

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING  
16<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Olivia Hyde	Chairperson
Lee Hillam	Panel Member
Geoff Baker	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Nelson Mu	Convener
George Nehme	Planner

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Gerard Turrisi	Gat & Assoc.	0416-257-833
John Bohane	Dreamscapes Architects	0421-324-295
Edward Li	Dreamscapes Architects	0420-541-991
Lou Tasic	Riverview Liverpool P/L	0411-704-444

**AGENDA:**

**Property Address:** 1-5 Speed Street, Liverpool

**Application Number:** DA-284/2017

**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**

Yes

## 4. PRESENTATION

The applicant presented their amended proposal for a Staged Development Application pursuant to Section 83B of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act for a 30 storey mixed use building comprising commercial floor area, a child care centre, gym, 190 residential apartments, on-site parking and demolition of existing buildings.

This application is for Stage 1 and seeks approval for site layout, location of future buildings, vehicular access from Speed Street, maximum building envelopes including setbacks and height, maximum gross floor area (GFA) across the site, landscape concept, and location and maximum number of car spaces.

The Applicant's architect explained how the scheme has been amended in response to the previous DEP Minutes, as follows:

- The proposal is a masterplan DA for built form envelope and controls only; it is not a fully developed DA.
- A VPA will be proposed as part of the application. This will provide 2 options: car park provided on site or payment of monetary contribution to Council.
- The site borders a heritage building. The previous scheme has been chamfered at the corner to allow views across the site to the heritage item. A neutral blank wall is proposed to the heritage item set 500mm off the site boundary and with planter boxes proposed on top to allow planting to spill over the blank wall to soften the visual impact upon the heritage item.
- The previously proposed podium (above ground) car parking has been removed. A more diverse program is now proposed for the podium.
- The ground floor is set back in from the street boundary so that Levels 1-3 of the building overhang it. The appearance is of the upper levels overhanging the street to follow a high street model with covered roof to allow people to congregate on the ground floor.
- The design intent of the monolithic glass structure is to allow a glass floating form. Glass, including coloured glass, is used as the primary means to express the architecture of the building.
- The introduction of an east/west breezeway through the site at Level 3 facilitates cross-ventilation to apartments and the pool area on the podium level.

## 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 that this project has come before the Design Excellence Panel. The Panel appreciates the architect's explanation of how they have responded to the issues raised in the previous DEP minutes of 20 July 2017. The architect detailed that the scheme has been amended incorporating the following key modifications:
  - The previously proposed 2 levels of above ground parking have been deleted from the scheme. This allows the provision of a stronger base to the building and activation of the streets, notably a more active façade to Speed Street.
  - The scale of the blank wall adjacent the heritage item on the corner of Speed Street and Pirie Street has been lowered, pulled back from the street boundary, and planter boxes proposed on top, designed to allow for the planting to spill over to provide softer green edges to the heritage item. Whilst the setback and planting idea is supported the Panel

has concerns that a single planter box at the top of the podium will not be sufficient. This concept requires further development.

- The ground level of the building is set back from the street to allow for the widening of the footpath and encourage activation of the street. The first, second and third floors of the building are cantilevered over the ground floor to act as an awning to provide protection from the elements and encourage active outdoor dining areas.
- The building separation distances to the western boundary have been increased to 6m-9m.
- The Panel is generally satisfied that the issues raised in its previous DEP minutes have been reasonably addressed by the amended masterplan DA. However, some of the issues in the previous DEP Minutes including the potential impact upon neighbouring sites are still relevant and need to be considered.
- The Panel recognised that the site is a difficult one to develop, having regard to the constraints presented by its irregular plot shape, frontages onto a noisy classified road and its adjacency to a heritage item.
- The Panel acknowledged that this is a masterplan DA and would strongly support the inclusion of a design excellence strategy, which may include a competitive process, peer review, and a design report indicating architectural design intent.
- The Panel strongly recommends the development of Design Guidelines for the site as part of the master plan DA, these should establish clear design based criteria for developing and assessing future stages to ensure a high-quality design outcome.
- Indicative layouts are useful to understand the proposal. However, the proposed envelope needs to demonstrate how, in a valued engineered situation, the main elements of the design will be upheld
- The Panel recommends that the discussions at the meeting be addressed by the Applicant at the DA stage when the building is further revised. This should include the breaking up of the façade, planting walls, glass façade, responses to the heritage building with lower podium height and potential for development on the adjacent non-heritage sites.

- **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.

## **6. CLOSE**

The proposal requires further consideration and the development must be referred to the Design Excellence Panel again when the Development Application is lodged.

