

06 October 2017

Design Review Panel 01  
Advice Summary

**Distribution:**

Alex Kibble (TKD)  
Georgia White (Savills)  
Cameron Lang (DET)  
Peter Mould (Panel)  
Paul Berkemeier (Panel)  
Peter McManus (DPE)

ALEXANDRIA PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL  
DESIGN REVIEW 01 – 28 SEPT '17,  
320 Pitt St, Sydney (Department of Planning and Environment)

CHAIR – Olivia Hyde (proxy for Dillon Kombumerri)  
PANEL MEMBERS – Paul Berkemeier, Peter Mould  
DESIGN ADVISOR – Diana Snape  
SSD ASSESSMENT OFFICER – Peter McManus

The following summary is a record of the advice provided to the proponent team for the above project. As part of the agreed alternative design excellence process, this is the first design review session undertaken for this proposal.

The Panel anticipates that presentations at future review sessions will address the issues outlined below. It is recommended that a representative from Urbis and from the Department of Education should attend the next Review session. Dates for future review sessions are yet to be confirmed.

Advice summary endorsed by the Chair:



Olivia Hyde  
Director of Design Excellence

Government Architect  
New South Wales  
L24, 320 Pitt Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect  
@planning.nsw.gov.au  
T +61 (02)9860 1464

governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au

Overall, the Panel supports the ambition of the proposal to redevelop the school on this site to better accommodate the needs of the surrounding community. The Panel supports the current direction of the proposal and that the project concept has been determined through consultation. The panel also notes the long history of involvement of the local Aboriginal community in determining the character of the school and the K-12 structure, as well as opportunities for sharing school infrastructure with the community.

The Panel acknowledges that the scheme as presented is in the early stages of concept design and anticipates further review of the following issues with the provision of more developed drawings:

- Fence height, design and visual permeability (particularly how this relates to a developed landscape approach as well as safety)
- The setbacks and heights of the school relative to adjacent sites especially in terms of potential overlooking (in relation to the primary school boundary and rooftop; a future review should address strategies to protect students should future adjacent development result in overlooking)
- Acoustics and noise level management strategy particularly as it relates to out of hours uses that may impact current or future neighbours
- Through site section drawings should identify flooding levels as well as current and anticipated adjacent building heights to demonstrate how the design is responding to current and anticipated context
- Further information is required for the Panel to evaluate and comment on the relative success of internal planning in terms of circulation spaces and wayfinding logic.

The Panel notes that the architectural expression and material palette are yet to be developed, and as such have no comment on this issue but anticipate that it will be subject to a future review including the following issues:

- Further information about the design and reasoning for screening on the east façade
- Environmental control principles and where they are being addressed (the Panel supports the intent to provide natural ventilation for classrooms and circulation spaces)

The Panel note that this project presents an opportunity to provide a high quality and generous landscape contribution to the area, and support the ongoing consultation with a landscape architect and Aboriginal landscape consultant. They anticipate further information to demonstrate an integrated, precinct scale approach to landscape architecture (including whole-of-school grounds, the park and immediate surrounds) which demonstrates holistic approach to:

- Safety and security (in particular how out of hours use of school infrastructure will be accessed and managed; including strategies to integrate fencing and secure lines into the landscape approach)

- Wayfinding (see above note in relation to overall circulation approach; in principle, the Panel support the proposed site organization provided that successful resolution of wayfinding is achieved)
- Sense of address (further detail as to arrival sequence and relationship to context)
- Parking and traffic modelling and how this is informing the approach to site organization (including anticipated pedestrian modeling; the panel note this information should inform and strengthen any proposal to close Park Street, which the Panel would support, in principal); this should also support service access design

Anticipating increasing population numbers in this area, the Panel note that the potential for adaptability and future growth in capacity is limited by the current school population, site area, and requirement to provide 10msq of open space per student. The panel also notes that the design team have indicated that structural principles have been applied which may provide the opportunity for vertical expansion and anticipate further information demonstrating this at the next review.

The Panel notes that the proposal to build up to 5 storeys is above the current allowable height limit on the site and anticipates further information from the DPE assessment team to clarify any likely implications. The panel also seeks clarification as to whether any envelope controls have been established over any adjacent sites in order to determine the appropriateness of the proposed heights from an urban design perspective.

The Panel request that future review presentations address how the project-specific principles have been applied and informed the architecture, in particular the principle of aboriginal identity (acknowledging the clear evidence that the school is inherently part of the identity of the local Aboriginal community).

