

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

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Lee Hillam	Chairperson
Kim Crestani	Panel Member
Alf Lester	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Nelson Mu	Convener
Michael Oliveira	Planner
Peter Oriehov	Planner

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Simon Twiggs	Frasers Property
George Massoud	Frasers Property
Mathew Kuhn	Frasers Property
Simone Dyer	Frasers Property
Michael Rowe	Ethos Urban
Georgia Darling	Hassell
David Tickle	Hassell
Alistair Eden	Group GSA

**AGENDA:**

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

**Application Number:** DA-779/2017

**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 for the first stage of works for the creation of Residential Precinct 1 at the Edmondson Park South Town Centre involving:

- Construction of 104 residential dwellings:
  - Townhome, terrace and studio dwelling typologies comprising: 24 x 1 bedroom dwellings; 12 x 2 bedroom dwellings; 59 x 3 bedroom dwellings; and 9 x 4 bed dwellings; car parking for 172 vehicles (including 20 x 3.2m wide universal design compliant spaces);
- Construction of Mews x 3;
- Subdivision of land;
- Landscaping and public domain improvements; and
- Provision of utilities and services.

## 5. DEP PANEL COMMENTS

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

- The Panel thanks the proponent for providing a guided tour of the completed part of the 'Display Village' which helped the Panel appreciate the 1:1 scale prototype of the project. It also thanks the proponent for bringing the scheme back to the Panel for its consideration and the explanations on how the scheme has responded to the issues raised by the Panel.
- The Panel commends the new hybrid typology and the mix of dwelling sizes proposed. The Panel supports this new innovative housing type which provides a more "urban" solution to housing with a mix of housing sizes and occupancies.
- The Panel's previous concerns about the length of the block and the lack of breaks in the buildings have been reasonably addressed the Applicant, having regard to the deep recesses incorporated into the facade. The Applicant advised that the block length of the display village is approximately 58 metres long and the longest buildings proposed are about 80 metres long. The Panel recommends that the maximum length of blocks should no more than 80 metres so as to reduce the visual bulk and mass of the buildings.
- Deep soil areas have not increased as previously recommended by the Panel. However, the Applicant has made the case that deep soil zones have been provided as part of the mews and community area of the overall project. The Panel suggests that additional tree canopy cover be provided and the trees be planted in pockets and the vegetation is to be in contiguous soils. The applicant shall quantify the extent of deep soil area provided for in this DA and ensure soil engineers are engaged to assist. (It is noted that the documentation provided indicated the extent of deep soil for each stage. The data for Stage 0 [the demonstration project] indicates a total area of 4000m<sup>2</sup> and a deep soil area of 360m<sup>2</sup> [9%] within the mews area.)
- The scheme would contribute to heat loading due to the courtyards proposed over the at-grade carpark and there may be inadequate tree canopy cover provided within the courtyards. The prototype included planter boxes and proposed tree planting and this was assessed by the Panel as being satisfactory provided Strata Plans cover the maintenance and irrigation is provided as noted by the consultants.

- The Panel was previously concerned that the spatial separation between opposite facing units was inadequate and previously recommended that the separation between buildings be increased to a minimum of 12 metres in order to address potential amenity issues. The Applicant advised that the separation between opposite facing units has been increased to 8.6-9.7 metres and sun shading and privacy screens have been introduced to the third floor bedroom windows to address privacy issues. The Panel has noted, after visiting the prototype that judicious placement of the arbours/ pergolas within the courtyards and the sun shading/privacy screens proposed is a reasonable design solution in addressing privacy and the spatial separation between buildings and that the dimensions noted would appear to be satisfactory given the screening devices proposed.
- The public domain seats within the mews are supported as they are regarded as positive elements. These should be mandatory elements within all the mews.
- The Panel recommends that Frasers Property conducts on-going monitoring following occupation of the dwellings to ensure the buildings including the landscaping are being satisfactorily maintained in perpetuity.
- The new windows and balconies added to end dwellings to enhance presentation of the scheme are acceptable.
- The Panel recommends that Frasers Property commence discussions with Council in respect to garbage collection for the scheme.
- The Panel was previously advised by the Applicant that the units are a minimum of 4 metres wide internally. However, the drawings show some of the 2-bedroom units are only 3.7 metres wide internally. In the Panel's view, living rooms or combined living/dining rooms must have a minimum internal width of 4 metres for 2 and 3-bedroom units.
- The applicant should submit plans providing an open space analysis including an analysis of canopy tree cover for the development.

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

- The quality of the proposed materiality is commended by the Panel. All buildings are to be made of robust, low-maintenance materials and be detailed to avoid staining, weathering and failure of applied finishes.

#### **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.

#### **Sectional Drawings**

- Sectional drawings at a scale of 1:20 of wall section through with all materials, brickwork, edging details are to be submitted.

