

CITY OF CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN

DESIGN ADVICE REPORT

OF THE CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN DESIGN REVIEW PANEL MEETING

HELD ON 10 SEPTEMBER 2024

PANEL MEMBERS Stephen Cox - Chair
PRESENT Gabrielle Pelletier - Panel Member

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Bruno Pelucca - Senior Urban Designer
Joanna Niedbala - Panel Secretariat
Alice Pettini - Executive Planner
Robert Steedman - Team Leader Planning East (observer)
Natasha Parasiris - Town Planner (observer)

The meeting opened at 10.07 am

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The City of Canterbury Bankstown acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land, water and skies of Canterbury-Bankstown, the Darug (Darug, Dharug, Daruk, Dharuk) People. We recognise and respect Darug cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land. We acknowledge the First Peoples' continuing importance to our CBCity community.

INTRODUCTIONS

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairperson asked the Panel if any member needed to declare a conflict of interest in any agenda item.

All Panel members returned "Declaration of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement" forms and there were no conflict of interest declarations.

DA-30/2024: 206-214 LAKEMBA STREET, LAKEMBA

Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a five-storey mixed use development comprising of:

- A Registered Club;
- Community Facility;
- Commercial Premises;
- Function Centres;
- Food and Drink Premises;
- Business Identification Signage;
- 2 level basement; and
- Associated landscaping.

Site Visit

A site inspection was undertaken by Panel members prior to their first review of the matter on 11 April 2024.

Briefing by Council Planning staff

Alice Pettini, Executive Planner, presented an overview to the Panel.

Presentation by Applicant

The applicant was not in attendance.

PANEL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

The Panel has provided advice regarding the proposal in response to the CBLEP Design Excellence clause 6.15 and its subclauses below.

Introduction

The Canterbury Bankstown Design Review Panel met on 10 September 2024 to review the amended proposal for 206-214 Lakemba Street Lakemba. The amendments to the proposal included a new landscape zone on the western boundary of the site, a pad-mount substation, additional services information shown on the plan, and several updates to improve safety, align with NCC requirements, and to improve some operational issues.

While these changes were welcome, most of issues raised at the 11 April Design Review Panel meeting remain unresolved.

To summarise the comments below, the 206-214 Lakemba Street project is complex, proposing an ambitious number of different uses in a single building, however, the organization of these uses in a radial configuration does not assist the coordination of the different components of the building or provide a high-quality design outcome. Having reviewed the proposal for the second time, the Design Review Panel concludes that the radial design is unwieldy, complicates and undermines the proposal irredeemably. We conclude that it is the wrong answer for the site, it is unsuitable for the complexity of the building, creates a poor-quality outcome, and therefore cannot be considered a high-quality design to achieve design excellence.

Notwithstanding the difficulties arising from the organizing principle of the building, other contextual design issues also remain, such as the relationship to the approved multi-residential development to the south, the urban form on Lakemba Street, the dominance of vehicle movements on site at the expense of pedestrians, the lack of activation of the public domain, material selections, and constraints on the landscape due to the design.

To assist the applicant, the text from the 11 April Design Review Meeting is repeated below within a box, with additional comments arising from the 10 September 2024 Design Panel Review following each section.

General

The Panel understands that the site has several challenges including the stormwater easement along the western boundary, the interface with the adjoining R2 zone, the approved development to the north (Nos 5-9 Croydon Street), and the risk of flooding on the site. During the site visit the Panel also noticed the three large trees located along the northern boundary which are currently proposed to be removed.

The Panel is concerned that the proposal has not adequately considered these constraints and consider alternative design outcomes that may provide better resolution and potential of exhibiting design excellence.

The site is identified as part of the Key Development site in the Croydon Precinct in CBDP Chapter 11.4. The DCP includes a structure plan which shows a pedestrian connection and landscaped overland flow zone, 10m wide, adjacent to the western boundary of the site. Ideally, the stormwater infrastructure is to be relocated into this zone. The Panel is of the opinion that this zone should be included as part of the design as per the DCP. In addition, a street setback on Lakemba Street of approximately 3m, not required by the DCP, would assist to retain the existing street trees, and provide more space for an appropriate interface to mediate levels between the street and the required flood level, to accommodate stairs and ramps, and to promote activation of Lakemba Street.

The current design proposal, adopting a radial grid arrangement, appears to be generated from the alignment of the stormwater easement and the eastern boundary. The arrangement, while distinctive, creates a difficult design framework which results in inefficient planning and an outcome that does not achieve design excellence. The panel is of the opinion that adopts the western landscape zone and Lakemba Street setback would provide a development envelope that would facilitate a simpler and more efficient outcome which would have a greater potential to achieve design excellence.