The Panel notes that it is the intention of the Department to use a Design and Construct contract. In light of this information the Panel also requests a presentation of the design in relation to the cost plan with a focus on how design excellence will be retained through to construction.

24 October 2017

**Design Review Panel 01  
Advice Summary**

**Distribution:**

Alex Kibble (TKD)  
Georgia White (Savills)  
Cameron Lang (DET)  
Peter Mould (Panel)  
Paul Berkemeier (Panel)  
Peter McManus (DPE)  
Rod Stanton (DoE)

ALEXANDRIA PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL  
DESIGN REVIEW 01 – 13 OCTOBER, 2017,  
320 Pitt St, Sydney (Department of Planning and Environment)

CHAIR – Olivia Hyde (proxy for Dillon Kombumerri)  
PANEL MEMBERS – Paul Berkemeier, Peter Mould  
DESIGN ADVISOR – Diana Snape (absent)  
SSD ASSESSMENT OFFICER – Peter McManus (absent)

The following summary is a record of the advice provided to the proponent team for the above project. This is the second design review session undertaken for this proposal.

The Panel anticipates that presentations at future review sessions will address the issues outlined below. It is recommended that a representative from Urbis and from the Department of Education should attend all review sessions. Dates for the next review session is confirmed for Monday, November 6th.

The design team are encouraged to see the next DRP session as work in progress with a focus on design intent rather than presentation quality drawings.

Advice summary endorsed by the Chair:



Olivia Hyde  
Director of Design Excellence

Government Architect  
New South Wales  
L24, 320 Pitt Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect  
@planning.nsw.gov.au  
T +61 (02)9860 1464

governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au

Generally, it was the Panel's view that whilst many of the items noted in the first DRP advice letter were addressed to some extent, the drawings presented were not sufficiently resolved or detailed to enable a full or holistic understanding of the proposal and its impacts in regards to these issues, nor an assessment by the Panel of the schemes capacity to achieve Design Excellence. The Panel notes that it is a requirement of this Alternative Design Excellence process that the scheme achieves the support of the Panel in this regard.

More detailed drawings illustrating greater design resolution are required addressing the following issues:

- Circulation and wayfinding. Horizontal and vertical circulation, in terms of logic, capacity, architectural concept, spatial experience, security, out of hours access and sense of address.
- Architectural language. Drawings provided in regards to the architectural language of the proposal including the design and environmental performance of the screen were not considered to be sufficiently developed to enable review of design excellence by the Panel. The Panel requests annotated detail sections, 3D sketches and material samples. These should describe the materials and how they come together, including but not limited to the screen element and its interface with the façade, structure and other elements. These should support a clearly articulated conceptual design approach to materials and detailing.
- Design of fence and gates including roof top fencing. Provide detail on the height, materiality, visual permeability, integration with landscape design, planting and streetscape, and with the coordinated site wide response to circulation, wayfinding and after-hours access. To include typical details of new fences and gates and modifications to existing (where proposed).
- Integration of structure and plan. All columns are to be indicated on the plans along with fixed and loose furniture. In section, typical structure and services depths are also required, particularly for proposed long span spaces such as the gym.
- Impact of flooding levels on the interface of school buildings with the landscape, pathways and streets noting the potential for an integrated landscape / built edge response.

- Drawings provided on context. Current and future neighbours (current and potential future development), setbacks, heights and the proposed response to acoustics, overlooking etc. require further development and clarification for submission with the SSDA. Include impacts of roof top play areas and associated fencing and shade structures.
- Public art. A strategy for public art is required including commitment from DoE, program and budget.
- Landscape design. The Panel supports the landscape concept presented as a starting point. Include further detail to address integration issues noted in this letter. Visual connection from Park Road E/W across the site is supported. Increase shade to roof top areas.
- Traffic. Confirm modal split of students arriving / departing the school and identify design opportunities to increase non-car usage. Provide a precinct plan identifying current and potential future bike and pedestrian routes to bus stops, rail etc.
- Community use. The Panel supports the proposed community access to the school including pre-school, community centre, community garden, kitchen and sports facilities.
- An integrated precinct. The Panel support an integrated precinct approach to the design of the school grounds, Park Road and the park itself, including the potential future relocation of sports fields to support this, should the opportunity arise.
- Procurement. A decision on the delivery model has not yet been made. Panel to be kept updated. Confirmed that TKD will be retained as lead design consultant throughout the process. The Panel note that this is a requirement of the Alternative Design Excellence process.

