

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING  
22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018**

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Olivia Hyde	Chairperson
Lee Hillam	Panel Member
Kim Crestani	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Nelson Mu	Convener
Michael Oliveira	Planner
Greg Mottram	Planner

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

S. Pini	HDR – 0414-765-012
Chris McGillick	Ethos Urban – 0410 291 014
Michael Rowe	Ethos Urban – 0403-043-345
Georgia Darling	Hassell – 0409 524 575
Warwick Dowler	Frasers Property – 0438 534 628
George Massoud	Frasers Property – 0403-482-929
Esteban Insavsh	Frasers Property – 0426-222-656
Simon Twiggs	Frasers Property – 0412-262-173
Tom Jamison	Frasers Property – 0421-694-501

**AGENDA:**

**Property Address:** Lot 1 Campbelltown Road Edmondson Park

**Application Number:** DA-767/2017

**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 details of their proposal for the first stage of works for the proposed Edmondson Park Town Centre Core. The Applicant's team took the Panel through the various stages of the Masterplan process, the Concept Approvals determined by the Department of Planning and Environment, and detailed how they have responded to the issues raised in the DEP previous Minutes.

## 5. DEP PANEL COMMENTS

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

- This matter previously came before the Design Excellence Panel and the Panel raised a number of issues for the Proponent to consider, as detailed in the previous DEP Minutes. The Panel appreciates the applicant's design team taking the Panel through the various stages of the Masterplan and explaining how they have responded to the issues of concern to the DEP.
- One of the key issues raised by the Panel was with respect to the lack of deep soil zones provided within the scheme. The Panel notes that the scheme has not been amended to incorporate any deep soil zones and the entire project sits above a basement carpark.
- However, the Panel has been re-assured of the proposed tree plantings with sufficient soil volumes of a minimum of 25m<sup>3</sup> that would allow trees to grow to their mature height and provide sufficient canopy coverage. The Panel appreciates the additional details on the proposed trees. The Panel accepts the Applicant's response to raised garden beds as a reasonable design solution under the circumstances. Notwithstanding the above the Panel would fully and strongly support a reduction in car parking and full unencumbered streets and street tree planting that is deep soil and to the water table.
- Although the Applicant presented a case as to why they do not believe it is necessary to provide a pedestrian link through the site, the Panel remains unconvinced about the lack of pedestrian access directly from the Railway Station through the site, despite the challenges presented of the Station and Main Street. The Panel recommends that the scheme should safeguard a future pedestrian link in some form of an at-grade link from the Train Station through the site. The proposed links between the Station and Main Street is considered unsuccessful in that they do not align. The Panel recognises that there is a fundamental problem with the location of Main street and the position of the Station. This is an unfortunate outcome that presents a conundrum between good retail practice and pedestrian hierarchy from the station over which the proponent has no direct control.
- The Panel suggests that the proponent should demonstrate that the routes from the station through the town centre will be pleasant and provided with sufficient shading for users to compensate for additional travel time and lack of a clear way finding path.
- It is therefore considered critically important that greater consistency between Main Street and Henderson Rd be provided in terms of public domain treatment. The proposed public domain treatment to Main Street should continue to Henderson Road and additional tree plantings should be provided along Henderson Road. The scheme would appear to give

greater emphasises to Main Street over Henderson Road. Legibility for pedestrians is a priority and this should outweigh street hierarchy. Main street and Henderson Road should read as a legible continuous public domain.

