether it is accessible from the street (bearing in mind CPTED principles).	
4.4.9	Overall the panel offers qualified support for the current design direction, acknowledging that the current scheme represents a broad consistency with the SEARs envelope. However, the panel reiterates it’s previous recommendation that further work is required to mitigate the visual bulk of the east and west elevations, and that the proposed reduction in yield/ FSR may be necessary in achieving an acceptable design outcome. The panel also recommends that the benefits of the preferred scheme must be carefully analysed against the SEARs reference scheme in order to justify the proposed height and form.	

Distribution: All Present