08 November 2017

Design Review Panel 03  
Advice Summary

Distribution:

Alex Kibble (TKD)  
Georgia White (Savills)  
Cameron Lang (DET)  
Peter Mould (Panel)  
Paul Berkemeier (Panel)  
Peter McManus (DPE)  
Rod Stanton (DoE)

ALEXANDRIA PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL  
DESIGN REVIEW 03 – 06 November, 2017  
320 Pitt St, Sydney (Department of Planning and Environment)

CHAIR – Dillon Kombumeri  
PANEL MEMBERS – Paul Berkemeier, Peter Mould, Olivia Hyde  
DESIGN ADVISOR – Diana Snape  
SSD ASSESSMENT OFFICER – Peter McManus

The following summary is a record of the advice provided to the proponent team for the above project. This is the third design review session undertaken for this proposal.

The Panel anticipates that presentations at a future review session will address the issues outlined below. It is strongly recommended that a representative from Urbis and from the Department of Education should attend all review sessions. Dates for the next review session is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, November 22nd.

The Panel recommends ongoing review, as well as ongoing engagement of TKD as lead design architect, subsequent to lodgment to protect the design integrity of the proposal to ensure that the quality of the built outcome is commensurate with the significance of the site.

Advice summary endorsed by the Chair:

Dillon Kombumeri  
GANSW Principal Architect

Government Architect  
New South Wales  
L24, 320 Pitt Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect  
@planning.nsw.gov.au  
T +61 (02)9860 1464

[governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au](http://governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au)

Generally, many of the items noted in the first and second DRP advice letters were addressed to some extent and drawings have been provided with a greater level of detail. However, no identifiable changes have been made to the design in response to the Panel's comments. GA NSW reiterates that it is a requirement of this Alternative Design Excellence process that the scheme achieves the support of the Panel.

While the Panel supports the design approach of the proposal in principle, at this stage they are not able to endorse the scheme as having potential to achieve design excellence.

Acknowledging the early stage of design development there remain key issues to resolve or develop prior to lodgement in order to demonstrate the potential to achieve design excellence. These are detailed as follows:

**Circulation and wayfinding.**

- Successful resolution of hierarchy of internal planning & overall circulation, including horizontal and vertical circulation, in terms of logic, legibility, capacity, architectural concept, spatial experience, security, out of hours access and sense of address – note carried over.
- The Panel recommends further exploration of opportunities to optimize connections and interface between external and internal spaces, including rooftops

Overall, the proposed site organization is supported, but wayfinding and sense of address (especially high school) remains unclear

**Architectural language.**

- The Panel acknowledges the provision of detailed drawings and material sample board as requested. However, the current proposed approach is considered to be overly restrained and currently misses the opportunity to be more expressive of the richness of the school's community and cultural context.
- The Panel recommends that a greater richness of palette may help to manifest opportunities offered by the community consultation to date and potential artist collaborations.
- The Panel notes that further development and resolution of the proposed screen element is required to understand its likely form or performance as an integrated architectural element and its environmental performance.
- The Panel needs to further understand the impact of environmental mitigation measures (sun shading to east and west for example) on the building.

**Design of fence and gates including roof top fencing.**

- The Panel acknowledges provision of further detail as requested. However, a coordinated site wide response to circulation, wayfinding and after-hours access is still unclear.
- The Panel note that façade screen, roof-top fencing and perimeter fencing should read as integrated and coherent design elements.

- Roof top shade elements: further detail is required to demonstrate visual impact and coordination with other elements. Confirm the extent of shading required for early child care centre.
- The Panel strongly recommends the approach to screen and fencing should be resolved, and this approach be endorsed by DoE according to their security requirements, prior to lodgment

#### Contextual response.

- Current and potential future adjacent development, setbacks, heights and the proposed response to acoustics, overlooking etc. require further development and clarification. Include impacts of roof top play areas and associated fencing and shade structures – note carried over. Further development is required to demonstrate appropriate contextual response

#### Integration of structure and plan.

- The Panel acknowledges provision of further detail as requested and support the proposed approach.
- The Panel recommends further consideration of simplified room layouts to improve space usability and flexibility for future layout changes.

#### Flooding impacts

- The Panel acknowledges the provision of further detail and support the proposed integrated landscape / built edge response.

#### Public art

- The Panel supports the intent to integrate public art and note that a robust integrated public art strategy is required which includes commitment from DoE, program and budget.