To assist the applicant, the Panel has provided further detail about the particulars of the proposal in response to the CBLEP Design Excellence clause 6.15, these relate to the current design but are considered helpful should an alternate design be considered.

Refer to the summary comments above concerning issues that remain due to the limitations of the radial organisation.

The landscape setback to the western boundary is an improvement on the previous design, however the priority of vehicle movements still dominates the ground plane, and the resolution of entry and level changes from the street is unsatisfactory to provide appropriate benefit to the public domain and activation.

Refer also to comments below under the Canterbury Bankstown LEP Design Excellence headings.

1. Architectural design and materiality

Subclause 4(a): Whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved.

Materials information is provided but is not comprehensive.

The proposal includes a Schedule of Colours and Finishes which includes a CGI identifying the proposed finishes. In light of the design excellence considerations for architectural design, materials and detailing, the panel questions the appropriateness of the material selections.

- There appears to be a reliance on applied finishes such as cement render and paint which are questionable in terms of quality and require more intensive maintenance.
- The use of unshaded curtain wall for the northern elevation
- Various materials are not identified on either the Schedule of Colours and Finishes or the elevations.
- The proposal lacks a proper analysis of materiality in the context which might inform an appropriate materiality for the building type and location.

The panel recommends that materiality be reviewed whilst undertaking a context analysis. It is also recommended that detailed sections (at 1:50 or more detailed scale) are provided through the key facades showing the proposed finishes and construction methodology to demonstrate whether a high standard of architectural design, materials, and detailing will be achieved by the proposal.

Despite the amendments, the proposal does not exhibit a high standard of design, materials, and detailing.

To provide a fuller sense of the issues with the design, the response in this section is expanded to consider other aspects of the design including more technical coordination issues as well as materiality and detailing. From an organisational perspective, the design exhibits problems with qualitative issues such as circulation, street activation, the placement and design of stairs and ramps, and landscape, which are discussed in other following sections.

From an initial technical review of the proposal by the Design Review Panel (not an exhaustive review), both structure and building services are not adequately considered or coordinated in the proposal.

As proposed, the design will require significant modification to resolve and coordinate the structure and building services, and therefore the panel concludes that the proposal is not a high-quality design.

Structure

The structural layout is incomplete and not coordinated:

- Structure does not align through the levels and the sections demonstrate that there is no allowance for transfer structure.

- This building will require large spans for the function, restaurant, and theatre spaces, but no allowance has been made for the significant depths required to support these spaces.
- Structural depths for the larger spans are not shown on sections and these will also require coordination with services which will significantly lower ceilings.
- It is highly inefficient to have an intervening office level (level 2) not requiring large spans located between function and restaurant spaces above and below that require large spans. A more efficient layout would locate the offices elsewhere which may then also allow all office rooms to access natural light.

A high-quality design for a building of this type would exhibit careful organisation of spaces and resolution of structure. As a starting point, the structure should be largely continuous extending from the car park grid to the roof with discrete areas catering for larger spans.

To reorganise the building to achieve an efficient and workable structure grid will almost certainly affect the overall form, massing, and layout of the building. The panel is convinced that this organisation needs to occur and therefore conclude that the current proposal does not achieve a high-quality design.

Building Services

The services integration is also incomplete and not coordinated. Again, the Design Review Panel has conducted an initial review (not an exhaustive review) which has raised questions, including the following:

- Services do not reticulate vertically, go missing from one floor to the next, or in their vertical reticular then appear in the middle of a room.
- Drainage of concrete roofs is notional and is unresolved in relation to capture of water and reticulation. This is a services coordination problem that will have other effects for material selections and detailing. For example, how will water collected from the large roof reticulate when the concrete soffit is exposed beneath?
- The sections do not show the required ceiling spaces to accommodate services even when the required service space is annotated on the plans. As the structure is also not properly shown on the sections, the coordination required to understand the ceiling height and then the volume and proportion of the spaces below is incomplete.
- Placement of services is inefficient and will cause unnecessary expense. The substation and main switch room seem to be located as far apart as possible from each other, and the layout requires the connecting cable to run through a stormwater easement. Typically, a close connection between switch room and substation is advantageous both for cost and to meet the requirements of the energy provider.
- The Design Review Panel has not sighted a BCA report and therefore have questions about fire safety. What performance solutions are proposed? How will sprinklers integrate with off-form concrete soffits?

