

Liverpool DEP Minutes

DA-552/2018

31 Harvey Avenue Moorebank

Commentary based on amended plans supplied for desktop review by LCC 20.05.20

Panel

Rory Toomey GANSW

Matthew Taylor, Landscape Architect

Shaun Carter, Carter Williamson

Below are Issues to Be Considered from the DEP Briefing Report:

The application was presented to DEP on 15 November 2018. The Panel raised a number of concerns with the proposal (see previous minutes attached). The external design of the building is largely unchanged, but revisions have been undertaken to try to overcome the Panel's concerns.

The site is part of a previous Pre-DA for a RFB, which had a number of issues raised by Council Officers and the DEP. This proposal is now for two buildings on the site, and 31 Harvey Avenue has now been incorporated into the site, addressing a previous concern.

- *Internal layouts: Internal layouts improved for efficiency and amenity.*
- *Materials and building longevity: Improved materials proposed, and solid or obscure glazed balconies.*
- *Communal open space: The lifts now extend to the roof, and amenities and shade structures added.*
- *Articulation and vertical expression: The building facades have been revised to be more vertical in treatment, with an overall simplified design.*
- *Height: Top of building projects above maximum height restriction, but this is only pergola/shade structure and amenities for the communal roof terrace.*
- *Privacy: Roof terraces now set further back from front building lines.*
- *Solar access: Proposal now appears to comply with ADG requirements.*
- *Cross ventilation: Over 60% of units now cross-ventilated.*
- *Layout/design of accessible units: Layouts of these units now appear acceptable.*

Panel comments on current submission:**31 Harvey Avenue**

The proposal is much improved by amendments made in response to the previous Panel comments.

The following are recommendations to improve it further with minor adjustments to current scheme.

The Macro:

- Overall the diagram of the project is effective as a site and program response.
- A qualified landscape architect must be engaged to develop the site planning further into an integrated built form and landscape response – introduce canopy trees where possible

The Micro:

These are specifically focused comments on the planning / sections/ elevations for the applicants to consider and/or incorporate.

- Represent material composition more accurately on elevation drawings. Brick is currently shown as white and FC cladding as brick-like horizontally striated blocks. ie. CD-1 and BK could be reversed to give a better impression of visual intent.
- The serrated N/W wall of units 002, 102, 202, 302 does not appear to be helping these units with solar access, planning flexibility or apartment separation. The panel recommends replanning these units with their living spaces in the N/W corner enjoying a dual aspect. Bed 1 and bathroom could go along the common wall with unit 001. This is not critical but please explore this suggestion.

Conclusion:

The proposal is supported in its current form subject to responding to the above minor recommendations.

Please review the design considering the above advice; the proposal can continue through the assessments process without returning to the DEP. Thank you for your efforts.