

21 August 2018

RECORD OF MEETING NOTES FOR ATTENDEES:

Design Excellence Review

Panel: Darlene van der Breggen Shaun Carter Roger Nelson (by Skype)

Frasers Property: Warwick Dowler Simon Twiggs

Hassell: Angus Bruce Georgia Darling

SESL: Simon Leak Chantal Malner

Ethos Urban: Michael Rowe

Liverpool City Council: Michael Oliveiro DESIGN EXCELLENCE STRATEGY PANEL, Meeting 3, 101 Bathurst St, Sydney.

The following notes summarise the discussion and comments provided to the project team by the Design Excellence Strategy Panel (panel) on 15 August 2018. This meeting was convened to address design issues raised at the second meeting on 05 May 2018.

The review is based on an A3 report provided on 10 August 2018 and PP presentation delivered at the meeting. The panel noted the following in relation to the design issues raised at Meeting 2:

- 1. **Deep Soil:** The panel noted the efforts made by the applicant on the matter of deep soil/ tree pits and appreciates the adjustments made to the originally proposed pits ie to connect them and increase their volume (as shown in the additional materials provided on 10 August). The panel considers this a workable compromise considering the site constraints and is supportive of the security provided by a Bond or Bank Guarantee for tree replacement. The panel recommends that this be negotiated with Council and conditioned as part of the DA determination;
- 2. **Roof Design**: The panel felt that the submitted roof plan did not convey the full visual impact of the roof design, noting that the design is still in development due to its complexity. The application should be supported by 3D elevated views of the roof design (including views from overlooking balconies) and information regarding overall materiality of the roof. The panel recommends that this be conditioned as part of the DA determination. The panel also recommends that the roof plan annotation "work in progress" be changed to "design intent";
- 3. Upper Ground activation of Soldiers Parade: The panel supports the proposed plan adjustment to provide a fully glazed, visually active frontage to the Soldiers Parade elevation of the Market Hall, provided that the glazing is floor to ceiling and that there will be provisions in the leasing agreements to ensure the presentation and visual transparency of these windows. The panel recommends that this be conditioned as part of the DA determination.
- 4. **Parapet wall over retail car park entry**: The panel was concerned with the solid concrete parapet wall (labelled "CON1") over the car park entry as it blocks views into and from the pedestrian laneway above and creates a 'back of house' feel along this frontage. This should be transparent (eg glazing or open balustrade) to increase lines of sight into and from the laneway and 'dissolve' the visual impact of the parapet. The panel recommends that this be conditioned as part of the DA determination;
- 5. Lower Ground frontage to Soldiers Parade: The panel supported the consistency of the louvre finish along this frontage noting that all service doors and door frames should be a matching finish, and flush with the adjacent wall to create a smooth seamless wall and mitigate the utilitarian, 'back of house' character of this frontage. The panel also supported continuation of artwork from the public laneway to this elevation. The panel recommends that this be conditioned as part of the DA determination;
- 6. Visibility of car park access points: The panel noted that the entrance from Main Street

Government Architect New South Wales L24, 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001





into the car park access point is still too concealed from the street. To improve its legibility, the building line should be recessed to create an 'entry foyer' that reveals the top of the escalator to be visible from the street. This entry should also be double height - similar to the car park entry from Eat Street. The panel recommends that this be conditioned as part of the DA determination; and

7. **Soldiers Parade Stairs**: The panel supports the design changes to the public stairway between Eat Street and Soldiers Parade as it is more consistent with its urban setting.

Next Steps

The panel agreed that further presentations would not be necessary and that the above issues can be conditioned as part of the DA determination, as noted.

Government Architect New South Wales L24, 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001





08 May 2018

RECORD OF MEETING NOTES FOR ATTENDEES:

Design Excellence

Review Panel: Darlene van der Breggen Shaun Carter Roger Nelson

Frasers Property:

Tom Jamison Simon Twiggs George Massoud Esteban Insausti

HDR Rice and Daubney: Susanne Pini

Hassell: Georgia Darling

Ethos Urban: Michael Rowe

Liverpool City Council: Michael Oliveiro Peter Oriehov DESIGN EXCELLENCE REVIEW PANEL, Meeting 2, Edmondson Park Sales Office.

The following notes summarise the discussion and comments provided to the project team by the Design Excellence Review Panel (DERP) on 8 May 2018. This meeting was convened to address design issues raised at the first meeting on 30 April 2018. The review is based on a PP presentation and an A4 report tabled at the meeting, as well as site models that were on display at the Edmondson Park Sales Office.

The DERP noted the following progress in relation to the design issues raised at Meeting 1:

Site-wide Strategy:

There was further discussion in relation to the overall lack of mid-block permeability from Eat Street to Henderson Road. As this review is limited to the Market Hall project itself, the DERP agreed that the north-south pedestrian route through Market Hall (aligning with the main circulation spine north of Eat Street) should be maintained – to preserve future opportunities for direct connection to Henderson Road, should the opportunity arise.