Building Operation

There are also many questions about the effective operation of the building. One issue that does not appear to be resolved are the design considerations for the commercial kitchens:

- There are four commercial kitchens servicing different gathering spaces in the building. Only two are connected to the goods lift, the others are presumably accessed and serviced through front-of-house areas and regular passenger lifts. This is not ideal for

functionality or a high level of service.

- Without any physical connection between the different kitchens, is it feasible to operate four different teams to service these spaces?
- Is there a hierarchy of preparation and service kitchens? Other similar projects would operate a main kitchen and service other areas with a service kitchen, providing a more efficient staffing and service model.
- Are the kitchens sized appropriately for the spaces they serve? Kitchens appear to be sized at approximately 10-15% of the areas they serve which appears far less than normal standards.
- How is waste handled? Do the upper kitchens require waste to circulate through front-of-house areas and lifts?

A demonstration of a high-quality design outcome would be to stack back-of-house services to facilitate vertical reticulation such as service lifts, exhaust risers, and drainage. This would also facilitate an operational model that has one main commercial kitchen and smaller re-heat style kitchens. This is similarly absent from the logical set out of service and circulation cores across the building. In the panel's opinion, a different approach to the planning and organisation of the whole building would be necessary to do this. As proposed, the panel is not convinced the design offers a high-quality solution.

Other Issues

The panel has similar questions about arrival, circulation, wayfinding, egress, amenity of spaces, outlook, and thermal comfort. To assist the applicant here are some key questions that are unresolved or raise questions about the quality of the design:

- Should access to the large gathering spaces above ground floor be completely reliant on lifts? A void is created through four floors (which may trigger atrium NCC fire requirements). A front-of-house stair would provide an appropriate connection for at least two or three levels.
- The gallery/foyer spaces are located adjacent to a curtain wall without any solar protection besides glass selection (unspecified except for "film protection". This is unlikely to provide a comfortable environment for people in hot weather.
- The northern fire stairs are in an important front-of-house area. Is there a better location for them? Can they discharge under an awning without a fire engineered solution?
- The reception area is in the centre of ground floor lobby with the lifts behind. Is this a suitable and workable location for so many different uses in the building? Should the desk be more closely linked to the building administration to avoid an isolated staff member being so exposed in this location?

Materials

The April Design Review Panel notes requested 1:50 detail sections for each façade type. The panel considers this information essential in the Development Application documentation for several reasons:

- The sections outline the different façade strategies for building.
- They demonstrate that each façade has been considered and that all the facades relate appropriately to each other.
- They show the selection, location, construction intention of each material.
- They provide assurance to the panel and Council that the design selections and

detailing will be present in the final building.

Therefore, it is not appropriate or desirable that these sections should be prepared at a later time for the Construction Certificate.

The panel provides these comments about the proposed material selections:

- Rendered and painted concrete is not considered a high-quality finish.
- The exposed concrete soffit is unlikely to be high quality finish due to the care in construction required to achieve a high-quality finish, the lack of coordination of roof and ceiling mounted services which will affect the appearance of the soffit.
- Screening over blank walls on the south façade is not supported.
- Screening to plant is undefined and therefore the panel assumes a high-quality finish is unlikely.
- Materiality is not shown on many walls. It is presumed to be render and paint and therefore not supported by the panel.
- Looking closely at the CAD model in elevations and perspective views, there are many areas that are unresolved including exposed slab edges, unresolved slab thickening visible on the façade, missing elements, and poor geometry.

To assist the applicant, the panel notes that the expectations of a project that is required to respond to the Design Excellence requirements of the LEP are greater than a normal DA. Based on the documentation reviewed by the panel, a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate the building type has not been achieved on the project.

2. Form and external appearance in context

Subclause 4(b): Whether the form and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain.

The panel notes that the proposal exhibits a distinctive form. As a community building, something distinctive and different to the context is potentially appropriate for the development. Considering the adjoining properties along Lakemba Street there is an opportunity for the project to set an urban agenda, becoming an example for later development. However, the panel's understanding of the form is that it is derived from site constraints rather than in response to the wider urban context.

The proposal includes the removal of street trees and a series of ramps and stairs which are due to the level change to achieve a flood planning level. The stairs, ramps and circulation areas appear extremely constrained due to the placement of the building. The panel is of the opinion that a greater setback from Lakemba Street may allow the retention of the street trees and more space for a more generous and successful level transition to the flood planning level.

