

23 March 2012

Received by

26 MAR 2012

Archives & Record

The General Manager  
Liverpool City Council  
Locked Bag 7064  
Liverpool BC  
NSW 1871

Attention: Ms Natalie Stewart – Team Leader, Major Development

**DA-946/2011 2 Browne Parade and 1-3 Bigge Street**

Thank you for your emails and letter of 15 March 2012 regarding the above development application.

The issues and concerns raised by the JRPP and in your letter are responded to as follows:

**Design excellence**

The original Arc scheme was considered by the Design Jury to have sufficient urban design and architectural merit to qualify for the design excellence bonuses because it would be suitable for this key / gateway site and provide a positive contribution to both the existing and desired future contexts.

The current DA scheme is substantially the same design as the original scheme and still demonstrates design excellence.

The Arc scheme is considered to demonstrate design excellence for the following reasons:

- The form and massing composition components of low podium, base and two relatively slender ended towers will produce an urban design solution which accords with the objectives for higher density in the urban centre yet will be reasonably sympathetic with existing redevelopment in the locality.
- The single storey podium accommodates good activation of the Bigge Street and Brown Parade frontages, a central common open space on the podium roof and a mounded landscape buffer to the Hume Highway.

640 820 591 35



- The modulated base, stepping from 4 to 7 storeys suits both the scale of existing redevelopments and the desired future character for the northern precinct streetscapes.

Further design attributes of the scheme:

- The orientation of the two towers and the north facing space between allows good solar access to the landscaped podium and to the adjoining property to the south.
- The tapering and narrowing at the ends of the two towers reduces visual impact when viewed from the north and south.
- The facade designs have a good balance between solid and void and are sufficiently well articulated including framed elements, recesses, recessed and projecting balconies, louvre panels and screens, sun hoods, window openings and variety of materials.
- The perimeter roof top elements are integrated with the overall design of the facades and would help to screen the services projections.
- The street wall element at the southern end of the Bigge Street building is an appropriate height to provide a buttress end to the development and to connect to the future redevelopment of the adjoining property.
- Vehicular access and common pedestrian entries are direct, well resolved and have good legibility from the streets. The common pedestrian entries are well articulated and have good street address.
- The common open space at Level 1 has direct, barrier free access from both lift lobbies.
- The ground floor residential units facing Browne Parade have separate pedestrian access to activate the street.
- The lift lobbies and corridors have good access to natural light.
- The vertical circulation is good including both towers having two lifts in case of breakdown.

### **SEPP 65 Design Quality Principles for Context**

The proposal satisfies the context principles because it would provide both an acceptable urban design response (relationship of built form to surrounding space created by building heights, setbacks and landscape) and an architectural response to the existing redeveloped urban



character (buildings of 6 to 10 storeys) and the desired future character contained in the LLEP 2008 and the LDCP 2008 Part 4.

The street presentation of the proposal will make a positive contribution to the desired future character for the precinct because of the degree of activation at footpath level and also the modulated and stepped base which both defines the public domain as required and provides an appropriate scale in the streets for pedestrians.

### **Building separation – southern boundary**

The 7 storey street wall element at the southern end of the Bigge Street building is proposed to be setback 1.2m from the southern boundary.

Zero setbacks can be allowed under the SEPP 65 RFDC in urban contexts between street wall buildings. A zero setback could be allowed for the 7 storey element (in lieu of the 1.2m proposed) as well as the single storeyed podium. As the zoning is encouraging a future environment of high density residential living (at the northern end of the Liverpool City Centre) a zero setback (and zero building separation) would be appropriate. Future redevelopment of the adjoining property could then butt up to the subject proposal.

The 1.2m setback does not comply with the numerical control under Part 7.4 of the LLEP 2008 which requires a 4.5m setback (on the basis of distributing the 9m building separation distance for parts of buildings between 12m and 25m equally between adjoining properties). This non-compliance could be supported on the basis that it is allowed under the RFDC building separation controls where a zero building separation in appropriate urban contexts and that the objectives of Part 7.4 (1) could still be achieved.

It is understood that SEPP No.1 does not apply and further that the proposed numerical non-compliance could be supported by the Council under Part 4.6 of the LLEP 2008.

### **Impact on the adjoining property to the south**

The redevelopment opportunities for the adjoining property to the south would not be unreasonably compromised by the subject proposal.

Any future design could take advantage of a street wall to Bigge Street with a zero setback to the common side boundary with the subject property.

It would be desirable to see an indicative design for the adjoining property to the south which demonstrates a working option for its redevelopment and how it would relate to the subject DA design.



### **Suggested ways to improve the DA design**

The southern facades of the two towers will require privacy screening to the ends of balconies and window openings to comply with the RFDC for 18m building separation (habitable / balcony to non-habitable) and to allow unscreened balconies and window openings to the northern facade of the future redevelopment of the adjoining property.

Further architectural differentiation between the towers (this could be achieved by detailing and variation of external materials).

The southern facade of 7 storey street wall element will be exposed to view until redevelopment of the adjoining property so its detailed design is important to ensure a high quality appearance.

The common meeting room would be better relocated (still at Level 1) so that it is integrated within the footprint of one of the two buildings and preferably adjacent to the common open space.

The indicative landscape design needs further resolution and refinement to confirm detail of the proposal. This is critical for all aspects of the design at ground and podium levels and particularly including detail of the treatment of the car park and service entry which is open to sky.

Yours sincerely



Roger Hedstrom