

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
Thursday 12th September 2019**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rory Toomey	Chairperson	Government Architect NSW
Alf Lester	Panel Member	LFA
Kim Crestani	Panel Member	Order Architects

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

Ernest Dupon	Benedict Industries
Jonathan Nemedez	Michael Fountain Architects
Michael Fountain	Michael Fountain Architects
Philip Towler	EMM Consulting

OBSERVERS:

Boris Santana	Principal Planner	Liverpool City Council
Scott Sidhom	Coordinator Urban Design	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Application Reference Number: DA-611/2018

Property Address: 146 Newbridge Road Moorebank

Council's Planning Officer: Boris Santana

Applicant: BENEDICT INDUSTRIES PTY LTD

Proposal: (Re-advertise) Construction and operation of a Marina (Georges Cove Marina). The development consists of:

- A maritime building which will house a dry berth facility providing 250 berths, a function centre, tourist, entertainment, recreation and club facilities, a petrol storage tank (60,000 litres) and a diesel storage tank (60,000 litres).
- A wet berth facility for 186 craft (including casual berths) which will consist of a marina basin, rock protection of the basin and foreshore, including embellishment and revegetation of the river foreshore, construction of a navigation channel, construction of public recreational facilities on the foreshore, floating berths and walkways, fuel pumping facilities, sewage pump out facilities and emergency berth access.
- Construction of three external car parking areas and basement car park providing a total of 637 car spaces.
- A private marina clubhouse.
- Associated works and support infrastructure including power, water and sewerage.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

The Chairperson introduced the Panel and Council staff to the Applicant Representatives. Attendees signed the Attendance Registration Sheet.

The Liverpool Design Excellence Panel's (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.

All nine design principles must be considered and discussed. Recommendations are to be made for each of the nine principles, unless they do not apply to the project. If repetition of recommendations occur, these may be grouped together but must be acknowledged.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

NIL.

3.0 PRESENTATION

The applicant presented their proposal for DA-611/2018, 146 Newbridge Road MOOREBANK NSW 2170.

4.0 DEP PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The nine 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 recommendations in relation to the project:

4.1. Context

- The Panel understands that there are unresolved court matters related to environmental (and other) factors of this proposal, and notes that these matters are subject to Council assessment.
- Given the potential for additional development in area, this marina could offer good retail and other facilities for the local neighbourhood. However, the cumulative impacts of future developments to the north and south of the subject site and increased traffic generation and access around this site need to be resolved /addressed by Council.
- The Panel, however supports the project as a positive contribution to the public nature of the waterfront development, its enhanced retail and public facilities subject to the recommendations below.
- The panel supports the proposed staging of the works.

4.2 Built Form + Scale

- The Panel supports the design of the building (including its size, shape and form), as an appropriate and well-resolved functional marina facility.

4.3. Density

NIL.

4.4. Sustainability

- Consider the incorporation of Photovoltaic and battery storage technology, to generate power for lighting and electricity purposes on-site, including electrically powered lifts for boats. This includes (if not implemented during initial building construction), future proofing the building to later incorporate photovoltaic panels (e.g. space for integrating panels onto the large north-east facing rooftop).
- Include drought tolerant and low maintenance species, within the planting schedule (i.e. within the Landscape Plans).

4.5. Landscape

- The Landscape Concept Plan submitted is unresolved and lacks sufficient detail for a project of this scale.
- A detailed set of Concept Landscape Plans (for DA standard) are to be prepared by an AILA Registered Landscape Architect. The plans must show more context, clearly define the proposed design detail at each relevant interface and boundary (including the riverfront), and must provide detail of the proposed materials and finishes, in plan and typical cross sections
- The Panel strongly encourages meaningful integration of indigenous heritage into the waterfront landscape and how it relates to the building and marina. This may be achieved through combining some of the following: planting, paving, material specification, spatial design, artworks, naming and so on.