## **6. CLOSE**

The applicant has reasonably responded to the Panel's concerns about the scheme including acoustic treatment of the carpark, privacy between opposite facing units and the public/community domain treatment.

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  
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:**

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
Mathew Kuhn	Frasers Property – 0438 583 055
Alistair Eden	Group GSA – 0404 656 269

**AGENDA:**

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

**Application Number:** DA-779/2017

**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

Yes

### 4. PRESENTATION

The applicant presented their proposal for the first stage of works for the creation of Residential Precinct 1 at the Edmondson Park South Town Centre involving:

- Construction of 104 residential dwellings:
  - Townhome, terrace and studio dwelling typologies comprising: 24 x 1 bedroom dwellings; 12 x 2 bedroom dwellings; 59 x 3 bedroom dwellings; and 9 x 4 bed dwellings; car parking for 172 vehicles (including 20 x 3.2m wide universal design compliant spaces);
- Construction of Mews 3;
- Subdivision of land;
- Landscaping and public domain improvements; and
- Provision of utilities and services.

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 where 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 for the presentation and taking the Panel through the various stages of the Masterplan and how they have responded to the issues of concern to the DEP.
- The Panel also understands that the "Display Village" of a similar entire block development has been approved and is under construction . That is reassuring that design excellence should be able to be demonstrated in this 1: 1 prototype and that this new hybrid typology can be tested.
- The Panel supported the mix of dwelling sizes which should ensure good social mix.
- The applicant confirmed that the proposal provides for 893 dwellings in total in the residential precinct, consisting of a mix of rear loaded terraces and townhouses. A total of 104 dwellings are proposed within this proposal.
- The applicant advised that all parking will be provided onsite and only visitor parking will be provided within the mews. The at-grade carpark will be naturally vented at either end. The Panel recommends that this be peer reviewed to ensure compliance.
- The Panel previously raised concerns about the amenity of the ground level single aspect apartments in that they are non-cross ventilated, as they back onto the at-grade carpark. The applicant states that mechanical ventilation will be provided to these single aspect non-cross ventilated units on the ground floor as a means to achieve ventilation.
- The applicant advised that all pocket parks proposed will be in private ownership, identified as D, except local park E, which will be dedicated to Council as a public reserve.

- The Panel commends the team for exploring different, diversified building typologies. The architecture of the scheme is sophisticated and interesting and the Panel supports the provision of affordable housing as a benchmark. However, there are some design issues that need to be resolved, notably privacy problems between opposite facing units.
- The Panel is concerned that there is insufficient spatial separation provided between opposite facing units. Whilst additional privacy screens have been included, the Panel recommends a minimum of 9m separation be provided between opposite facing units. As for the Mews a minimum of 12m should be provided between opposite facing buildings.
- End facing dwellings should appropriately face the street. The end dwellings currently have their side elevations to the streets, which do not activate the street, and would be positively advantaged with additional windows that would enhance those dwellings and contribute to the streetscape.
- Consideration should be given to providing breaks in rows of attached dwellings to reduce visual bulk. The scheme would be greatly improved with breaks as recommended in the Draft Medium Density Design Guide. Top 2 levels should be provided with visual breaks and views of the sky.
- The proposed 4m width internally to units is acceptable to the Panel.
- The arbours /pergolas proposed to the private open spaces are acceptable, however, they should not be continuous. The Panel supports the applicant's proposition that landscaping by-law be set up for the scheme so that landscaping will be maintained in perpetuity by the body corporate. Whilst it is understood that this will add to the strata fees this should be seen as a positive contribution to the overall hybrid building typology and will also set a good benchmark for any similar developments. Landscaping should be irrigated to ensure survival of the planting.,
- The applicant should submit plans providing an analysis of canopy tree cover for the development.
- The Panel recommends that the submitted acoustic report be peer reviewed by Council to ensure that the arrangements of the development do not create internal acoustic issues. The peer review should also include ventilation to the carpark and opening into the 1 bedroom ground floor apartments. The DEP suggest some consideration for a sound/air lock directly into the one bedroom apartments having access from the carpark.
- The installation of air-conditioners and condenser units needs to be judiciously controlled . Appropriate details should be submitted.

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

- The quality of the proposed materiality is commended by the panel. All buildings are to be made of robust, low maintenance materials and be detailed to avoid staining weathering and failure of applied finishes.

