

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING
19th October 2017**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kim Crestani	Chairperson
Jane Threlfall	Panel Member GA NSW
Russell Olsson	Panel Member

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Nelson Mu	Convener
Rodger Roppolo	Planner

APOLOGIES:

Nil

OBSERVERS:

Chris Yoo: Woods Bagot – chris.yoo@woodsbagot.com.au
Domenic Alvaro: Woods Bagot – domenic.alvarro@woodsbagot.com.au
Adam Coburn: Mecone – acoburn@mecone.com.au
Aras Labatis: Coronation – al@coronation.com.au
Nicole Lasky: Coronation – nicolel@coronation.com.au
Cordelia Maxwell-Williams – Coronation – cm@coronation.com.au

AGENDA:

Property Address: 26-28 Shepherd Street, Liverpool

Application Number: DA-82/2017

Item Number: 4

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 amended proposal for the amalgamation of sites at 26 and 28 Shepherd Street and construction of a new 14 storey residential flat building comprising 82 apartments at 26 Shepherd Street and the extension to 'building C1' approved under DA-612/2015 by a maximum 14 storeys containing an additional 150 apartments at 28 Shepherd Street, changes to basement levels, plus basement excavation, landscaping and associated site works.

The applicant advised that the Paper Mills building will be operated by a single operator and its intention is provide a destination offering various eating facilities, including café, restaurants.

The applicant's architect explained how they responded to each of the DEP's previous minutes.

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:

- This is the second time the application has come before the Panel. The Panel is considering the applicant's response to the DEP's previous minutes.
- The Panel notes that there is a Planning Proposal pending for the site and the Applicant noted that it was soon to be adjudicated upon.
- The Panel's previous minutes raised concerns in respect to the appropriateness of a 6m slot between two 14-storey high buildings, as the height of the buildings has been increased from 7-storey to 14-storey. The Applicant presented two potential options in reply. Option 1 was for the filling of the 6m gap between the buildings to create one large building and thus, complies with ADG building separation requirements. The second option involved the insertion of two glazed bridges linking the 2 buildings. The Applicant explained that the intention of the latter option is to provide a necessary link between the buildings to allow the space to be used as communal room for residents but importantly, maintain a view corridor between the 2 buildings without accentuating the mass and scale of the building.

The Panel does not support the filling in of the gap between the buildings which would have resulted into one large building. The proposed treatment with panoramic glazed bridges connecting the buildings is considered to be an acceptable design solution. The Panel does not believe it is essential to provide the recommended spatial separation distances of the ADG in this case. However, it requests that the window placement within the slot be calibrated and finely articulated to ensure judicious placement of windows and hoods allow for privacy and minimise overlooking.

- The quality of pedestrian and through site link access from Shepherd St to the river is an important element and should be accentuated. The applicant clarified that there are 4 public pedestrians and 1 private pedestrian link proposed through the site. The Panel is satisfied with the quality of the pedestrian link between the street and the river.

- The Panel commended the architectural resolution and detailing of the strong architectural elements incorporated into the base of the building, which works well in resolving the upper levels of the building.
- Proposed treatment of the east façade of the building at 26 Shepherd Street facing the river should be refined as the Panel does not believe that its treatment suitably complements other parts of the building. The Panel requests that consideration be given to perhaps introduce protection of the east facing windows from the elements. The required architectural elements could include small vertical fins or even projecting the slab slightly out from the building. The Applicant is to detail the façade solar access for the affected windows to inform a detailed response to window design and solar shading.
- The Panel notes that the scheme provides deep soil zones along the river frontage of the site and asked the applicant whether any deep soil zones are provided within the communal open spaces of the development. The Applicant advised that 1m deep planter boxes are provided within the communal open space that would allow for the planting of trees. The Panel requests that the raised planter boxes be contiguous to provide for maximum benefit for plantings and should include soil depths of up to 1.2m in height.
- No landscape plans were presented at the meeting.
- Some discussions were held on whether the reverse podium of the building will create any wind tunnel effect from the river? The Panel requests that this be considered by the Applicant and a desktop wind study to test the wind downward draft on the building be submitted at CC stage to ensure this can be mitigated with the planting of trees or suitable architectural treatments.
- The proposed mixed materials incorporated into the buildings are well considered by the Applicant and supported by the Panel.
- The Panel appreciates the diversity of communal open spaces and the socialising opportunities incorporated into the proposal such as through site link, both internally and externally.
- Consideration should be given to improve the energy performance of the building including the installation of solar panels to the building, given the large amount of roof space and that greater greenery be provided to afford further shading to the communal areas.

