



CUMBERLAND DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL (CDEP)

MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING	27 July 2022
MEETING LOCATION	Via teleconference (Teams)

PROPERTY ADDRESS	1, 3 & 3A Marsden Street, Lidcombe and 2 Mark Street, Lidcombe NSW 2141
Application No.	DA2022/0253
FILE No.	
PANEL MEMBERS	Mr Glenn O'Loughlin (Chair) Mr Ashley Dunn Mr Iain Stewart
APOLOGIES	nil
ATTENDEES	Mr Joe McLaughlin – Urban Link Mr Tony... – Urban Link Ms Christiane... – Urban Link
COUNCIL STAFF	Michael Lawani – Senior Planner Mr Ali... – Planner Ms. Esra Calim – Planner
APPLICANTS	Marque Eight Pty Ltd
DECLARATION OF INTEREST	No known conflicts of interest registered
REASONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY CDEP	Submission of a development application incorporating buildings with a height greater than 25m.
BACKGROUND/PREVIOUS MEETINGS/SITE MEETINGS	N/A



GENERAL INFORMATION

Cumberland Design Excellence Panel (the Panel) comments are provided to assist both the applicant in improving the design quality of the proposal, and Cumberland Council in its consideration of the development application.

This Design Excellence Panel aims to:

- Support Council's *Community Strategic Plan* goals for a resilient built environment
- Facilitate design excellence in development for Cumberland
- Assist in shaping Cumberland's centres into vibrant, attractive and liveable spaces
- Promote innovative design solutions that achieve high quality buildings and spaces for key sites
- Encourage diverse and innovative design that is both contextually appropriate and makes a positive contribution to the architectural quality of the locality

The Design Excellence Panel is established to:

16 Memorial Avenue, PO Box 42, Merrylands NSW 2160

T (02) 8757 9000 F 02 9840 9734 E council@cumberland.nsw.gov.au W cumberland.nsw.gov.au

ABN 22 798 563 329

- a) Act as an advisory panel where applicants for significant development proposals can receive expert design feedback. This includes critical consideration of design elements and, where required, alternative design suggestions and solutions to achieve design excellence
- b) Support the statutory Design Excellence provisions within Council's Local Environmental Plan

In considering the proposal the Panel takes into account:

- a) Council's Local Environmental Plans (LEPs);
- b) Council's Development Control Plans (DCPs);
- c) State Environmental Planning Policy No 65—Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development (SEPP 65);
- d) Apartment Design Guide (ADG).

The Panel's focus is on design excellence, particularly the amenity of the proposal for occupants as well as the quality of the proposal in its context. Absence of a comment related directly to any of the principles, clauses or controls does not necessarily imply that the Panel considers the particular matter has been satisfactorily addressed.

PROPOSAL

Description

The subject site is located at 1, 3 & 3A Marsden Street, Lidcombe and 2 Mark Street, Lidcombe NSW 2141 and is formally known as Lot 7 Sec 2 DP 846, Lot 8 Sec 2 DP 846, Lot 9 Sec 2 DP 846, Lot 10 Sec 2 DP 846, Lot 11 Sec 2 DP 846, Lot 12 Sec 2 DP 846. The site comprises six lots with a consolidated site area of 2,441m². The total allotment is rectangular in plan with three street frontages: a primary frontage to Marsden Street, a secondary frontage to Mark Street and a rear frontage to David Place. The site contains 3 dwellings on the eastern half of the site and an industrial factory building on the western half of the site with associated structures dispersed throughout the site.

The site is located within the 'Lidcombe Town Centre' and is within Key Site 7 in section F2-5 of the Business Site Specific chapter of the Cumberland Development Control Plan (CDCP) 2021. Sharing the site's B4 Mixed Use zoning, adjoining developments consist of 3 to 11 storey Residential Flat Buildings to the west, north and south-west, and single storey dwelling houses to the south fronting Mark Street.

The property at 4-18 Mark Street to the south of the site benefits from development consent DA2019/0229 for construction of an ~~11-storey~~^{11-storey} mixed use development. Similarly, the property at 4-12 Railway Street to the immediate east benefits from development consent DA2021/0092 for construction of 4 mixed-use buildings ranging in height from 2 to 18 storeys.

To the east, Friends Park and the Jewish Reserve are open spaces located nearby the site. The wider locality contains a mix of commercial and residential land uses, and this is anticipated to form the basis of the desired future character of this precinct.

