

LIVERPOOL DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL

Property: 17-23 Goulburn Street Liverpool Lots 1 2 3 & 4 DP13932

Application Number: DA-1212/2015

Panel Members Present: Olivia Hyde, Anthony Burke, Geoff Baker

Assessing Officer/Unallocated: Taylar Vernon

Officers in Attendance: Taylar Vernon, Nelson Mu

Applicants Name and / or Representatives: Mr W Chao

Date of Meeting: Friday 10 June 2016

Item Number: 3

Pre DA ☐

Post Lodgement ☒

Chair: Olivia Hyde

Apologies:

Convenor: Jan Mccredie

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Liverpool Design Excellence Panel (the Panel), comments are to assist Liverpool City Council in its consideration of the development application.

The absence of a comment under any of the principles does not necessarily imply that the Panel considers the particular matter has been satisfactorily addressed, as it may be that changes suggested under other principles will generate a desirable change.

The 9 design quality principles will be grouped together where relevant, to avoid the unnecessary repetition of comments.

PROPOSAL

Construction of a 9 storey residential flat building, comprising of 2 blocks with a total of 108 units and 2 levels of basement parking with associated tree removal.

Note: Liverpool City Council is the consent authority and the Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel has the function of the determining authority.

PANEL COMMENTS

The 9 design principles were considered by the panel in discussion of the development application. These are 1] **Context**, 2] **Built Form+ Scale** 3] **Density** 4] **Sustainability** 5] **Landscape** 6] **Amenity**, 7] **Safety** 8] **Housing Diversity +Social Interaction** 9] **Aesthetics**.

The Design Excellence Panel makes the following comments in relation to the project:

The architects presented the scheme and outlined the changes as previously recommended by the panel. These are

- The section of building extending over the courtyard has been removed.
- There is a direct view from entry to the rear garden courtyard.
- FSR compliant.
- Adjusted encroachments so that the building complies with ADG and SEPP 65.

There was a discussion on materials. The architect said that there had been cracking / failing of textured applications in the ASF system. He is proposing Hebel panels and blocks with a flexible render.

The Panel made the following comments:

Compliance and Internal Planning

- Master bedrooms appear to be undersized. All habitable rooms must comply with the ADG
- A smaller set-back should be provided from the laneway boundary so that the separation distance is taken from the centre line of the laneway not the site boundary. If the building is located closer to the laneway it would enable a more generous deep soil zone along Goulburn Street and planting of larger trees within the property boundary in front of the building.
- Panel recommends ADG compliance rather than DCP compliance in this instance as it gains the benefit of planting to both sides of the building.
- Level 8 is set back to comply with the Liverpool DCP. Noted that this level can only be 20% of GFA
- The Panel recommends a floor-to-floor height of 3050mm. This enables a floor-to-ceiling height of 2.7m to be easily achieved.

Landscape

- A landscape plan (even a sketch) must be provided. It should show deep soil planting and solar access to the ground level communal area.
- The landscape and planting strategy needs to demonstrate that it works well with the publicly accessible areas, the interior of the building as well as externally to the neighbourhood.
- A strategy for ameliorating the relationship of the access driveway with the neighbouring property needs to be developed.
- Council should condition the DA to ensure that substantial street trees are planted. This was supported by the architect and applicant.

Open Space

- The communal open spaces at ground level and Level 8 must in aggregate comply with the ADG standards: minimum area equal to 25% of the site area and minimum 2 hours solar access in midwinter to 50% of the communal open space
- The bin storage is to be located in the basement and the temporary storage relocated so that it does not impinge on the communal courtyard area and the view from the entrance.

Scale and Bulk

- The panel remains concerned about the bulk / mass of the building, and the proposal as presented does not ameliorate this concern. Building articulation remains unsatisfactory. Overall, the current proposal is not of acceptable design quality.
- The building does not yet represent an excellent design solution for a building of this scale and more work on the development of the architectural expression of the project is required.

The massing and articulation need to be further modified so that the building appears less bulky.

- The mass can be refined by an aesthetic approach so that the building is well modulated and articulated.
- It was suggested that an architect who is expert in this particular aspect of architectural resolution works with the applicant's architect to update the aesthetics of the building so that design excellence is achieved.
- The architect is to come back to Council with design sketches to address these issues.

This application does not need to be reviewed by the Panel again but as outlined above the architect is to come back to Council with design sketches to address the resolution of the massing and articulation.