Design and Sustainability:

There was no additional information in relation to materials and finishes, or the design of the roof, PV panels etc. It was acknowledged that this aspect of the design is still progressing and it was agreed that further details should be provided for review prior to finalizing the Development Assessment.

Proposed amendments to activate the Greenway frontage with new windows at both ground and upper levels were supported. As these windows are fixed it was agreed that there should be provisions in the tenant agreements for them to remain unobstructed and presentable.

There was still a concern with the extent of blank frontage to Soldiers Parade, as this is the only elevation visible from outside the Town Centre. As previously noted, there is an opportunity to enliven this through terraces or at the very least, openable or display windows from the tenancy behind.

At the ground level of Soldiers Parade, the extent of 'back of house' uses such as service access points etc will have a poor impact on the presentation and amenity of the street from a pedestrian perspective. Careful consideration is to be given to the resolution of this frontage, including detailing, materiality and artwork. Further details should be provided for review prior to finalizing the Development Assessment.

The proposed large cinema façade to Soldiers Parade is an important frontage and the DERP was strongly supportive of the design as it was represented on the display model. The quality and prominence of this treatment should be prioritized over all other artworks on the site.

It was noted that the retail uses fronting the Town Square had not been amended to introduce some civic uses, as previously requested. On the basis that a civic facility will be provided on the opposite side of Main Street, the DERP felt that:

- the design of the square should be opened up to visually incorporate the civic frontage opposite
- the civic uses should be predominant, ie at least 2 stories high and extending the full width of the square.

Government Architect New South Wales L24, 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001





Circulation and Access:

Further information was provided on the operation of the pedestrian entries / exits to carparks, but no design changes are proposed nor was there any undertaking to provide 24 hr access. The DERP maintained that both access points should be clearly visible from the public domain and operational 24/7 if possible. At the very minimum at least one of the access points should be operational 18/7.

More information on the proposed pedestrian bridge was provided and the DERP was pleased to note that it would not be enclosed. The DERP was satisfied with the current design provided that the openness as well as the 6m clearance above Eat Street are maintained.

Public Domain:

Additional information about the design of the public domain was provided, including materials and details. The DERP was satisfied with the quality of finishes and the degree of resolution but still felt that the public spaces are excessively cluttered.

The proposed design for the Solders Parade entry stairs was clearly understood from the site model as well as additional information that was provided at the meeting. While the overall configuration of the ramp and stairs works well, the proposed terrace lawns and planted edges are unsuited to this entry. The DERP agreed that it should have a robust urban character with no soft landscape treatments, and with metal balustrades instead of glazed balustrades.

There was further discussion in relation to deep soil planting for all trees. The proposed recessed planting pits are still not considered adequate and it was noted that the combined 632m³ tree pit for the 42 trees in the Town Square doesn't even meet the standard (25m³/tree) proposed in the previous meeting. The DERP was concerned that since the last review, no further investigations had been undertaken to address this concern, even though bulk excavation for the underground car park is progressing rapidly. The opportunity to introduce deep soil planting to the public domain (as in Rouse Hill Town Centre) must be seriously investigated before the project progresses any further. The DERP agreed that this is the best opportunity for the Town Centre to achieve meaningful tree coverage over the longer term, and that it will add considerable value to the quality, amenity and operation of the Market Hall and the Town Centre.

Next Steps

The DERP agreed that further presentations would not be necessary and that outstanding issues could be reviewed through email and phone discussion, and subsequently as DA or CC conditions.

In conclusion, the DERP agreed that the proposal has the potential to achieve Design Excellence, but that this will be subject to the recommendations outlined in these notes.

Government Architect New South Wales L24, 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001





30 April 2018

RECORD OF MEETING NOTES FOR ATTENDEES:

Design Excellence Review Panle:

Darlene van der Breggen Shaun Carter Roger Nelson

Frasers Property:

Tom Jamison Simon Twiggs George Massoud Esteban Insausti

HDR Rice and Daubney: Susanne Pini

Ethos Urban Michael Rowe

Liverpool City Council Michael Oliveiro George Nehme DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL REVIEW, Edmondson Park Town Centre Liverpool City Council – 33 Moore St, Liverpool

The following notes summarise the discussion and comments provided to the project team by the Design Excellence Review Panel (DERP) on 17April 2018. The review is based on a PP presentation and A3 architectural drawings.

The proposal is for the Marketplace, a 2 storey development, comprising 45Km² of retail as well as cinemas and medical centre, at the heart of the proposed 5ha Edmondson Park Town Centre. Design Excellence consideration is required as a condition of the original development consent.