The hardscape materials proposed for the street Interface (plain concrete and pavers) do not appear sufficient to achieve the objectives of design excellence.

The amended proposal outlines the inspiration for the form and appearance of the project based on Classical Greek architecture and more specifically the Greek Colonnade and Agora. No study or precedents are shown, analysed which might inform the necessary translation

into the proposal. The panel is unconvinced by the explanation provided.

While inspiration from Classical Greek Architecture might be appropriate for this building, further resolution is required to both understand the precedent and to properly locate this building in its urban context. The resolution of the urban context is important as this building has an opportunity to set the urban agenda along Lakemba Street.

The panel's intuition is that a building which creates a street wall along Lakemba could interact with the existing and future urban context and provide an organising principle which could embrace reference to Classical Greek Architecture. In the panel's opinion, the current proposal has not adequately analysed the existing and future urban context nor properly examined and translated Classical Greek precedents into a coherent design.

Other details raised in the April Design Review meeting remain unresolved:

- The system of stairs and ramps are not well designed and create awkward and constrained spaces.
- Vehicle movement dominates the ground plane at the expense of pedestrians and landscape.
- Outdoor dining spaces in front of the retail spaces are small, uninviting and unshaded and compromised by stair access. The panel has strong doubts about the viability of these tenancies for retailers.

In the opinion of the panel a different approach is required to mediate public domain, outdoor dining, accessibility and needs of good retail tenants.

The panel therefore is not convinced that the current approach to the form and external appearance achieves the high-quality design as required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

3. View corridors

Subclause 4(c): Whether the development detrimentally impacts on view corridors.

The panel is unaware of any view corridors that should be protected on the site. However, the proposal includes elevated balconies on levels 1-4 which are in close proximity to the approved apartments over the southern boundary and laneway. The panel is concerned that these outdoor areas may cause privacy and/or acoustic problems for the residents.

It is of similar concern that the ground floor elevation along the southern boundary directly faces the private open spaces of lower-level apartments, and the location of plant and blank facades will be noisy and unsightly, poorly impacting the amenity of these residents.

It is recommended that the applicant seek access to the adjacent site planning in order to adequately assess visual, acoustic, and overshadowing impacts to this development. Further design consideration, section studies, details and consultant input are advised to properly consider this interface.

The concerns relating to privacy risks to the adjacent developments are not resolved by the amended proposal:

- The outdoor balconies on the south façade still appear problematic with reference to their proximity to the approved apartments on the opposite side of the lane. A different organisation of the building may solve this issue. Balconies to the northern or western frontage would provide solar protection to the façade and avoid the noise and overlooking concerns of the current proposal.
- Where provided, the screening of the current design is not considered adequate to resolve the acoustic and privacy concerns.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to the to view corridors and privacy achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

4. Heritage and Country

Subclause 4(d)(i): How the development addresses heritage issues.

The panel is unaware of any sensitive heritage considerations for the site. However, the panel advises that the project should respond to Country.

As a project requiring the exhibition of design excellence, the panel recommends that the design includes a response to connecting with Country. As a starting point the panel recommends reviewing the project through the lens of the GANSW “Connecting with Country” framework.

While an Acknowledgement of Country plaque is now included in the design, the panel’s opinion is that a more detailed response is required.

Ideally, an indigenous consultant is engaged to facilitate meetings with the local indigenous community so that a more thorough and meaningful response to Connecting with Country is provided. The panel is of the opinion that the size and scope of the project necessitate this type of response to this issue.

The panel is therefore not convinced that the current approach to heritage and country achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

5. Relationship with neighbouring sites

Subclause 4(d)(ii): How the development addresses the relationship of the development with other existing or proposed development on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form.

The relationship with the development to the south of the site requires further consideration. Overshadowing, privacy, and noise should be examined in further detail.

- The height and massing of the proposal appears to reduce solar access to the approved development to the south, Nos. 5-9 Croydon Street. Shadow analysis should be supplemented with elevational shadow analysis to assess the reduction in solar access to the approved apartments. The panel does not support any proposed height encroachment due to the risk of overshadowing to the approved apartments.

- As discussed above, the location of external balconies on the southern façade are potentially problematic for noise and privacy. Further analysis of these spaces should be provided.

While further overshadowing information is provided, the panel has the following comments:

- Overshadowing should consider compliant and non-compliant building heights.
- The shadow diagrams are inconsistent and need revision. Compare for example, 2.00pm View from the Sun with 2.00pm elevation shadows. Elevational shadows for 3pm and 4pm appear identical.
- What solar access outcome is proposed for the adjoining approved residential project. Will the building still achieve Objective 4A-1 design criteria? Is non-compliance further exacerbated by the additional building height?