- **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

The panel visited the site and were very pleased with the quality of construction and materials selected for the previous stages of the development.

- **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.

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING
13th of April 2017**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Geoff Baker	Chair
Anthony Burke	Panel Member
Roger Hedstrom	Panel Member

OTHER ATTENDEES:

Hannah Ko	Woods Bagot
Chris Yoo	Woods Bagot
Joe Bell	Mecone
Aras Labutis	Coronation

APOLOGIES:

Nil

OBSERVERS:

Nelson Mu	Convenor
Rodger Roppolo	Planner

AGENDA:

Property Address: 28 Shepherd Street Liverpool

Application Number: DA-82/2017

Item Number: 3

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:

Amalgamation of sites at 26 and 28 Shepherd Street and construction of a new 14 storey residential flat building comprising 82 apartments, an extension to 'building C1' approved under DA-612/2015 by a maximum 14 storeys and an additional 150 apartments, changes to basement levels and basement excavation, landscaping and associated site works.

The proposal is identified as Nominated Integrated Development, requiring approval from the NSW Department of Primary Industries Water pursuant to the Water Management Act 2000.

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 notes that the proposed development has been lodged pending the outcome of a Planning Proposal presently before Council that permits additional building height and FSR. The following comments are contingent on the Planning Proposal being approved.
- The Panel is concerned about the intensity and magnitude of the proposal for the site and that inadequate separation distances are provided between the proposed tall buildings. The scale of the development has significantly increased since the earlier less-dense proposal was reviewed by the Panel.
- The proposal at No. 28 reads as two separate buildings and the separation between them, at only 6m, is considered inadequate. As a result, the architectural expression of the buildings is considered to have been compromised.
- The Panel notes that the 6m separation distance between the two towers at 28 Shepherd Street would have been evaluated under different circumstances when this part of the proposal was previously reviewed, including the then overall height of 7 stories and the absence of plans for a building on the 26 Shepherd Street site. The separation distances in the ADG are as follows:

No. Stories	N to N	N to H	H to H
1-4	6m	9m	12m
5-8	9m	13m	18m
8+	12m	18m	24m

N = non-habitable room H = habitable room/balcony

- The proposal does not comply with the ADG. For example:
 - (a) the twin towers at No.28, at Level 7 and above, have bedrooms on both sides of the 6m gap between the towers. This dimension should be 24m.
 - (b) the new building at No. 26 has bedrooms facing the north tower at No. 28 which in turn has windows facing the No. 26 tower. The separation distance provided is 12.5m. Again, it should be 24m.
 (If there were no habitable rooms along the facades in question, the gap should be 12m and (b) would be satisfactory, but (a) would not).
- The Panel recommends that the separations between the buildings be opened up, to comply with the ADG building separation standards.
- As the sites are now consolidated, the Panel suggests that an improved - connection be provided between No. 28 and No. 26 and then on to the Paper Mill by separating the tower and low-rise portions of the new building at No. 26 and providing an appropriate pedestrian link through this space to the Paper Mill to the north and the communal open space of No.28..
- Apartment mix for the development should comply with the apartment mix as per Council's DCP.
- The proposal should comply with the minimum required solar access as per the ADG. That is, 70% of the apartments to achieve the required solar access.
- The DA is not accompanied by a landscape plan, which is of significant concern to the Panel, having regard to the scale and density of the proposal.
- The Panel notes that the communal open space for 28 Shepherd Street has no deep soil zone, which would limit the ability to provide meaningful landscaping for the development. A single continuous zone is not essential, but genuine deep soil zones at both ends of the communal open space and/or pockets of suitable deep soil landscape within the space should be provided.

- 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.

- Upzoning**

The scale of the upzoning is very substantial and presents various issues and concerns. Most obviously, the precinct now projects a series of large towers along the riverfront in unacceptably close proximity to each other. The greater intensity of use requires a rethink of the masterplan. The Panel believes that amendments such as simply extruding the already

approved towers upwards do not work. The project should be reconsidered holistically from first principles. This should include input from heritage and landscape architects.

- **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 proposal is not acceptable and must be referred to the Design Excellence Panel again.