

12 – 18 Thompson Street, Bowen Hills MINUTES OF MEETING – PRE2019/405

1 William Street

Wednesday 11th March 2020
Pre-lodgement meeting #3

Attendance and Apologies

The meeting commenced at 1:00pm

Present		
EDQ representatives		
Peita McCulloch	EDQ – Manager, Development Assessment	PM
Archie Venitis	EDQ – Principal Engineer, Technical Services	AV
Sarah Hampstead	EDQ – Planner, Development Assessment	SH
Peter Richards	Deicke Richards (EDQ's Design Consultant)	PR
Applicant Representatives		
Leo Mewing	Mewing Planning Consultants (Applicant)	LM
Téa Tsang	Mewing Planning Consultants (Applicant)	TT
Christian Ganim	Gansons Pty Ltd, Ganboys Pty Ltd & Ganbros Pty Ltd (Applicant)	CG
Peter Willis	Red Door Architecture (Architect)	PW
Kathryn English	RPS (Landscape Architect)	KE
Andy Johnston	Cardno (Traffic Engineer)	AJ

Item	
1.	Background <ul style="list-style-type: none">• First pre-lodgement meeting was held on 12 September 2019.• Second pre-lodgement meeting was held on 16 January 2020.• Pre-lodgement advice has been previously issued to LM on 3 December 2019. This included EDQ's in principle support for a 14-storey building 'Tower 1' subject to Tower 1 achieving compliant setbacks to the southern site boundary; delivery of



Item	
	<p>sufficient grounds commensurate with the Tower 1 non-compliances, including a public plaza; achieving a plot ratio of 3:1 for the total master planned development site; for development on the balance of the master planned site being compliant with building height, building setbacks, tower separations and other relevant provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDQ confirmed the engagement of Deicke Richards as the design review panellist to provide specialist design advice to EDQ on the assessment of the proposed development.
2.	<p>Tower 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land uses in Tower 1 have been resolved. LM advised that a Development Permit for MCU for Office, Health Care Service, Hospital, Childcare Centre, Shop, Food and Drink Outlet, Research and Technology Industry will be sought for Tower 1. • The parking station use, and removal of staging for construction of podium/tower has been removed. • The following key issues were discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Podium Design & Carparking:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Updated concept plans were presented. The design results in an un-sleeved podium with landscaping to screen the carpark. ○ LM confirms that the podium design has been further progressed. When viewed from the street, the podium appears to be 4 storeys rather than 5. The design now provides clearer distinction in built form between podium and tower components. ○ PR advises that there is a strong difference in expression between the podium levels and the tower. ○ The applicant has engaged a landscape architect to ensure the proposed planting is well-integrated and viable. ○ LM confirms that rainwater tanks are to be provided and will ensure podium planting is maintained. A 1m depth is proposed to ensure appropriate mass is achieved in terms of height. ○ PR commented on design effort, advising the depth on the façade zone enables the curving screens in plan and creates larger areas for landscape treatments and planting. ○ PR questioned if extra columns were required along the podium for structural purposes, which would change the design and result in loss of recesses. Further investigations are to be undertaken by the applicant to determine if additional columns are required. ○ PR advises that the corner of Thompson Street and Murray Street has an unused zone behind the curved façade line. ○ Consideration could be given to extending the glass line of the ground floor uses the full height of the podium. This would form a visual break at the corner, providing more vertical emphasis. This corner is very viable and announces the entry to the precinct. A break would also reduce the visual continuous impact of the podium. ○ PM raises oversupply of carparking proposed for Tower 1 and the possibility for removing these spaces to result in a sleeved design. ○ LM advised that these carparks are critical to the day hospital operator, a reduction in spaces would compromise the delivery of Tower 1.