The panel is not convinced that the additional height in the proposal is warranted. In their opinion a different and more efficient arrangement of spaces could both provide a more workable design, reduce height, and alleviate the current concerns regarding overshadowing, privacy and noise.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to neighbouring sites achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

6. Bulk, massing and modulation

Subclause 4(d)(iii): How the development addresses bulk, massing and modulation of buildings.

As discussed previously, the proposal exhibits a distinctive design which appears related to the specific challenges of the site, rather than being driven by the design principles of Classicism. As stands, the proposal includes level 4 which breaches the height limit of 18m. The panel questions whether the current design strategy creates inefficiencies of planning that generate the breach and is of the opinion that this would be avoided if a more regular orthogonal building form were explored.

As discussed previously, the panel is not convinced that the radial design provides an appropriate design logic for the proposal. The panel is of the opinion that a different design organisation would provide a better response for height, bulk, and modulation.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to bulk, massing, and articulation achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

7. Sustainability

Subclause 4(d)(iv): How the development addresses street frontage heights, environmental impacts, including sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity.

Subclause 4(d)(v): How the development addresses the achievement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

As a large non-residential building with a capital investment greater than \$10 million, the applicant will be required to comply with the State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 2022 legislation. This will include standards for energy and water, provisions for future net zero compliance, and reporting of embodied emissions. It should be noted that these are new minimum standards. Developments seeking to achieve design excellence should meet and where possible, exceed the provisions of this SEPP. As such, the Panel recommends that in addition to providing the requisite responses to the provisions of the SEPP Sustainable Buildings, the applicant should provide a sustainability report that demonstrates they have considered best practice sustainability design principles across their entire proposal including but not limited to the below suggested areas requiring further investigation:

- Shading to the eastern, western, and northern glazing including but not limited to the curtain wall.
- Natural light and ventilation access to all habitable spaces, reducing reliance on active systems.
- Where AC is required, work with a suitably qualified consultant to size and locate the plant. Currently it is felt there is insufficient space allocated in the design. Consideration must be given to locations away from active frontages, and incursions into the height plane.
- Material selection should take into account not only aesthetics and character, but also performance, longevity/ durability, embodied carbon, and maintenance.
- Whilst concrete roofing can be a boon for the support of green roofs, trafficable areas, or solar panels, those included in the proposal do not appear to have a purpose. These roofs subsequently will store and reflect heat back into adjacent rooms and require a high degree of maintenance with no measurable benefit. It is recommended that consideration be given to either greening the roofs overlooked by other spaces, applying a solar PV array to meet the provisions of the SEPP sustainable buildings, or materiality reassessed.

Based on their review of the amended proposal, the panel is not convinced that the proposal adequately responds to sustainable design and the principles of ecologically sustainable development. Along with the requirements of the LEP, the panel suggests that a response to the Sustainability SEPP is also required.

The following issues are noted about the current proposal:

- Section J/thermal insulation not considered or shown adequately in the proposal.
- Exposed glazed curtain wall construction is problematic for the project in terms of heat load and internal comfort and has a risk of being an unnecessary strain on the mechanical system and unsustainable approach to energy use.
- Materials are insufficiently considered in terms of sustainability both in terms of selection, longevity and maintenance.
- As proposed, the current lack of resolution of structure and building services would require the unnecessary use of resources (e.g., for transfer structures that might be eliminated in a better conceived design).
- The radial design organisation is inhibiting the resolution of the building in an effective and sustainable way.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to sustainability achieves the high-

quality design as required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

8. Site circulation

Subclause 4(d)(vi): How the development addresses pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements.

To facilitate the decarbonization of our future, it is incumbent upon the applicant to incorporate opportunities for sustainable transport. As outlined elsewhere in this advice, the pedestrianization of the ground plane should be improved to support safe and equitable circulation across and through the site between Lakemba St, Lakemba Station, and Jubilee Reserve. Similarly, bike storage should be located to support safe cyclist circulation with access to end of trip facilities. As a community facility, bike parking for visitors should also be considered at grade. Whilst not currently legislated, EV chargers should also be considered within the car park particularly as a response to the SEPP Sustainable Buildings plan for net zero.

The proposal places too much emphasis has on the circulation of vehicles on grade which removes street trees and creates unnecessary risk to pedestrians both on site and within the public domain. Consideration should be given to moving the vehicular access away from the main pedestrian circulation, with the potential to provide direct access into/out from the basement from the street.

