

**MINUTES OF DEP MEETING  
15<sup>th</sup> November 2018**

**DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Rory Toomey	Chairperson
Shaun Carter	Panel Member
Matthew Taylor	Panel Member

**OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Kathleen McDowell	Studio Rhizone 0406 062 986
Noura Thaha	Studio Rhizone 0470 692 275
Abhishek Kashyap	Studio Rhizone 0434 390 721
Akram Masri	A & K Engineering Pty Ltd 0415 199 317
Mounir Tamer	Owner 0421 225 503
Fouad Hebous	Owner 0416 034 231

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Nelson Mu	Convener – Liverpool City Council
-----------	-----------------------------------

**AGENDA:**

<b>Property Address:</b>	31 Harvey Avenue, 36 McKay Avenue and 61 Lucas Avenue, Moorebank
--------------------------	--

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA-552/2018
----------------------------	-------------

<b>Item Number:</b>	4
---------------------	---

**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 proponent presented their proposal for the demolition of existing structures and construction of two 5-storey residential flat buildings above basement carpark containing 76 apartments pursuant to SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) to be carried out in 2 stages.

The applicant provides an overview of the proposal as follows:

- Site is zoned R4 and in transition to R3 zoned land. It consists of 3 street frontages. The owner has secured 31 Harvey Avenue into the proposal, as previously recommended by the Panel.
- The biggest challenge for the proposal was the east orientated streets and thus would present challenges to ensure that the development achieves the required solar access. This resulted in 2 tower concept. The north tower was intentionally made into an L-shaped built form to open up the communal open space and to allow solar access to the southern building.
- Basement reduced to allow for more deep soil zone with a minimum of 3m dimension, as requested by the DEP.
- The landscape architect proposes tree replacement strategies to compensate for the trees removed.
- Although site has an allowable building height of 18m, only a 5-storey building is proposed. Ground floor is provided with 3.6m to allow future flexible use, as the site fronts B2 commercial zone.
- Light treatment introduced to the top floor to reduce the overall bulk and mass of the building.
- The dead spaces between the buildings have been improved.
- Apartment sizes have increased to exceed the minimum recommended by ADG.
- Setback separation provided between the buildings.
- 2 Communal Open Spaces provided: 1 on ground level and 2 rooftop terraces.
- The structures on the rooftop encroach onto the allowable building height.

### 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 appreciates the proponent's presentation which provided a background on the design rationale for the overall development.
- The proposed deep soil zone planting articulated on the drawings is supported. The panel is pleased that the scheme proposes the retention of trees on site and along the Streets.
- The diversity of Communal Open Spaces proposed are supported. When asked by the panel in respect to the different sizes of the rooftop COS, the applicant advised that it is due to height exceedance and also to protect the privacy of the R3 zoned land across the street.

- Some of the apartment layouts are considered to be inefficient and incorporate unnecessary circulation space that would not add to the amenity of residents. For example, Apartment 109 is provided with a master bedroom that is bigger than the living area. The Panel recommends that the applicant explores alternative design solutions to re-plan the internal layout of apartments to enhance the quality of internal space for residents as well as contribute to the appearance of the building to the public domain.
- The Panel provided general comments that apartment buildings should be judiciously designed for longevity and proper articulation of materials, including the having solid balustrade to first 3 levels (for better privacy) with possibly the ability to have clear glass above for the privacy of residents. Buildings need to respond to solar access and take advantage of it.
- Any changes in treatment of materials should be carefully defined.
- The Panel encourages the applicant to explore opportunities to improve the communal and corridor spaces. These should include opportunities for the strategic placement of seatings and communal facilities.
- The proposed two building mass is considered to have merit. Rooftop terraces are supported, but these should be complemented with shade structures, toilet facilities and communal facilities including BBQ. The Panel indicated that it supports roof structures supporting rooftop terrace activity, penetrating into the building height contingent on these structures been designed to contribute to experience of the COS.
- The applicant advised that the lifts terminate at Level 5 rather than at the rooftop in order to avoid encroachment into the height limit. The Panel encourages the lifts be extended to the rooftop terraces so as to allow equitable access to rooftop terraces provided that the lift overrun is centrally located and not highly visible from the public domain.
- The Panel encourages the applicant to review articulation of the outside of the building and any materials to be employed should be carefully selected for their intended purposes (selected materials should be chosen to reduce long term maintenance - like brick over painted render, and will likely provide the building with a better appearance (aesthetic) now and well into the future) Mock materials and finishes should be avoided.
- The architectural expression of the buildings is considered to incorporate excessive vertical elements. The design should investigate more horizontal delineation to simplify the buildings appearance. The building, as proposed, is considered unnecessarily busy.
- Two mature trees were noted on the periphery of the site and were not noted on the landscape plan, these trees are to be retained in the proposal.

## **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.

## **Sectional Drawings**

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

## 6. CLOSE

The proposal is not acceptable in its current form. A revised proposal that addresses the issues discussed above is to be referred to the Design Excellence Panel.

---