The DERP commended the design team on the thoroughness of its background investigations, but felt that not enough information on the proposal itself had been made available. The resolution of built form above ground still appears to be conceptual. The DERP noted the following design issues:

Site Strategy:

The DERP supported the proposed location of the Marketplace within the town centre, but noted that there was very limited permeability and an absence of direct and legible mid-block connections aligning with external laneways and approaches to significant destinations such as the railway station. Plans showing how the Marketplace can directly connect to such destinations (including the station entrances, street crossing points etc) should be provided in future presentations. An illustration of a typical after hours pedestrian route, from the railway station to home for example, would be helpful.

Design and Sustainability:

The exuberance of the design strategy and the richness of the material palette was commended although it was not certain that these would be able to be delivered and that some substitutions may be needed. As a general principle, the DERP supported authenticity of materiality. Future presentations should provide realistic information about proposed details / materials - as the basis for a firm commitment to deliver the quality of built form and materiality shown in the CGI/ renders.

The complexity of the folding roof and elevations appears to be more resolved that the drawings and perspective suggest, and the DERP was hopeful that this design feature could be preserved throughout design development. There was no indication as to how these could be integrated with solar panels and the DERP was unable to draw any conclusions in relation to the impact of the roof and solar panels on future residential developments that would overlook the Marketplace. Future presentations should provide more information on the 3 dimensionality of the design and the roof in particular.

The proposed awnings are an important design feature and there was much discussion in relation to detail and configuration with some views showing that further resolution is required to resolve awkward junctions. Alternative methods of pedestrian shelter, such as ground level setbacks, could also be considered instead of separate awing structures.

The extent of blank frontages to the public domain, particularly facing the residential street to the south and Solders Parade, is excessive and needs further consideration. Consider providing glimpses of internal activities from the street, as well as

Government Architect New South Wales L24, 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001





opportunities to oversee the public domain from within the retail areas - to improve street activation and personal security for street users.

Further resolution of the public domain interface, particularly at the Soldiers' Parade and Town Square frontages is required:

- For the Town Square, there should be more civic uses fronting the square. Notwithstanding Council's intention to commission a civic facility on the opposite side of Main Street, the DERP felt that the character of the square will be largely determined through the Marketplace project. As such, the square should be equally accommodating for non-retail users, ie a combination of retail and civic uses at the main frontages.
- For the Soldiers Parade frontage, it was clear that additional work is required to resolve the level changes as well as blank frontages concealing services and other 'back-of-house' functions. The DERP felt that there was great potential to better optimise its unique elevated location overlooking the community park opposite. The detailed design and proposed uses should be reviewed to improve activation and provide opportunity for overlooking the park through, for example, 'belvedere' style terraces or generously terraced stairs that accommodate seating and circulation.

Circulation and Access:

Pedestrian entries / exits to carparks should deliver people to the main public streets and the Town Square. They should be clearly legible from all approaches and seamlessly integrated with the public domain, ie in locations that don't diminish the urban character or impede pedestrian traffic flows.

The proposed car park entries / exits are too concealed from the public domain and appear to be within areas that are closed outside trading hours. In general, future presentations should provide more information showing how the public domain is accessed throughout the daily cycle.

There was little information on the design of the proposed pedestrian bridge across Eat Street. In general, pedestrian bridges should be avoided, particularly in lower density town centres, as they obstruct clear view lines in streets and reduce pedestrian activity at ground level. The circulation and access to the proposed cinemas should be reviewed to remove the need for a pedestrian bridge.

If a pedestrian bridge is unavoidable, then it should be detailed to minimize visual impact in the public domain, maximise transparency and be clearly connected to stair, lift and public domain access. There should also be a greater range of uses at either end to increase use of the bridge and allow it to become an upper level vantage point that overlooks the Town Square.

Public Domain:

The extent of below ground parking prevents deep soil planting for all proposed new trees. The proposed 25m³ of growing medium for each tree is inadequate for street trees of the size shown in the CGI's. Full soil depth should be provided below public corridors and the Town Square (as per Rouse Hill Town Centre).

Noting that the proposal relies heavily on the delivery of a strong well defined public domain on all frontages, a public domain plan showing materials and details, and clearly differentiating public from private, is required.

Proposed public spaces should not be excessively filled with design street furniture

Government Architect New South Wales L24, 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001





and other objects ie allow for some uncluttered space for future uses / programming.

Next Meeting

A further presentation considering the issues that have been raised, is required. The following additional information is to be provided:

- •
- •
- •
- •
- Drawings showing scale and north points Plans showing car park and roof levels Sections upgraded to show parking The project Landscape Architect should attend the next meeting Perspective views should include street hardware eg street lights and signage. •

Please note that these comments are preliminary and advisory only

Government Architect New South Wales

T+61 (02)9860 1464

