

LIVERPOOL DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL

Property: 24 – 26 George Street Liverpool

Application Number: PL-133/2015

Panel Members Present: Russell Olsson, Anthony Burke

Assessing Officer/Unallocated: Tony Ristevski

Officers in Attendance: Tony Ristevski, Lina Kakish

Applicants Name and / or Representatives: Amen Zoabi (Synergy Development), Charlie Zappia (Algorry Zappia), David Haskew (Haskew & Associates), Ahmad Refaieh (Synergy Developments)

Date of Meeting: 10 December 2015

Item Number: 5

Pre DA ☒

Chair: Helen Lochhead

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

Demolition of existing buildings and ancillary structures, removal of ten (10) trees, construction of an eight (8) storey residential flat building, comprising of 86 units, and two (2) levels of basement car parking.

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 Advisory Panel makes the following comments in relation to the project:

The Panel noted that:

- There was no registered architect at the presentation.
- The drawings did not have the registered architect's number.
- All DAs for apartment buildings must have a registered architect.

In regards to the proposal the Panel noted that:

- The FSR complies,
- The proposed building at 9 storeys is lower than the 35 metre height limit,
- The design response was poor,
- The setbacks do not comply,
- The interface with the adjacent development is not acceptable.

The Panel suggested the following:

- Option 1

Have a building form with a two level base of town house type development facing the side boundary. Locate two buildings above the base building at the front and rear of the site with windows oriented to the front and back and with a courtyard space providing separation between them.

- Option 2

Have two separate buildings with the buildings located across the site at the front and rear of the site oriented to the front and back with a separation between them. This option could have 4.5metre side setbacks and 6 metre rear setback. The front building could be above the 9 storeys [25 metres BCA] to maximise the yield. Potential building separation issues for BCA purposes would need to be resolved in the basement, however this approach could result in the maximum FSR being achieved whilst minimising the impact on adjoining neighbours, particularly in the centre of the site.

- Both Options

Extend the planting along from Tindall Ave into the site to create a vegetated landscape setting between this site and the development on 19-25 Bigge St.

In the event that amended plans are submitted to Council to address the concerns of the Design Excellence Panel the amended plans should be referred back to the Panel for comment.

.

LIVERPOOL DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL

Property: 124-26 George Street Liverpool

Application Number: DA-377/2016

Panel Members Present: Olivia Hyde, Geoff Baker, Jon Johannsen, Roger Hedstrom

Assessing Officer/Unallocated: Brad Harris

Officers in Attendance: Brad Harris, Nelson Mu

Applicants Name and / or Representatives: Synergy Development Group

Date of Meeting: Thursday 21 July 2016

Item Number: 2

Pre DA ☐ **Post Lodgement** ☒

Chair: Olivia Hyde

Apologies: Nil

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

Demolition of existing structures, Construction of a residential flat building containing 108 Units, with 2 Basement Car Parking Levels, (52 Residential Units in Building A – Ground Floor to Level 11, and 44 Residential Units in Building B – Ground Floor to Level 8) and removal of trees. Liverpool City Council is the consent authority and the Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel has the function of determining the application.

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 proposal was presented to a DEP previously.

The architects presented the scheme. They have taken on the comments of the previous panel by creating a courtyard in the centre of the site with two towers to the east and west of the courtyard.

The previous DEP had outlined two possible options. The applicant has developed Option 2. That option is for the two towers that are oriented to the front and rear of the site with a courtyard between them. This option stipulated that a 4.5m side set-back would be acceptable if the predominant orientation of the towers was not to the side boundaries.

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

The panel queried whether there was potential to access the site from Tindall Avenue not from George Street. This was not possible given the traffic volumes on Tindall Avenue. This is accepted.

Compliance:

- The side set-backs do not comply
- The height slightly exceeds the height limit on the front tower
- The height of the rear tower complies
- The FSR exceeds the permissible FSR by 0.3 because the proposal is over the 9 storeys and construction is more costly
- The deep soil areas do not comply

Side Set-backs

The panel stated that the issue with the proposed tower floor plan is the impact of the new development on the adjacent sites where balconies and habitable rooms are located facing the side boundaries.

Given that there were some ambiguities in the previous Panel minutes, the current panel will support the 4.5m side set back however it recommends the following re-organisation of the floor plan to minimise the number of rooms facing the side boundaries:

- Relocate building entries to the north from a shared pathway.
- Rearrange apartments so that living spaces and at least one of the bedrooms face east or west (rather than side boundaries).
- The attached sketch will be a helpful guide.

The purpose of the sketch is to illustrate the intent of the original recommendation that the units primarily face front and back and that either there are no or only second bedrooms that face the side boundaries.

- The reconfiguration of floor layouts should also consider how to achieve more efficient communal circulation that could offset any loss of GFA in floor plan reorganization.

The panel supports the small number of units in each tower.

FSR

The panel supported the scheme. It is concerned however about the increase in floor space. The panel has noted that on some sites applicants wish to reduce the permissible height of a building and still retain the permissible FSR. This is resulting in buildings that are lower in height but larger in footprint. If future proposals do not meet the required separation distances, set-backs and depth of building requirements the FSR is to be reduced so that it relates to the reduced height.

Deep Soil

The panel supported location of deep soil concentrated at the rear of the site, amenity should be maximized through introduction of large scale planting.

Car Parking and Deep Soil

The panel queried whether it is possible to reduce the car parking and increase the area of deep soil - for example through introduction of an area of deep soil within the courtyard area, to support large tree planting. Currently car parking complies with DCP not RMS standards.

General

Quality of construction and Material Selection

Consideration must be given by the applicant to the quality of materials and finishes. All apartment buildings are to be made of robust, low maintenance materials and be detailed to avoid staining, weathering and failure of applied finishes. Render is discouraged.

Floor-to-floor height

The Panel recommends a floor-to-floor height of 3050mm if required. This enables a floor-to-ceiling height of 2.7m to be easily achieved without bulkheads or dropped ceilings.

Detail section:

In order to provide clearer understanding of how the façade and balcony areas can be detailed, typical sections at 1:20 should be provided that can also show how services and drainage are intended.

This application does not need to be reviewed by the Panel again.
