

**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:**

Maryam Boroumand	Group GSA-Arch – <a href="mailto:mboroumad@groupgsa.com">mboroumad@groupgsa.com</a>
Lisa-Maree Carrigan	Group GSA-Arch – <a href="mailto:icarrigan@groupgsa.com">icarrigan@groupgsa.com</a>
Samuel Shepherd	GroupGSA-LA – <a href="mailto:sshepherd@groupgsa.com">sshepherd@groupgsa.com</a>
Murray Donaldson	Urbis – <a href="mailto:mdonaldson@urbis.com">mdonaldson@urbis.com</a>
Richard Ollerhead	Anglicare - <a href="mailto:Richard.ollerhead@anglicare.org.au">Richard.ollerhead@anglicare.org.au</a>

**APOLOGIES:**

Nil

**OBSERVERS:**

Nelson Mu	Convener – Liverpool City Council
Michael Oliverio	Planner – Liverpool City Council
Peter Oriehov	Planner – Liverpool City Council

**AGENDA:**

**Property Address:** 9-15 Northumberland Street, Liverpool

**Application Number:** PL-95/2018

**Item Number:** 1

**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 proponent presented their proposal for a 12-storey integrated housing development consisting of residential apartments, boarding house accommodation for social and affordable rental housing, a child care centre and a kiosk.

The proponent informed the panel that the site has a recent approval for a similar scale RFB and the new scheme has been conceived around the built form and envelope of the approved RFB. Certain aspects have been rationalised and maintained, notably the stepped built form. Key components include:

- Introduction of integrated communal open spaces. COS towards the street and the rear open space is for respite care.
- Various COS provided: smaller COS provided on level 1, which is paired with the studio and 1 bedroom units; larger COS provided on Levels 6 and 7, designed to allow access to daylight and visibility from the street; Level 8 has more substantial COS - this space butts against the northern adjoining building and formed part of the previous scheme.
- 138 units proposed: 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments. 80% of the units are social and affordable housing.
- Ground floor plan has been refined in response to issues raised by Council's at a Pre-DA meeting and deep soil zone increased from 7% to 15%. This resulted in reduced basement carpark.
- Point of entry/exit consolidated and daylight provided to corridor.
- Child care centre has been replaced with day respite care.
- Materiality consists of bricks and pre-finished panels. Simple palate of charcoal and white.

### 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 strategic decisions that drove the design rationale for the overall development, but wondered if a better approach might have been to review the site constraints (overshadowing of the park, solar access to the southern neighbour, better apartment amenity, whilst addressing the street in a more civic, 'city making' way) in the context of the GFA already approved, as a way to finding a more appropriate built form response. The panel believed this was a better path towards Design Excellence
- The panel notes that the proposal is within the permissible building height limit and it appreciates that the site benefits from an approval for a similar size development. The challenge with the scheme is to minimise impact upon adjoining sites and improve street amenity; this would likely be reinforced by creating a better street wall frontage, as is asserted by the northern adjoining building.
- There is an 8-storey residential flat building to the north of the site and this building is holding a blank wall on its southern boundary and is setback roughly 1.5m from the street.

The panel felt these 2 elements provide the proponent with a strong context to which built form envelope studies should respond, forming an important part of the site analysis.

- The Panel expressed concerns that the southern adjoining RFB, which currently enjoys good solar access along its northern elevation, will be adversely overshadowed by the scheme. The panel discussed the options of pulling the building closer to the street at its northern end or sliding the entire building to align with northern adjoining building so as to minimise overshadowing of the southern adjoining building and reinforce the street wall established by the northern adjoining building. Such arrangements may be appropriate, taking into account the 6m wide footpath of the street and the north adjoining site. Applicant advised that there is a control in the LEP requiring the building to be setback to minimise shadow impact upon the park across the street. It is noted the site has some challenging constraints that are emphasised by the GFA inherent in the proposal. The panel believes these constraints can drive appropriate and high quality design responses and outcomes.
- The Panel encourages the applicant to:
  - Provide built form studies for the site that better solve the constraints mentioned above.
  - The built form studies will include a portion of the building moving closer to the street (within the podium, as a minimum) and aligning with the northern neighbour's street setback.
  - This will require the applicant to re-plan the ground & lower floor plans so that the kiosk ( or other commercial activity ) is pushed closer to the street ( rather than 6m away from it ), in order to activate the street.
  - The re-planning will solve the physical disconnect between the respite care facility and the allocated ground level car parking spaces.
- The distribution of mass will need to provide an appropriate level of solar access to the southern adjoining site. The objective is to achieve SEPP65 solar compliance to the southern neighbour. The manner in which the mass is distributed will be determined by built form studies
- Panel is pleased that the proponent is considering a new scheme rather than the approved scheme.
- The scheme provides for a diversity and distribution of COS, which is supported.
- The reduced basement carpark to facilitate an increased deep soil zone and the mixed-use proposal is commended by the panel. It is noted that the concept of the deep soil zone is to facilitate vegetation, trees, shrubs and groundcovers that will provide an appropriately scaled amenity to the proposal and contribute to the overall amenity of the site and its immediate vicinity.
- The extent of GFA proposed is creating issues that are difficult to achieve good amenity within the development and maintaining the amenity of adjoining sites.

## **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 Panel does not support the proposal in its present form. A revised proposal that addresses the issues discussed above is to be referred to the Design Excellence Panel.

---