- Applicant to submit drawings clearly demarcating public and private domain seats and licensed/unlicensed areas where people can sit and eat their lunch without having to pay to use the space. The public private delineation will be essential in ensuring that the public domain is legible.
- The Panel recommends that significant unpaid community uses be explored and incorporated into and address the town square. These unpaid community uses should be located as part of stage 1 of the project and form a critical part of the town centre, as acknowledged in the modification approval for the Edmondson Park Town Centre. Selection of community uses in stage 1 should be undertaken in collaboration with Council's social planners.
- The proposed 3.5m wide footpath inclusive of tree planting verges is considered insufficient. The Panel recommends that the footpaths be increased to a minimum 4.5m.
- The minor amendments proposed to the scheme including commercial component on north-east corner of the site inclusive of public art is supported by the Panel.
- The Panel has not had a presentation on the design of the apartment buildings. Based on the drawings provided the Panel questions the ability of the apartment buildings to comply with cross-ventilation and solar access requirements of the Apartment Design Guide. The Panel notes that the drawings show single aspect apartments as cross-ventilated apartments, which is possibly incorrect and these apartments should not be counted as cross-ventilated apartments for the purposes of satisfying the ADG. As such, the Panel does not endorse that the cross-ventilation shown on the drawings for the single aspect apartments. The applicant is to accurately demonstrate that more than 60% of the apartments are cross-ventilated as required by the ADG.
- Preliminary desktop review by the Panel raised concerns about visual/acoustic privacy and solar access may not comply with the ADG.
- Communal open space quantity should be increased and equitably distributed within the development and made accessible to all residents.
- The Panel expressed some concerns about potential overshadowing as a result of the height of the proposed towers being positioned at the corners of the site.
- The Panel also recommends a review of the design of the apartment buildings is undertaken and potential does exist for a collaboration with different architectural approaches to ensure some diversity of built form.
- The Planning consultants expressed concerns that the DEP Panel was delaying the determination process. The Panel would like to reiterate that earlier engagement with the Panel is highly recommended rather than at a late stage, as raised in its previous minutes.
- The Panel questioned why the scheme did not have any building designed to take advantage of views on to Soldiers Parade. This would appear to be a missed opportunity to have apartments facing Soldier Parade and thus, maximising residents' outlook onto an open reserve.
- The Panel asked the Applicant as to the proposed measures to improve the presentation of the existing commuter car park to the west of Main Street. The Applicant responded by

stating that Transport NSW has no intention to expand its existing commuter carpark. The Panel suggested that the Applicant have discussions with Transport NSW regarding their car park and potential activation of the car park (at least 20m deep) would significantly improve the relationship between the town centre and the car park. The current relationship between the car park and the town centre is considered sub-optimal from an urban design perspective. Whilst it is understood that this may be difficult to achieve the advantages of a public realm space and some activation of the edge of main street would provide a marked improvement to the town centre.

- When questioned by the Panel, the Applicant indicated that the ground level will be linked to upper levels residential flat buildings by a series of lifts. A greater sense of connection between the ground and upper levels of the scheme should be explored by the Applicant.
- Similarly all access from the car park must exit within the public domain space and be legible as public access.
- The Panel sought clarification on the position of the landmark building on the site. Applicant advised it is not in this quadrant, it is in the south-west quadrant, which will be subject to a Design Excellence Strategy and a separate application.

#### **Quality of construction and Material Selection**

- Consideration must be given by the applicant to the quality of materials and finishes. All 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 for the residential flat buildings 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  
9<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Olivia Hyde	Chairperson
Lee Hillam	Panel Member
Anthony Burke	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Nelson Mu	Convener
Michael Oliveira	Planner
Greg Mottram	Planner

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Warwick Dowler	Fraser's Property – 0438 534 628
Stephen Gouge	Ethos Urban – 0410 291 014
Jon Hazelwood	Hassell – 0428 738 612
George Massoud	Fraser's Property – 0403 482 929
Suzanne Pini	HDR – 0414 765 012
Simon Twigg	Fraser's Property – 0412 262 173
Sam Faigen	HDR – 0410 658 773
Tim Lewis	Ason Group – 0412 299 692
Alan Azar	Fraser's – 0478 473 269

**AGENDA:**

<b>Property Address:</b>	Lot 1 Campbelltown Road Edmondson Park
<b>Application Number:</b>	DA-767/2017
<b>Item Number:</b>	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**

No

## **4. PRESENTATION**

The applicant presented their proposal for the first stage of works for the creation of Edmondson Town Centre Core:

- Approval of land uses across the site (including residential and non-residential), with fit out of non-residential the subject of a future approvals (as required);
- Construction and use of the retail, residential and commercial podium including approval of six residential flat buildings consisting of 427 apartments;
- Construction of two basement levels of car parking for 544 residential vehicles, 996 retail car parking, 50 retail motorcycles, bicycle parking; loading dock, plant, exhaust and waste rooms and residential storage;
- Approval for the use, access arrangements and floor space of a 140 place childcare centre. The detailed fit out of the childcare centre will form part of a separate fitout DA;
- Approval for the use, access arrangements and floor space of a 1300 capacity cinema. The detailed fitout of the cinema will form part of a separate DA;
- Civil engineering works including construction of Main Street and a temporary driveway to Bernera Road providing access to the basement;
- Public domain improvements including;
  - parking for 93 bicycles (visitors);
  - design of Eat Street and Town Square and indicative play equipment; and
  - landscaping of Main Street, Town Square and Eat Street;
- Landscaping works to the podium, private and communal open spaces;
- Indicative signage zones;
- Extension of augmentation of physical infrastructure and utilities as required; and
- Stratum subdivision.

The applicant outlined the context of the development, the statutory framework for Edmondson Park (Concept Approval; Statement of Commitments; Design Guidelines and Public Domain). The architectonic of the project was explained in detail by the Applicant's architect and Landscape Architect.

The key principles governing the proposal were highlighted the applicant. These include Heathiest and happiest community; Entrance to the site; Work and live balance; Street grid; Line of sight; Vegetated green spine; Creation of east/west streets; Activate Main Street; Active street edges; Strong connection externally from train and beyond; Fine grain; Create community heart of the town centre; Introduction of mews, pocket and active parks.

## **5. DEP PANEL COMMENTS**

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

### **Design Excellence Process**

It is considered highly inappropriate for a project of this significance to be referred to the DEP for the first time at this late stage. The Panel recommends DEP involvement at the early concept

stages of all projects, so that design advice can be incorporated in a proactive and productive manner.

The Panel further notes that a design excellence strategy for the 'market' and 'landmark' buildings was a requirement of the current Modification. This strategy was required to undergo 'independent peer review' and be approved by Liverpool City Council prior to lodgement of any DA. The strategy has not been seen by the Panel and we understand that it has not been approved by Council. Council / proponent to confirm and address this matter.

Any future presentation to the DEP should also show the competition winning masterplan so that the Panel is able to see the original design intent and its development.

#### Master plan

- The Panel notes that no singular drawing showing all phases of the master plan was provided, so it was not possible to assess the integration of this stage with others holistically. A master plan for all phases of the project is required, including general metrics such as the area of each different use.
- Greater consideration should be given to bringing people directly into the site from the train station, rather than funnelling people to the perimeter streets. The fine grain element within the site should commence from Henderson St as opposed to Main Street and Soldiers Parade as currently proposed. The applicant stated a preference for confining the public activity to Main Street to ensure that there is sufficient activity on this street. Whilst the Panel understand this, it is noted that Main Street is one sided for much of its length due to the commuter car park. The Panel would like to see alternative layouts that more realistically address desire lines and built form context.
- The Panel notes that no sports fields, some parks (but little design detail), no public infrastructure (libraries, schools etc.) are indicated on any drawings submitted to the Panel. The DEP is not able to support the proposal without a full understanding of the amenities to be provided and confirmation on who will provide them.
- The town centre must be more than a retail/ commercial offering. The current proposal does not successfully create a community heart as its focus is on the creation of places for people to spend money. The proposed public open space 'town square' is flanked by retail and is of a size and configuration that will not encourage the public to spend time. The public open space should be more generous and should be mirrored by more public space on the opposite side of Main St.
- The Panel believes that the site has a weak gateway presence due to the lack of an entrance opposite the train station and the location of the communal carpark on the opposite side of Main Street. The panel questions the likelihood of all the proposed small retail shops opposite the railway station being occupied and supported, especially as they get closer to Soldiers Parade.
- Applicant advised that they are in discussions with Department of Education about relocating a high school to the site – a vertical school. Further information is requested on this project when available.
- Main St: Footpath zones and vegetated verge areas are inadequate to support canopy trees, vital to address heat island effect. The lack of deep soil in this area due to the consolidated basement car park that runs beneath the street is unacceptable and is not supported.

