

<b>Date</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018
<b>Time</b>	11.00am-1.00pm
<b>Location</b>	Hassell Offices

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
Panel: Lee Hillam, GANSW (LH) Kim Crestani, City of Parramatta Council Architect (KC) Tony Caro (TC)	Panel: Cameron Sargent, Team Leader, DPE (CS) Josh French, Director Park Development & Strategy, PPT (JF) Guy Pinkerton (GP) Parramatta City Council
Observing: Stephanie Licciardo, PPT	
Proponent: Glenn Scott, HASSELL (GS) Laura Vallentine, HASSELL (LV) Will , HASSELL Lewis Glynn, APP (LG) Jason Perica, Perica & Assoc Urban Planning (JP)	

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Item</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Overview</b> This Design Review Panel will address the issues raised in DRP 02.
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Proponent Presentation</b></p> <p><b>Hotel Consultant recommendations</b> Hassell presented work done by the hotel consultants to confirm size and arrangements of rooms. The design and layout of rooms may be simplified, to still allow flexibility of layout to meet market demands, without so many options. The layout at the end rooms will be important, to give effect to the intention to create an engaging façade to the east and west elevations.</p> <p><b>Changes to proposal</b> The design has developed to incorporate a larger functions room on the roof of the podium. This creates a third level to the podium, but will be detailed to appear as a pavilion on the roof terrace. The additional bulk on the podium from the expanded function room needed greater attention and detailing. The intention of proportional respect with vertical building elements was understood and supported, although the scheme requires further refinement. The perimeter terrace areas around the function spaces may need weather protection, although the large protected outdoor area was noted. This addition to the proposal must be designed sensitively to;</p>

Item No.	Item
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not add perceived bulk to the podium, therefore materiality and detailing should be different to the podium below.</li><li>• Appear as a pavilion on the roof terrace.</li><li>• Avoid appearing as an element added later. The design should be integrated with the look and feel of the building as a whole.</li></ul> <p>The planting on the roof of the podium should not compromise internal functionality of the function spaces though excessive weight requiring column support within the spaces. Substantial planting on the green roof for hotel rooms may be less critical given the park outlook. Perimeter planting is encouraged.</p> <p>A pedestrian bridge connecting the hotel to the leagues club has been added at the first floor. This is supported by the Panel, who also suggested that the bridge provides opportunities for permanent art installation, projections, celebratory signage or decoration as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Ground floor re-design</b></p> <p>Rearrangement of the ground floor has allowed a better position for the loading dock and a foyer space that addresses both the north and east sides of the building.</p> <p>The changes to the ground floor layout were generally supported by the Panel.</p> <p>The Panel suggested removing the kitchen and toilet functions from between the café and main foyer space as this was creating a space too tight for large groups. These functions could be moved to between the café and the pool, which was seen as a less important visual connection.</p> <p>Some pinch points and visibility problems exist with the current pool layout, which can be amended by the above also.</p> <p><b>Façade Development</b></p> <p>The façade proposal as shown was supported.</p> <p>The idea of anchoring of the end walls by a more solid elements which were visually permeable and changing in nature through the day and night was understood (with a glass reinforced concrete system (GRC), alike “fish gills”). However, the visual effect externally and internally may be too solid. (see note about room planning)</p> <p><b>Public Domain Strategy</b></p> <p>The Panel supports vehicular access to the hotel from the southern access road on the adjoining Stadium site, and the overall approach to the retention of the Lemon Scented gum and priority to pedestrian movement as far as possible. The need to resolve the public domain and southern road (on the adjoining Stadium site) was very important and efforts to resolve this between Parramatta Park Trust, Venues NSW, INSW and the Club were encouraged.</p> <p>The public domain and pedestrian permeability of the wider precinct seemed compromised by the massing of the Stage 1 building envelope to the south on the adjoining Stadium site. This was beyond the scope of the proposal and the terms of reference of the Panel, although raised as an important wider consideration. Any efforts to break this massing would assist north-south pedestrian movements and this should be considered in a future Stage 2 DA.</p>

Item No.	Item
3.	<b>DRP Questions + Proponent Responses</b>
4.	<b>DRP General Comments</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The proposed height and skyline articulation is commended and supported.</li><li>2. The development of a hotel in this location is also supported and elements such as the training pool, gym and roof top bar are all seen as positive attributes.</li><li>3. Generally the proposal is developing well and has the support of the panel to proceed to the DA stage. The Department of Planning reserve the right to have this project seen by the State Design Review Panel at their request.</li><li>4. All concerns of the DRP as raised through the process of review have been adequately addressed.</li><li>5. Development of the design of the function room on the roof terrace can be resolved by the architects in line with the criteria above.</li></ol>
5.	<b>Actions</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. No actions are required, and no further DRP meetings are necessary. The proponent may request further DRP meetings should they require it.</li></ol>