

## **S75W MODIFICATION PROPOSAL FOR STAGE A, SHEPHERDS BAY**

### **SUMMARY OF 4th DESIGN INTEGRITY PANEL (DIP) MEETING**

**Held on 6th of June 2018 at Cox Richardson offices**

#### **Attendees:**

- Gabrielle Morrish (GM) - DIP Member
- Olivia Hyde (OH) - DIP Member
- Chris Johnson (CJ) - DIP Member
- Gavin Carrier (GC)
- Kevin Nassif (KN)
- Steve Kennedy (SK)
- Joe Agius (JA)
- Vicente Castro (VC)
- Carlo Di Giulio (CD)

#### **Summary of Items Discussed**

1. JA introduced the amended scheme noting that the main change has been a reduction in height to 10 storeys and the introduction of serviced apartments to fill a void of available GFA space.
2. JA confirmed that the publicly accessible plaza remains part of the amended scheme, as does its landscaping which required further design development.
3. JA stated that the residential component had been designed to be ADG compliant.
4. JA noted some issues the panel had raised previously such as safe pedestrian access to/from Stage A in particular to/from/along Parsonage Street and Well Street, as well as the slightly elevated western edge of the proposed plaza around Parsonage Street.
5. JA advised that the plaza and its western edge was designed to address pedestrian safety concerns as had been raised by RMS previously (i.e. discourage pedestrians crossing Parsonage Street). JA further noted that while pedestrian access may be limited in the road reserve immediately adjacent Stage A's Parsonage Street boundary, a

pedestrian thoroughfare which links with existing or proposed pedestrian refuges within Well Street and The Loop Road extends through the Stage A site.

6. The DIP would support any improvements to pedestrian access arising from changes in RMS' position.
7. Reference was made to the width and subsequent visual impact of the Church Street driveway. JA and SK advised that it was in response to RMS safety concerns for service vehicles entering Stage A. It is effectively a slip lane.
8. The DIP would support any improvements that minimise the visual and pedestrian amenity impacts of this driveway. In particular, the DIP noted that the design architects would investigate narrowing the 'throat' of the driveway by reconsidering the turning circles needed for the site and its uses.
9. GM questioned whether the Church Street driveway raises pedestrian safety issues. SK advised that it was mainly for the purpose of servicing the proposed supermarket and such a use does not require regular servicing. Servicing was likely to be outside of main pedestrian active hours. JA and SK further suggested that the driveway and footpath may be able to adopt the same finishes and/or materials which may assist with minimising their visual presence.
10. GM queried whether the intent was to convert serviced apartments to dwellings as they currently would not comply with ADG.
11. GC advised that they were not likely to be converted as the Concept Approval dwelling cap had been met. Also, serviced apartments have been a successful addition to other Holdmark projects.
12. GM, SK, CJ and JA all suggested that the original architectural roof feature had become too dominant since the scheme's overall height had been reduced. It would no longer be as visible since building height was reduced. All suggested it should be significantly revised and reduced in scale. In particular, regard was to be given to reducing the members sizes and that the outriggers were considered to still be appropriate. Further, the frame element on the top of the envelope would require refinement to work with the reduced tower height.
13. OH queried as to the degree of pedestrian accessibility to/from Stage A to public spaces to the south of the site.
14. JA referred to the previously mentioned (see item 5 above) onsite pedestrian pathway which would link to a proposed pedestrian refuge towards the intersection of Parsonage Street and The Loop Road. This refuge then connects with the foreshore. JA noted that this pedestrian pathway may conflict with the main basement vehicular entry to Stage A, but this could be treated. SK referred to the alternative access through Stage A, which was also accessible from The Loop Road pedestrian refuge, via Waterview Street. This would not conflict with the basement entry.
15. OH queried whether basement excavation could be reduced by raising supermarket to ground level.
16. VC indicated this would be difficult as the basement location is largely fixed because of the footprint of the supermarket tenancy and associated parking demands. That is, the wide supermarket tenancy could not be placed at ground level as it would occupy almost

all of the publicly accessible plaza. JA nevertheless suggested that there may be some scope to reduce the extent of basement excavation marginally as overall yield had reduced.

17. With the possible reduction in scale of the architectural roof feature, OH noted that there would be substantial space between the proposed top most level, and the maximum RL. GM indicated this provides opportunities to improve amenity. An example was that levels from the northern wing of the building could be relocated to the southern envelope, and that this would improve views from the recently completed building to the north of Stage A. Alternatively, mezzanine levels could be added to the current top or top 2 levels of the southern envelope as it provides opportunities for greater amenity.

18. OH suggested it could be an opportunity to increase floor to ceiling levels, and therefore amenity, in the dwellings and/or apartments proposed in the current floor plan.

19. CD and KN indicated that any change in the number of storeys would necessitate a further S75W as the current concept approval fixed the number of storeys to 10.

20. GM noted that mezzanine levels are not considered as a storey and these may, therefore, still be an option to improve overall amenity. It was agreed this can be considered in the preparation of the DA and that it wasn't an issue for the S75W.

21. OH stated that despite the substantial nature of the changes, the scheme was still highly resolved and of good quality.

22. OH indicated that some ongoing reinterpretation of the bridge should possibly remain part of the scheme. It perhaps shouldn't be entirely deleted. JA and SK suggested that perhaps only some elements of the current roof top architectural feature may require deletion (such as the heavy truss element), rather than the entire feature being deleted.

### Conclusion

23. The DIP confirmed that the integrity of original design competition winning scheme would be retained, albeit at a lower scale. The DIP further noted that it would not require a further review for the purposes of the current S75W application, and that it would revisit the scheme as part of any DA.

.....  
Gabrielle Morrish

Date

Chris Johnson

Date

Olivia Hyde

Date

  