#### Landscape design

- The Panel supports the landscape concept overall, noting that issues raised above will require further development of the landscape strategy (integrated fencing, rooftop open space design).

#### Traffic

- Note carried over – further information anticipated as part of EIS: confirm modal split of students arriving / departing the school and identify design opportunities to increase non-car usage. Provide a precinct plan identifying current and potential future bike and pedestrian routes to bus stops, rail etc.

23 November 2017

**Design Review Panel 04  
Advice Summary**

**Distribution:**

Alex Kibble (TKD)  
Anna Harris (TKD)  
Terry Denzil (Community)  
Rod Stanton (DoE)  
Georgia White (Savills)  
Alaine Ross (Urbis)  
Peter Mould (Panel)  
Paul Berkemeier (Panel)

ALEXANDRIA PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL  
DESIGN REVIEW 04 – 22 November, 2017  
320 Pitt St, Sydney (Department of Planning and Environment)

CHAIR – Dillon Kombumerri  
PANEL MEMBERS – Paul Berkemeier, Peter Mould

The following summary is a record of the advice provided to the proponent team for the above project. This is the fourth design review session undertaken for this proposal.

The Panel were satisfied TKD sufficiently addressed previous issues raised and now endorse the scheme as having the potential to achieve Design Excellence.

It is reiterated that the Panel recommends ongoing review, as well as ongoing engagement of TKD as lead design architect, subsequent to lodgment to protect the design integrity of the proposal to ensure that the quality of the built outcome is commensurate with the significance of the site.

Advice summary endorsed by the Chair:



Dillon Kombumerri  
GANSW Principal Architect

Generally, all items noted in the third DRP advice letter were addressed to varying extent and drawings were provided with a greater level of detail. This included significant and identifiable changes to the design in response to the Panel's comments.

Acknowledging the early stage of design development, key issues which must continue to be developed in order to achieve design excellence detailed as follows:

**Circulation and wayfinding.**

- Generally horizontal and vertical circulation is now more logical and legible, assisted by the increased use of colour.
- The high school has a new foyer and entry however the pinch point at corner of playing field presents a challenge to resolve. The Panel suggested refocusing the high school entry directly off the main gathering space where there is ground level covered protection readily available from overhanging accommodation above. This will be beneficial by providing an external waiting space for after-hours use of the Hall.
- The capacity of the three proposed stairs needs to be tested to determine if a further forth set of stairs would be required.
- Connections and interfaces between external and internal spaces (especially rooftops) is now better defined.

**Architectural language.**

- The current proposed approach is now considered to be more expressive of the richness of the school's community and cultural context.
- The Panel supports the colour material palette proposed and encourages the design team to maximise involvement of local artists.
- The Panel reiterates that further development and resolution of the proposed screen element is required to understand its likely form or performance as an integrated architectural element, and its environmental impacts.
- The Panel believes there should be a greater resolution of environmental initiatives (sun shading, wind breaks, etc) and their impact on the architectural resolution of the building generally.

**Design of fence and gates including roof top fencing.**

- The Panel acknowledges the fencing strategy is clear and the design has improved.
- The Panel notes that the façade screen, roof-top fencing and perimeter fencing are now integrated with building design elements.
- Roof top shade elements were shown to demonstrate minimal visual impact for neighbours whilst maintaining visual privacy for school students. The Panel supports the folding of the screen element to help shading of the roof areas.

Contextual response.

- Current and potential future adjacent development, setbacks, heights and the proposed response to acoustics, overlooking etc. now demonstrate contextual response.

Integration of structure and plan.

- The Panel acknowledge provision of further detail as requested and support the proposed approach.

Flooding impacts

- The Panel acknowledges the provision of further detail and support the proposed integrated landscape / built edge response.

Public art

- The Panel supports the intent to integrate public art and note that a robust integrated public art strategy is required which includes commitment from DoE, program and budget.

Landscape design

- The Panel supports the detailed development of landscape concept overall, noting that issues raised above will require further development of the landscape strategy (integrated fencing, rooftop open space design).

Traffic

- The Panel notes the design team have investigated modal split of students arriving / departing the school, and reiterate that design opportunities should be proposed to increase non-car usage.
- It was also noted that a precinct plan was shown identifying current and potential future bike and pedestrian routes to bus stops, rail etc.

Further to this the Panel supports the proposed closure of Park Road to improve connection between the school and adjacent public park, and the potential to adjust the location of the playing fields to allow the school site to be less constrained.