

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING  
20<sup>th</sup> of July 2017**

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Geoff Baker	Chairperson
Anthony Burke	Panel Member
Roger Hedstrom	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Nelson Mu	Convener
George Nehme	Planner

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Gerard Turrisi – Gat & Associates – 0416-257-833  
Simon Parsons PTW – 0418 863 098  
Karen Le Provost – PTW – 0434-048-851  
Joseph Gannavo – Owner – 0412-488-888

**AGENDA:**

**Property Address:** 149-151 Terminus Street and 360 Macquarie Street  
Liverpool

**Application Number:** DA-1257/2016

**Item Number:** 1

**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:

Staged development application pursuant to Section 83B of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act.

This application is for a Stage 1 masterplan or concept plan approval for a mixed use development and seeks approval for site layout, location of future buildings, vehicular access from Macquarie Street, maximum building envelopes including setbacks and height, maximum gross floor area (GFA) across the site and location and maximum number of car spaces. Liverpool City Council is the consent authority and the Sydney South West Planning Panel has the function of determining the application.

## 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** 9] **Aesthetics**.

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

- The Panel considers the proposal satisfies the issue of transition at street level in respect to the treatment of the interface between the public and private domain.
- The report contains a diagram showing articulation of the ground floor. It is essential that this diagram is included in the DA documentation.
- The design of the vertical “slots” in the facades above the podium is considered sufficient to modulate the length of the building and reduce its perceived scale.
- The Panel does not support habitable rooms facing these slots between the buildings. Having habitable rooms opening onto the slots would not contribute to the amenity of the apartments.
- The architectural language of the building should trim the slots with solid and well defined element(s).
- The Panel appreciates the openness of the applicant to discuss the issues with Council in moving forward with the scheme.
- The Panel is satisfied that the issues raised in its previous minutes have been satisfactorily addressed by the amended scheme.

- **General**

Note: All SEPP 65 apartment buildings must be designed by an architect and his/her 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.

## 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.

In the event that amended plans are submitted to Council to address the concerns of the Design Excellence Panel the amended plans should be considered by Council.

---

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING  
13<sup>th</sup> of April 2017**

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Geoff Baker	Chair
Anthony Burke	Panel Member
Roger Hedstrom	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Gerard Turrisi	Gat & Associates
Darren Laybutt	Gat & Associates
Simon Parsons	PTW
Karen Le Provost	PTW
Joseph Gannavo	Owner

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Nelson Mu	Convenor
Boris Santana	Planner

**AGENDA:**

<b>Property Address:</b>	149 Terminus Street Liverpool
<b>Application Number:</b>	DA-1257/2016
<b>Item Number:</b>	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**

Nil

## **4. PRESENTATION**

The applicant presented their proposal:

Staged development application pursuant to Section 83B of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act for a mixed-use development including commercial and residential floor space, child care centre and parking.

This application is for a Stage 1 masterplan approval for a mixed-use development and seeks approval for site layout, location of future buildings, vehicular access from Macquarie Street, maximum building envelopes including setbacks and height, maximum gross floor area (GFA) across the site and location and maximum number of car spaces.

Liverpool City Council is the consent authority and the Sydney South West Planning Panel has the function of determining the application.

## **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 9] Aesthetics.**

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

### **Massing and Scale**

- The massing and scale of the proposed building are of concern to the Panel as the proposed building does not comply with the existing DCP and proposed amendments to it.
- The proposed scheme identifies the building as containing 2 attached towers. However, the building mass reads as a large single tower with no clear visual distinction between the towers. The Panel is concerned that the perceived scale of the development is excessive. Having two suitably defined towers may be a more appropriate built form for the site. The Panel is not satisfied that the Applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed built form is the best and most suitable solution. The Macquarie Street elevation, in particular, is rather long, broad and insufficiently articulated.

- The perceived scale of the Macquarie Street façade needs to be refined. The Panel appreciates the horizontal division of the building but would like to see the mass along Macquarie Street incorporate further modulation between tower A and tower B above the podium level. The current floor plate of over 1000m<sup>2</sup> is too large for a single tower building.
- The proposed treatment of the podium (which includes above ground parking) should be further refined, notwithstanding the proposed green walls to screen the carpark and blend it with the commercial component of the building. Having an above-ground carpark for a prominent site such as this is not considered the best design solution, however the Panel appreciates the constraints of this particular site.
- In view of the above concerns, and noting the various other massing concepts shown in the architect's report, the Panel recommends that alternative options that reduce the perceived mass and scale of the building should be further explored by the applicant.

#### **Maintenance of Green walls**

- The Panel expressed concerns about the on-going maintenance of the proposed green walls over the life of the building. The applicant advised that the green walls will be linked to the commercial component of the building, rather than residential, thus relieving the residents of the maintenance burden. Whilst there may legal mechanism in place to ensure the satisfactory maintenance of the green walls, the applicant has not yet demonstrated that, should they fail, appropriate design solutions are incorporated into the building that would ensure the aesthetic of the building is not compromised.
- A landscape architect should be involved in the project from the outset so that essential maintenance issues relating to the green walls and landscaping in general are addressed to ensure the survival of all plantings. Details shall be provided at DA stage.

#### **Street treatment in General**

- The proposed zero setbacks to the streets may be appropriate, however, the present scheme has not adequately demonstrated sufficient dispensation to the public domain. There is not enough evidence supporting the nil setbacks to the streets in the current scheme.
- The Panel understands that a 3m setback from the street boundary as required by the DCP may not be practical or acceptable on this site because of its form and geometry. However, the value of the setbacks towards public benefit is an essential criterion that must be considered and incorporated into the development.
- The scheme as presented does not clearly show how street activation is satisfactorily achieved. The proposed street activation measures need to be refined. The Applicant advised that an awning is proposed along the Bathurst Street extension, Macquarie Street and part of Terminus Street, which will be shown on the DA documentation.
- It is critical that the proposal achieves compliance with Council Street Activation Policy for the City Centre. In response, the Applicant indicated that they proposed to enter into a VPA with Council to assure that the public benefits of the proposal are delivered.
- The Panel recommends that discussions be held between the Applicant and Council with a view to achieving a satisfactory activation of the public domain and ensuring that the proposal will contribute to public benefits.

- Greater details are warranted on the proposed street activation of the Macquarie Street frontage and the public benefits provided in association with this significant site. This may include indentation(s) to the building at ground level, provision of greater canopy area over footpaths; solutions could include a colonnade and a substantial continuous awning over the street or a combination of these. These strategies must be incorporated into the proposed masterplan, rather than at the DA stage.
- The proposal needs to address how human scale is achieved through building massing and articulation, as well as façade treatments.

#### **Vehicular Access**

- Whilst the Panel regards the proposed vehicular access from Macquarie Street as a sub-optimal solution, the Applicant advised that other alternatives are not acceptable to the RMS. Given the importance of the pedestrian activation of Macquarie Street, as proposed by Council, vehicular access needs to be refined to appropriately address pedestrian safety and activation of the Macquarie Street frontage of the site.

- **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.

## **6. CLOSE**

The proposed masterplan be further refined to incorporate the above advice given from the panel and will need to be seen by the panel again.

In the event that amended plans are submitted to Council to address the concerns of the Design Excellence Panel the amended plans shall be considered by DEP again.