Applicant requested that the same Panel members be involved when the proposal comes back before the Panel at the DA stage. Panel convenors to ensure at least some continuity in the Panel.

---

**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 and Associates – 0416-257-833  
John Bohane – Dreamscapes Architects – 0421-324-295  
Edward Li – Dreamscapes Architects – 0420-561-991  
Tony Sun – Dreamscapes Architects – 0433-001-928  
Lou Tasic – Serbona Projects P/L – 0411-704-444  
Yiwen Zhung – Riverview P/L – 0430-509-361

**AGENDA:**

**Property Address:** 1 Speed Street Liverpool

**Application Number:** DA-284/2017

**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

No

### 4. PRESENTATION

The applicant presented their proposal:

Staged Development Application pursuant to Section 83B of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act for a 30 storey mixed use building comprising commercial floor area, a child care centre, gym, 190 residential apartments, on-site parking and demolition of existing buildings.

This application is for Stage 1 and seeks approval for site layout, location of future buildings, vehicular access from Speed Street, maximum building envelopes including setbacks and height, maximum gross floor area (GFA) across the site, landscape concept, 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 notes that the Architect's Registration Number (ARN) is not included on the architectural drawings. All drawings must include ARN and the registered architect must attend the DEP meeting.
- The proposal is likely to have an adverse impact on the development potential of the adjoining site to the west, whose sole street frontage is to Terminus Street, in that:
  - the RMS may not permit vehicle access to that adjoining site from Terminus Street; and
  - the proposal does not comply with the required Apartment Design Guide building separation distances along the boundary between the two sites.The Panel suggested that every effort should be made to include the adjoining site to the west as part of the development site. The applicant indicated that they have attempted to achieve this, however, they were unable to reach an agreement on consolidation. The applicant also indicated that they sought to purchase the heritage item to the south of the site on Speed Street, but could not reach an agreement with that owner either.
- The applicant outlined that the design of the car park allows basement vehicular access from Speed Street to the adjoining site to the west through the subject site, so that should the adjoining site be re-developed, a right-of-carriageway could be created over the subject site in favour of the adjoining site.
- The applicant clarified that the proposal provides for 5 levels of basement parking and 2 levels of above ground parking, the latter to be used as commercial/public parking. The above ground parking occupies two stories of the proposed 4 level podium of the proposal (6m in height).
- Above ground parking is not supported by the Panel, as it does not contribute to the presentation of the development to the public domain. All parking should be in the

basement for prominent key opportunity sites such as this site. Above ground parking does not exhibit design excellence and has implications on adjoining sites, particularly the heritage item to the south-west. The proposed above ground parking overwhelms the adjoining heritage item.

- The proposed blank wall facing the heritage item should be lowered in scale to achieve a greater degree of compatibility with the heritage item. The current scheme is not sympathetic to the heritage item.
- In response to questions from the Panel about the suitability of the proposed entry driveway, the Applicant indicated that the traffic modelling of the intersection by their traffic consultant indicates that it is satisfactory from a traffic point of view and is in a logical location for the development. Further, the applicant said that the driveway is located at the furthest point from the intersection of Speed Street and Terminus Street and the Roads and Maritime Services will not allow vehicular access from Terminus Street to the site.
- The treatment of the entry to the carpark should be sensitively designed contingent on the location of the entry driveway to be acceptable from a traffic perspective.
- The proposed 4 storey high podium of the development abutting the side boundary with the heritage item is not considered responsive to the heritage item. Although a podium is necessary for the development, it must be sensitively designed in response to the heritage item and the scale of the development. Alternative options should be explored by the applicant to provide some type of transition to the heritage item. For example, the proposal could have a 4-storey podium on Terminus Street, wrapping around to Speed Street as far as the main residential entry, with a 2-storey podium on Speed Street from that point to the southern boundary adjoining the heritage item. In summary, the podium must provide a strong base consistent with the scale and height of the proposed building, yet should not overwhelm the heritage item.
- The proposal does not comply with the ADG in respect to building separation distances. The separation distances between the proposal and a possible new building on the adjoining site must comply with the ADG. Therefore, amendments to the proposal are necessary. Failure to comply with the required building separation distances is likely to diminish the development potential of the adjoining site.
- The extensive amount of glazing incorporated into the building facades, especially on Terminus Street, is monotonous. The architectural expression of the building needs to be refined and should incorporate variations in building materials, articulation and so on.
- Internal corridors could be refined in detail to provide some variety, for example by indenting unit entry doors.
- **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.

## **6. CLOSE**

The proposal is not acceptable and must be referred to the Design Excellence Panel Again.

---