4.6. Amenity

- It is understood that the previous Panel recommended a bridge (pedestrian and cyclists) which was accommodated to ensure seamless connectivity across the foreshore. The Proponent noted at this Panel meeting that Council had recommended removal of this bridge (due to potential on-going maintenance issues and the need for elongated ramps etc for DDA access). In the absence of this bridge, the walkway/ pedestrian route across the entire frontage of the development should be reconsidered as noted below.
- The Panel acknowledges that since the DA was approved, the bridge has been deleted from the design based on feasibility, maintenance, spatial impacts and requisite clearance height issues. The Panel is satisfied with the alternate route (i.e. along the

building frontage) as an active transport corridor, provided that public access is maintained at all times.

- Overall, this is a function-driven building and is well resolved as a functional marina facility. The sleeving and generosity of the public walkway works well, however the pedestrian route located along the waterfront (in front of the marina building) needs to be further developed to privilege the pedestrian experience over any conflicts generated by the function of the marina, and outdoor dining/entertainment infrastructure that is likely to spill out onto the pathway.
- The walkway/pedestrian route needs to be an unimpeded minimum width of 4m, for the entire journey and Council should consider creating an easement to protect the public right of way along this route to provide for a continuous connection along the waterfront in lieu of the original bridge.

4.7. Safety

- The Panel recommends compliance with CPTED principles, whilst still ensuring that the ground plane remains open and inviting for people.

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

N/A

4.9. Aesthetics

NIL.

5.0 OUTCOME

The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided final direction to the applicant as follows:

The proposal is supported by the DEP, subject to the submission of the required landscape Plans and must return to the panel, with all feedback incorporated or addressed.

The Panel may elect to undertake a desk top review of the amended submission.

PREVIOUS MINUTES FROM DEP MEETING (12 APRIL 2018)

The previous proposal was reviewed by the Design Excellence Panel (DEP), at a Design Excellence Panel Meeting held on 30 November 2015. The Design Excellence Panel made the following comments in relation to the project:

- *The Panel can only consider the DA that is before it.*
- *The applicant advised that the site has always been a quarry and the proposal for a marina was an appropriate building type for this site. It was understood that functions and receptions may be also held on the site.*
- *The Panel understood that the marina was for small boats only.*
- *Water depth was advised to be 2.5 metres.*
- *The draft of the boats was advised as approximately 1 metre.*
- *The issue that had led to the new application was that it was considered that SEPP 55 had not been complied with and that a contamination investigation had to be undertaken. SEPP 55 must be complied with. The panel has no jurisdiction relating to contamination and would leave such matters to the Council and other authorities.*
- *This has commenced and the EPA have been engaged.*
- *In reviewing the DA the JRPP raised the issue of contamination.*
- *Additional flooding investigation has been undertaken since the approved DA. High lead-in time for flooding e.g. 12 – 14 hours and a range of mechanisms for evacuation have been undertaken.*
- *Additional height of the marina buildings is the result of flooding and the DA has been modified. The panel had no issues with the additional height proposed*
- *The Panel queried if it was similar to the ANZAC Bridge Marina. The architect was the same architect as that of the Anzac Bridge marina which was a good scale comparison.*
- *The architect said that it was similar size but had more transparency and that the ANZAC Bridge Marina has translucent glass at the rear wall so at night it glowed*
- *The limits on the size of the vessels is determined by the limits further downstream.*
- *The Marina will operate as a Function Centre and the traffic has been considered.*
- *The Applicant outlined the reasons for the location of the entrance to the marina showing the different scales / uses and “3 headlands” concept and the pedestrian bridge.*

Pedestrian Access:

- *The Panel considered that it was critically important to provide clear contiguous pedestrian access along the River Foreshore.*
- *There should be a 3D CGI/montage of the bridge as it is part of this proposal.*

- *Strong support for the inclusion of the bridge. It was felt that:*
 - *If it was not built now it would not eventuate.*
 - *Ultimately Concrete Recyclers may not be there in the future and a continuous foreshore walk was essential.*
 - *It is too easy for the river edge pedestrian access to be obscured or stopped by the marina operations – pedestrians would be forced behind the marina building.*
 - *If Council did not feel it could maintain the bridge Council could approach the RMS to determine if they would undertake the long term maintenance.*
 - *Council needs to consider the long term future for all residents so they have unimpeded access.*
- *There should be a Landscape Plan that shows how the proposal fitted in with LCC long term vision for the site*
- *LCC should have a landscape framework for the Georges River*