## Apartments

- No podium communal open space proposed for southern apartment buildings. This does not comply with the requirements of the ADG and is not acceptable in new development on a green field site. The podium space provided for residents will not be useable as communal open space due to the strong association with the commercial program of gym and office space.
- The Panel did not have time to review the design of apartments in detail.

## Market Hall (including the Cinema, Town Hall, Town Square, etc.) and Landmark building

- The Panel understand that these elements are required to demonstrate design excellence in accordance with a design excellence strategy. As noted above, the strategy has not been seen by the Panel. The Panel is not able to make further comment on these elements without this document in an approved form.

## Sustainability

- The Panel is concerned that the scheme does not provide sufficient shade coverage and inadequately responds to the local climate and heat island effect due to the full basement strategy. The current scheme provides no opportunities for deep soil zones and canopy trees. The site is a large, greenfield site with unlimited constraints and the non-provision of deep soil zones is not justified.
- Environmental targets, strategies and performance monitoring for the scheme should be explicitly detailed in the application (including measuring heat, water recycling etc.) to minimise the environmental impact of the project and ensure that the development is responsive to its development context.

The DEP offers the following comments in response to the applicant's key principles:

### **Heathiest and happiest community;**

To achieve this the Town Centre should focus on providing support to the community. Some of these community support elements are retail, such as supermarkets, fine grain shops and F&B establishments, however there appears to be little consideration to the provision of space or functions that do not require people to spend money. Currently the proposal reads as a shopping centre not a town centre. The Panel does not support the current proposal as being likely to achieve this key principle.

### **Entrance to the site;**

The entrance to the site as a whole as proposed is unconvincing. The established arrival point from the train station is largely ignored and therefore the primary entry address to the site is via private car into Main Street or Soldiers Parade car parks. Further consideration must be given to people arriving by train or bus, and people walking or cycling from other parts of the development eg. where housing, schools or work centres are located.

### **Work and live balance;**

There was no strategy put forward for how the proposal supports this idea. Where are the work centres and how are they accessed from Edmondson Park? Are there any co-working spaces proposed?

The Panel requests that a strategy to achieve this principle be made clear.

**Street grid;**

The proposal has a thoughtful approach to the hierarchy and different characters of streets.

**Line of sight;**

Visibility through the site and to landmarks will be clear. Parks should be further utilised to provide a sense of openness at points along these sight lines. It is recommended that the open public square be extended and further public space be provided on the other side of Main Street (as part of the concept envelope for the hotel building).

**Vegetated green spine;**

The level of tree canopy and vegetation in the Town Centre is inadequate. This Key principle, while positive and dealt with reasonably well elsewhere does not affect the Town Centre.

**Creation of east/west streets;**

No comment. The intention of this key principle is not clear.

**Activate Main Street;**

Main street has inadequate footpath widths and street tree planting. The idea to create a 'main street' is supported however the current proposal is being dominated by the needs of cars and parking (beneath). The position of the Main Street as offset from the station entrance is not supported.

**Active street edges;**

Further ideas for active street edges need to be employed. All activity should not be provided by retail.

**Strong connection externally from train and beyond;**

As discussed in entrance to site above.

**Fine grain;**

The fine grain of the development is being considered in the scale of retail spaces, however it may be considered that diversity of scale is also important. For example, a street frontage to the train station that is the supermarket (provided that it is glazed and open), may be a more successful approach than the numerous small shops which may remain empty during the early days of this development. A supermarket, which usually has longer opening hours and is useful to all in the community, could provide a more practical and lively street activation opposite the station, notwithstanding the level changes (see Northbridge Shopping centre, where the visibility of the activity within provides a better street frontage than a closed small shop.)

**Create community heart of the town centre;**

The Town Centre does not provide a convincing 'community heart'. The dominance of retail, the small scale of any public space and the absence of legitimate tree canopy are all contributing to the feeling that this is not a community heart but a shopping centre. The provision of a cinema complex is strongly supported however the integration of the cinema into the activation of public domain remains questionable in the current proposal.

**Introduction of mews, pocket and active parks.**

Parks are not a strong part of the strategy for the Town Centre. At the very least a strong visual connection to open space and parkland can and 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.

### **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.