#### **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  
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	Frasers Property – 0438 534 628
Stephen Gouge	Ethos Urban – 0410 291 014
Mathew Kuhn	Frasers Property – 0438 583 055
Jon Hazelwood	Hassell – 0428 738 612
Lisa-Maree Carrigan	Group GSA – 0412 529 682
George Massoud	Frasers Property – 0403 482 929

**AGENDA:**

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

**Application Number:** DA-779/2017

**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 for the first stage of works for the creation Residential Precinct 1 at the Edmondson Park South Town Centre involving:

- Construction of 104 residential dwellings:
  - Townhome, terrace and studio dwelling typologies comprising: 24 x 1 bedroom dwellings; 12 x 2 bedroom dwellings; 59 x 3 bedroom dwellings; and 9 x 4 bed dwellings; car parking for 172 vehicles (including 20 x 3.2m wide universal design compliant spaces);
- Construction of Mews 3;
- Subdivision of land;
- Landscaping and public domain improvements; and
- Provision of utilities and services.

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 by the applicant. These include Healthiest 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 concept stage of all projects, so that design advice can be incorporated in a proactive and productive manner.

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.
- The Panel notes that no sports fields, some parks, 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 Panel questioned the amenity value of the triangular shaped pocket park for residents, given its location adjacent to a busy road intersection. It was discussed whether the pocket park should be relocated to a less noisy location and that space instead given to private open space and deep soil areas at the rear of the dwellings. Applicant advised that the pocket park will be nominated as a community park, which has been created in response to the intention of the concept approval to provide for a hierarchy of open spaces. The Panel supports the creation of a range of open spaces however would also support a review of the masterplan to improve the scale and amenity of private open spaces, increase building separation and improve the amenity of public open spaces.

### Housing

- The design intent to provide a range of dwellings of different types and scales across the broader precinct is supported. However, the medium density town house model currently proposed has several significant design issues.
- Ground floor single aspect dwellings do not achieve cross-ventilation and are not regarded as great spaces for residents. This is not considered an acceptable outcome for new dwellings in a green field development area. Applicant to revise the design to improve natural ventilation to these dwellings which back onto the car park.
- The proposed 4m deep private open spaces between medium density townhouse dwellings is inadequate and will result in amenity, privacy and acoustic issues. The applicant confirmed that the dimensions between buildings is 8-9.8m and that arbours are proposed to provide screening of cross views from windows and visual relief. The Panel is not satisfied that adequate building separation is provided, or that there is adequate private open space provided to each dwelling.
- The applicant should explore alternative building typologies and the relocation of parking to ensure cross-ventilation to the dwellings, the provision of greater deep soil zones, ground floor private open space wherever possible, and greater canopy tree cover.

### Car parking

- The townhouses have been designed to provide at-grade shared parking at the rear of the dwellings with podium level private open space (POS) above. For a Greenfield site this is considered a sub-optimum arrangement. Wherever possible POS should be located on the ground floor to allow equitable access for all future occupants. The applicant should review the design of carparking, including a consideration of basement car parking, to assist in ensuring planning for cars are not a dominant feature in the site and dwelling design.
- Recommend that visitor parking is removed from the Mews Streets to ensure that these areas can be used for active and passive recreation, consistent with design intent.

### Sustainability

- 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.
- A full review of deep soil provision and tree canopy is required leading to an integrated approach to heat island effect across the precinct.
- The Panel notes the inclusion of solar panels and other energy efficient measures into the proposal, this is supported. These measures require further detail and clear targets that can be monitored.

The DEP offers the following comments in response to the applicants key principles:

**Heathiest and happiest community;**

To achieve this additional space must be given to outdoor living, cars must not be allowed to dominate the planning and a full strategy for access to community and public facilities such as schools, sporting fields, bushland parks and active and public transport must be shown. The Panel does not support the current proposal as being likely to achieve this key principle.

**Entrance to the site;**

This is discussed in the notes on the Town Centre.

**Work and live balance;**

No strategy has been put forward for how the proposal supports this idea.

**Street grid;**

The proposal appears to have 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.

**Vegetated green spine;**

This element will provide some of the crucial tree canopy, however it could be considered as a wider promenade to allow bigger trees. The street and private tree strategy elsewhere on the site is unclear.

**Creation of east/west streets;**

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

**Activate Main Street;**

This is discussed in the notes on the Town Centre.

**Active street edges;**

This is discussed in the notes on the Town Centre.

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

This is discussed in the notes on the Town Centre.

**Fine grain;**

Some variety is being provided in the residential types and in general the residential portion seems to take a good approach to the scale of the built form to the public domain. The dominance of the on-grade car parking is unacceptable when considered against this principle as it creates large portions of end wall to the developments.

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

This is discussed in the notes on the Town Centre.

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

The mews, while supported as an idea, will not be a common feature throughout the development, occurring only once in this proposal. Consideration should be given to including this type more consistently across the site, and to restricting vehicle access to these spaces. Concern that the active parks are not large enough for the population proposed. Concern that pocket parks are located in areas with low amenity and will therefore deliver little benefit.

### **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.

## **6. CLOSE**

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