PANEL COMMENTS

Massing & Facade

- The proposed grid design approach is generally successful for the west façade and co-living podium expression, providing building identity and opportunities for solar control.
- Corner balconies on west expressed as part of grid are similarly successful.
- Reconsider the ~~14-storey~~^{14-storey} presentation of the building's western façade to the street, with the façade setback at level 4 to articulate and visually separate the tower, consistent with the other elevations.
- Breaking up the potential maximum building envelope into two separate towers is generally supported for providing a better urban outcome for the street and neighbours to the south.
- Use of brickwork at low level is supported as a robust, low maintenance finish.
- Painted ~~hebel~~^{hebel} at upper levels is not supported from a long-term maintenance point of view – paint will fade and look shabby quickly, a higher quality and more articulated cladding should be explored.
- Reconsider blank facades at courtyard between towers from Level 4 up – facades here should have more openings and be defensively designed to articulate the façade and improve natural ventilation. Considered openings on this façade will provide the opportunity to replan the apartments to provide better cross ventilation and light, noting cross-viewing and privacy should also be managed. Openings should be appropriately sized to work with prevailing summer breezes.
- Consider an eastern boundary setback to achieve a similar outcome on the east tower façade with opportunities for outlook to the neighbouring park. The current proposed blank façade is detrimental to

the site to the east with little expression and a domineering scale. Setbacks and openings will provide better amenity to the apartment occupants and will offer a better and more appropriate urban outcome.

- Street tree planting around the site is strongly supported to provide shade and reduce the heat island effect. The proponent should demonstrate that adequately sized street trees are able to be accommodated by the proposal, particularly adjacent to basement construction.

Communal/Open Space

- Landscape design was not presented at the meeting – Landscape design input should be co-ordinated with the architectural design to ensure the landscape proposed is viable.
- The design intent for communal space, particularly to level 1 and 2 of the building, should be developed further to achieve high quality communal spaces that will be comfortable, attractive and useable for residents. Opportunities for common vertical circulation within these areas to provide shorter travel distances should be explored.
- Further information to confirm compliant solar access to communal open space is required.
- Ground floor communal open space would be better served by a community facility, instead of two office space/apartments currently shown. This community space could be useable by the co-living population and accessed from their lobby too – to overcome social segregation issues. Office/commercial or retail space in this location will be difficult to lease. Apartments here will have poor amenity and are inappropriate.
- An activation strategy/shared zone access for David Place should be incorporated, with the relationship between the laneway and communal open space to east, and commercial tenancy to west developed.
- Windows overlooking David Place from the western commercial tenancy should be included to maintain passive surveillance whilst taking into account quality of outlook.
- Achievement of the ADG deep soil provision is commended.

Co-Living Space

- Consider social aspects and CPTED issues with respect to the proposed co-living component – consider dividing large floorplate into two neighbourhoods separated by multilevel open void space. This needs serious consideration as it will be the first approved co-living development in this Council jurisdiction. Options should be presented that demonstrate pros and cons of different approaches (segregation vs integration and options in between).
- The Housing SEPP requires 30m² communal living area + 2m² per room (more than 6 rooms). To achieve design excellence this living space (or spaces) should provide genuine flexibility with opportunities for gathering in different sized groups, with facilities to cater for a range of living needs. Connectivity between internal living space and communal open space is supported. The panel questions whether a single large internal communal living space which is remote from many of the rooms is the best solution – further details of how this space would operate including precedents should be developed. Consider communal shared internal space for each neighbourhood instead of just one large shared space.
- The scale of communal spaces should be broken up even if they remain in a cluster. Spaces should be designed to allow smaller groups to gather with the possibility of coming together if desired. Care should be taken to avoid a dominant group from taking ownership over the communal spaces.
- Confirmation that (at least 1) Communal Living area will receive 3 hours winter sun between 9am and 3pm is required.
- Co-living communal open space should remain greater than 20% of the site area.
- Communal open space should be accessible from shared circulation, not only through communal shared internal space. Access to communal open space when communal shared internal space is occupied needs to be considered.
- Acoustic issues should be further considered as the large communal space (internal and external) that will serve 85 residents plus guests may get noisy and is directly under residential apartments above.
- Consider solar access, view to sky for south void space through north void space – explore void spaces in section. Void spaces should be used for waiting areas for the lifts to take residents out of the relatively narrow corridor and away from the front doors of units.
- Further development of the long corridor and the entry to each room is recommended to provide better amenity for residents moving about within their living environment. Consider entry door recesses, finishes and/ or expression to avoid potentially relentless corridors. Develop a language for common spaces to enhance legibility and identity. Corridors should continue to be broken up with communal open spaces with access to natural light.
- Consider greenery, landscape design solutions and function for these communal spaces and express their presence on grid façade – general comment is that these spaces need to be designed further as they are shown as blank spaces (literally voids) at the moment. How do they become activated, consider seating, post rooms/ deliveries, community notices etc.
- Consider a stair linking the co-living environment to its ground floor lobby and the ground floor community facility to encourage usage and to alleviate congestion at lifts for early morning/evening rush hour – this really should happen, remove reliance on lifts for lower floors.

