

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING
Thursday 17th May 2018**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lee Hillam	Chairperson
Anthony Burke	Panel Member
Alf Lester	Panel Member

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Joshua Farkash
Graham Neaves

OBSERVERS:

Nelson Mu	Convener
-----------	----------

APOLOGIES:

George Nehme
(Planner)

AGENDA:

Property Address: 5 & 15 Rynan Avenue, Edmondson Park

Application Number: DA-471/2016

Item Number: 2

1. WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

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.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Yes

4. PRESENTATION

The applicant presented their proposal for the demolition of existing structures, removal of trees, subdivision into five lots, construction of three residential flat buildings and construction of a road to be dedicated to Council. The proposal is identified as Nominated Integrated Development under the Water Management Act 2000 requiring approval from DPI Water. The Sydney Western City Planning Panel has the function of determining the application.

The Applicant's architect explained the proposal as follows:

- The original site had an approval for for 3RFBs . Building A, which addresses Camden Valley Way, has been completed.
- The owner of the land was successful in acquiring the southern adjoining site and proposed a further RFB.
- The submitted proposal now provides for 4 buildings.
- The western part of the site is zoned open space and will be acquired by Council. A detention basin will be provided on the western part of the site.
- As a result of previous discussions with the DEP, the scheme has been modified to provide a continuous open space through the middle of the site to improve solar access to the development. Slots/gaps are provided between buildings to allow views and access to the central communal open space.
- Driveway entries to the buildings have been relocated from the western to the southern part of the site.
- The proposal complies with all the requirements of the ADG including communal open space.
- Buildings B and C have been significantly changed (from the previous scheme) and only minor changes have been made to Building D.
- The ground floor level for buildings B, C and D has been raised by about 750mm due to flooding and the level of the new public road . Sections of the buildings exceed the allowable building height by roughly 1.5m.

5. DEP 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**, and 9] **Aesthetics**.

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

- The Panel thanks the proponent for bringing the scheme back to the Panel for re-consideration and the explanation provided by the applicant on how the scheme has responded to the Panel's previous minutes.

- The Panel has been advised that the amended proposal is within the allowable FSR for the site. The buildings, however, encroach into the maximum building height limit. The slight exceedance of the building height limit is considered acceptable to the Panel having regard to the flood affectation of the site and the limited impact upon neighbouring properties in terms of overshadowing and visual/acoustic privacy.
- The Panel notes that the site is identified within the 17 dwellings/ha density band. The density of the scheme is approximately 125 dwellings/ha over the developable part of the site. However, when calculated against the overall site area of roughly 3.944 hectares, the scheme yields a density of approximately 40 dwellings per hectare. This is not considered to be unreasonable and would be in-line with the maximum density permitted for the locality.
- The height exceedance is accepted by the Panel for building B and C. The height exceedance for Building D, except where required by lift overruns, as it is adjacent to new lower scaled development should be removed to create a better transition to the neighbouring properties unless it can be shown to have no increased impact on the shading to the neighbouring properties.
- The proposed built form, scale and architectural treatment of the amended proposal is supported by the Panel.
- Building B corridor should be amended to provide for an open corridor rather being terminated with an enclosed fire stair. The applicant advised that the previous scheme provided for open corridor. This should be reintroduced into the scheme.
- The Panel is satisfied that the issues raised in the previous DEP minutes have been satisfactorily addressed by the applicant.

General

Note: All SEPP 65 apartment buildings must be designed by an architect and their registration number is to be on all drawings. The architect is to attend the DEP presentations.

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 minimum 3050 to 3100mm floor-to-floor height so as to comfortably achieve the minimum 2700mm floor-to-ceiling height as required by the ADG.

Sectional Drawings

Sectional drawings at a scale of 1:20 of wall section through with all materials, brickwork, edging details to be submitted.

6. CLOSE

The proposal is acceptable subject to the incorporation of the above advice given from the Panel and will not need to be seen by the Panel again.

LIVERPOOL DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL

Property: 5 Rynan Avenue Edmondson Park

Application Number: DA-471/2016

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

Assessing Officer/Unallocated: George Nehme

Officers in Attendance: George Nehme, Nelson Mu

Applicants Name and / or Representatives: Joshua Farkash & Associates

Date of Meeting: Thursday 21 July 2016

Item Number: 4

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, removal of trees, subdivision into four lots, construction of three residential flat buildings and construction of a road to be dedicated to Council. The proposal is identified as Nominated Integrated Development under the Water Management Act 2000 requiring approval from DPI Water. 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 Design Excellence Panel makes the following comments in relation to the project:

The architect presented the scheme.

- It is a Greenfields site located near Cabramatta Creek
- A new street is being introduced to facilitate the development. The new street runs east / west from Rynan Road and then bends around and runs north / south beside the park and Cabramatta Creek
- The park extends west to Cabramatta Creek from the new street.
- The proposal is for a new DA and a Sec 96 for the existing DA
- The new streets are to be designed as standard local roads
- The proposed apartment buildings are 5 storeys designed around a courtyard
- Lobbies to the buildings are located directly from Rynan Street and 'New' Street on the creek side
- The philosophy was to provide security from the lobby only and to not have direct access from street to the ground floor apartments.

Compliance

- There is a non-compliance in terms of height due to need to raise building due to flooding Buildings B and C The panel accepts the minor non-compliance
- FSR complies. It is under on Buildings B and C and over on Building D
- The deep soil exceeds the requirements.

The Panel made the following comments on the DA:

- Consider removing the central north facing apartments in Building B/C that address the east /west 'New' Road to create a communal space through the site that visually links to the developments on the opposite sides of the new road. This change would also provide significantly more winter sun to the B/C communal open space.
- Options for relocating the apartments that would be lost by redesigning in this way are :
 - increased height along the park side of the New Road
 - repositioning units on the half levels proposed in the existing scheme
- Relocate the driveway entry to underground car parking in Building B/C to the southern boundary and remove it from the park side so that there is maximum benefit to the dwellings that are located along the New Street that faces the park and the creek.
- Increase the generosity of entrance lobbies and stairs to have a better relationship with the internal courtyard and create a more generous and legible entry foyer and corridor connection.
- Consider relocating the entry to the car parking on Building D to enable better (northern) orientation of private open spaces on the ground floor

Internal Planning

- Privacy on adjacent balconies in inverted corners needs to be addressed
- Concern about the 'snorkel' apartment windows in bedrooms that share a party wall.
- Internal corridors are open with light and ventilation at the ends, but the staggered changes in direction do not assist legibility and clarity, and could be improved by introduction of light wells or slots through to the street.

Street Address

- The interface to the street needs to be more considered. Solid walls are to be as low as possible with buffer planting and permeable fencing that allows street surveillance above.
- The panel supports individual entrances for all street facing apartments, although it was noted there were grade differences in many cases.
- Consider treatment of car park entries for example through introduction of a trellis to soften impact on streetscapes.

Materials

- The panel supports the use of robust materials. The architect said that render and paint is the preferred finish.

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, there should be a section at 1:20 that can also show how services and drainage are intended to be managed.

The panel thanked the architect for the large scale drawings and for having his name and registration number on the drawings.

The Panel cannot support the scheme in general at this point in its development. 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.