Item	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LM confirmed that the excess car parking in Tower 1 is intended to allow for decanting of the other car spaces currently on the site, thereby allowing for future stages to be efficiently developed. ○ Only Tower 1 is proposed to have a surplus number, which is proposed to be compensated by a reduced number of carparking in the remainder of the site (i.e. through the delivery of towers 2, 3 and 4). ○ LM discusses that the requirement for a sleeved podium is not as strong in the Mixed Industry and Business Zone, as opposed to other zones in the PDA (i.e. Mixed-Use Zone). The Mixed Industry and Business zone does not permit residential development. Consequentially it not anticipated that development in this zone will attract high volumes of people during the weekends or evenings. ○ LM confirms that the ground floor retail will provide strong activation for the precinct. ○ PM advises that podium design would need to be discussed in greater detail with the delegate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Post meeting note: On 18/03/2020 PM advises LM that EDQ are still looking to achieve an active edge to Thompson Street, however it is understood that carparking is critical for the hospital. PM + LM discuss potential to adaptively reuse the area of the car park along Thompson Street for an active use i.e. office when the excess parking can be accommodated within the future basement parking. LM suggests that there may be room to do this for levels 1 and 2 but wanted to keep level 3 for deep planting. ● <u>Level 5 Southern Site Boundary:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The setback of the hospital use on the southern boundary has been increased to 3m with landscape incorporated in the setback and on the roof of the day surgery. ○ PM notes the side setback to the south is non-compliant. For compliance the scheme requires a 6m setback above level 4. ○ PM raises that EDQ has issued pre-lodgement advice providing EDQ's in principle support for a relaxation to the building height for Tower 1 subject to the building <i>achieving compliant setbacks to the southern site boundary</i>. ○ LM confirms the proposed functional floor space is 1,441m², which is at the limit of suitability for the interested day hospital operator. Any further reduction in the floor space is advised to be problematic for the operators. ○ PM raises privacy and amenity concerns for the adjoining site. ○ LM advises that the design provides for screening of the entire level 5 side facing façade, to avoid privacy impacts. In addition, landscaping along the interface will provide additional screening – for both privacy and amenity. ○ PM confirms that this non-compliance would need to be discussed in further detail with the delegate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Post meeting note: On 18/03/2020 PM advises LM that EDQ are still assessing the proposed setback noncompliance. Advice regarding suitability and acceptability of height despite this noncompliance to follow. ● <u>Level 6:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A childcare use is proposed on level 6.

Item	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PR questions the extent of the outdoor play area to the southern side boundary as this encroaches the side boundary setback. For compliance the scheme requires a 6m setback ○ PM advises that an outdoor play area in this location which is non compliant with setback requirements is not likely to be supported. This would result in impacts to the privacy and amenity of the future adjoining building, especially for a residential use. ○ LM advises that the design of level 6 will be revisited to ensure that that the outdoor play area will be contained within the setback requirement. ○ PR requested additional information on the sliding doors, demonstrating how the doors will be used and the visibility of the doors when closed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Ground floor retail uses & Awning</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PR advises that the ground floor street interface has more importance, given the podium parking. ○ PR questions planter boxes to Thompson Street. Greater detail is needed on proposed landscaping in this location. ○ PR advises that views from the street into ground level retail uses is of high importance as it provides vibrant and active frontage. It is important that these spaces do not appear private. ○ PR/PM advise that ground floor uses should be close to the street with excellent visibility to and from the street. ○ There may be a rationale to have a recessed ground floor on Thompson Street as there is a grade change and some landscape may be appropriate. ○ However, PR recommends that the glazing on Murray Street and extending around the corner to the entry be closer to the boundary with the pavement extending directly to the glass line. This is a high amenity place in the precinct looking north to a future open space. ○ An awning over the street along this glazed frontage and continuing around the corner over the entry is encouraged. ○ PR/ PM request the design to explore the possibility for outdoor seating to be brought forward further towards the street frontage.
3.	<p>Master Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EDQ advises that an 18m building separation is to be achieved from Tower 4 to the adjoining Pellicano development approval (EDQ ref: DEV2019/892). ● AV advises that stormwater management needs to be demonstrated for development on the site. ● There is concern with Dual access points off Thompson street, as this does not assist with the streetscape design. ● AV confirms that EDQ has engaged in discussions with BCC regarding access off Abbotsford Road. ● AV confirms that BCC has only commented on transport and that further discussions between BCC and EDQ are required to inform acceptability of the proposal. ● Further justification is required on the removal of carparks from Thompson Street. ● AV advises the proposed loading zone is unacceptable. Servicing is to be demonstrated to inform acceptability.

Item	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Post meeting note: EDQ requires a staging plan showing which extent of existing buildings are to be retained and removed at each stage of the Masterplan development. BCC has provided comments regarding Abbotsford Road access which was forwarded to LM. EDQ are currently reviewing this advice.
4.	<p>Summary and Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EDQ advises that key areas for further design resolution include:<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Level 5 southern boundary setback;ii. Un-sleeved podium car park to street frontages;iii. Provision of carparking spaces at a greater rate than the scheme, and any resulting implications on the traffic network and the built form design (i.e. un-sleeved podium carparking);iv. Ground floor active uses;v. Ingress and egress to Abbotsford Road; andvi. Resulting support for building height for Tower 1 given non-compliances with the scheme.