- The hidden “dogleg” corridor access to units at southwest part of floorplate should be replanned to avoid the current CPTED issue and reduced amenity.
- Provide a workstation/study to manager’s unit.
- Adequate bicycle/motorcycle parking for the co-living component of the development should be provided. Bicycle parking should be secure and in a location that appropriately reflects the approach to co-living integration. The current bicycle parking arrangements where some co-living residents do not appear to be able to access their bicycle parking by lift is not supported.

Planning

- Improve lobby design/address with mail-rooms and waiting areas – lobbies are too deep by comparison to their width and require better visual access from the street.
- The westernmost lobby and escape stair arrangement at ground level and the co-living levels would benefit from replanning to achieve vertical expression directly below the vertical slot in the southern façade of the western tower.
- The panel is concerned that awnings will need to be provided over entry points to manage wind impacts in this environment of tall towers built to the street alignment. Reconsider the current arrangement in conjunction with lobby redesign, maintaining appropriate lobby height and width for the scale of the building.
- Show neighbouring context on plans, especially. ground floor.
- Improve east entry lobby access to lifts around corner at end of corridor.
- Improve cross ventilation – particularly where windows in bathroom showers are currently shown.
- Reconsider deep balconies or demonstrate that sufficient light and ventilation is maintained with the proposed design.
- Ceiling heights have been designed to the minimum 2.7m – can this be increased without impacting surrounding amenity?
- Co-living ceiling heights are likely to be insufficient and should be increased if possible.
- Waste management provisions do not currently appear to be adequately addressed for a building of this scale and replanning should avoid on floor bins in corridor cupboards.
- Egress arrangements should be reviewed to avoid risk associated with converging exits.

Sustainability

- Limited documentation regarding sustainability was provided at the meeting. A sustainability report that commits to a suitable sustainability target with the design principles and initiatives pursued should be provided, noting that 5/6-star Greenstar (or equivalent) should be considered the minimum for design excellence.
- Integrate sustainability measures into design including:
 - Passive solar design, with shading/screens, controlled natural ventilation and the like including technical studies or expert input as appropriate.
 - Water capture and reuse.
 - Maximising levels of insulation.
 - Choosing appropriate colours to avoid overheating/glare.
 - Maximising glazing performance/reducing glazed extents.
 - Optimised HVAC including recovery systems and mixed-use efficiencies (with commercial component).
 - Maximising air-tightness (with appropriate levels of ventilation).
- Consider energy harvesting with PV cells on roof and/or green roofs for cooler environments.
- Reconsider use of gas – consider future proofing development by implementing electric systems now.
- AC is currently only proposed in Living Spaces. This suggests that owners will retrofit AC into bedrooms and Study with machines on balconies. This should be designed out, provide possibility of AC in bedrooms, oversize the plant to accommodate this. Provide ceiling fans in bedrooms and consider ceiling fans in living areas.

Designing for Country

- How is this being addressed?

GENERAL

The Panel is not satisfied that a DA proposal can meet the criteria for ‘design excellence’ without consideration of the above recommendations, and reasons outlined in the following commentary.

Considerations	Comments

<i>Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved.</i>	The proposal has the potential to achieve design excellence if the recommendations above are addressed in the architectural and landscape design of the proposal in the DA submission.
<i>Whether the form and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain.</i>	Refer to the Panel recommendations above. If these recommendations are addressed, then the development should contribute positively to the public domain.
<i>Whether the development detrimentally impacts on view corridors.</i>	No negative impacts were identified with adjacent properties, but the public realm view along Marsden Street and into Davey Street would improve with the recommended setbacks/changes to the east tower.
<i>How the development addresses the following matters:</i> <i>The suitability of the land for development;</i> <i>Existing and proposed uses and use mix;</i> <i>Heritage issues and streetscape constraints;</i> <i>The location of any tower proposed, having regard to the need to achieve an acceptable relationship with other towers (existing or proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form;</i>	<p>Land is suitable.</p> <p>Appropriate, but subject to improvement of interfaces with ground level environment.</p> <p>There are no impacts on heritage items but the street relationship should be improved as recommended above.</p> <p>The proposed development requires further consideration relative to the surrounding built form. Scope for enhancement of the communal open spaces and public domain needs to be further refined and developed in detail as part of the DA.</p>
<i>Bulk, massing and modulation of buildings;</i>	The building form, height and podium level articulation requires further refinement as per the Panel recommendations above.
<i>Street frontage heights;</i>	See above recommendations.
<i>Environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity;</i>	See above recommendations.
<i>The achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development;</i>	See above recommendations further clarifying sustainability initiatives that should be considered.
<i>Pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access and circulation requirements; and</i>	See above recommendations.
<i>The impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain.</i>	See above recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

The Panel's opinion is that this scheme does not currently achieve Design Excellence, but is capable of achieving Design Excellence if the recommendations above are incorporated. The amended scheme should be referred back to the Panel for further consideration.