The amended proposal shows some improvement to the circulation strategy. The panel is of the opinion that the movement of vehicles is still far too dominant in the ground plane and inhibits the proper resolution of pedestrian paths, connection and activation of the public domain, and provision, landscape.

Comments from the previous notes remain unaddressed.

In addition:

- The panel questions the 2,400 mm car space width used throughout the proposal. The traffic report indicates that AS2890.1 class 2 is appropriate for most of the spaces in the development requiring a 2,500 mm wide space.
- Basement planning is facilitated in the proposal by the lack of coordination of the structure of the building. This provides the panel no confidence that the current arrangement is appropriate. As discussed previously, the radial design creates additional complexity in the basement design which could be eliminated by an alternate design.
- The amended proposal includes consideration for bicycles. The panel would recommend that end-of-trip facilities are included. These could contribute to the sustainability measures for the project.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to site circulation achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

9. Impacts to public domain

Subclause 4(d)(vii): How the development addresses the impact on, and any proposed improvements to, the public domain.

The panel notes the inclusion of the Café to face the western easement, and the inclusion of a pedestrian path to the south, however the street activation at Lakemba St requires review. Whilst the requisite FFL from the flood zone sets the retail level above the ground floor plane, the current solution utilises a narrow width for traversing this level change and proposes limited circulation along the edge of the shopfronts. Opportunities to activate the level change, such as with seating for the café, should be considered. As outlined above, the panel suggests that a setback of least 3m would provide opportunity to retain street trees and provide a more generous and appropriate level change along the Lakemba Street frontage. A greater generosity of space will assist the commercial viability of the retail and promote activation to the street.

The proposed commercial and community spaces with late night operating hours are all proposed to be above the ground floor. The experience of patrons exiting at night therefore needs consideration. Currently there are multiple opportunities for concealment, and obstructed lines of sight from exits to boundary that will impact pedestrian safety. An opportunity for improvement may be the relocation of the restaurant to the ground floor to improve site safety at night by increasing activity and passive surveillance at the ground plane. This relocation would also assist in improving street activation and commercial viability.

As discussed previously, the interface with Lakemba Street is not well resolved. While one of the existing trees along the front boundary is now retained, the layout of the driveways, porte-cochere and level changes does not provide a high-quality response to the public domain.

Within the site, the parking located to the west elevation of the ground level necessitates an inactive façade and results in a poor outcome.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to the public domain achieves the high-quality design as expected by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

10. Site infrastructure

Subclause 4(d)(viii): How the development addresses the integration of utilities, building services and waste management infrastructure in the site layout and building design.

The panel is not convinced that all necessary building services and spatial requirements have been included in the design for such a complex building. For example, the mechanical requirements for the large restaurant, reception, function, theatre areas, kitchens and car park exhaust would be considerable, but the plans show very few plant rooms, risers, or rooftop plant. A substation would also be expected on a site of this size.

The panel recommends that further consultant input is included to ensure that the building is properly serviced, properly protected in case of fire, and that appropriate spatial allowances are included in the plans and on the roof.

A substation is now included in the proposal; however, questions remain regarding the connection to the main switch room and whether the proposed location will be viable considering the Flood Planning Level.

The panel makes the following comments on the amended design:

- The onsite detention location and size does not look convincing. The structure appears to pass through the OSD which may not be feasible.
- Considering the rainwater collection of the large concrete roofs, the indicated falls do not suggest that water catchment and drainage, hobs and overflows have been properly considered.
- Exposed downpipes are shown on plans. These are not considered appropriate for a project needing to exhibit design excellence. Cast-in downpipes might resolve some issues, but as the structure so rarely aligns and there is therefore no confidence that roof drainage, waterproofing and service reticulation is appropriately considered.
- Insufficient information is provided for the screening of plant including whether acoustic attenuation is required when the plant is located near other developments and proposed developments.

The panel is not convinced that the current approach to site infrastructure achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

11. Landscape design

Subclause 4(e): Whether the development integrates high quality landscape design in the site layout and building design.

The Panel acknowledges the complexity of the site and recognize that there has been a degree of generosity afforded to the landscaping and quantity of new trees. However, there are remaining concerns regarding the quality of the landscape design:

- As mentioned in the introduction, there are three significant trees along the Lakemba Street boundary that are being shown as removed as part of this application. These trees significantly add to the quality of the public domain, and should be considered an asset to both Lakemba, and the applicant. In the absence of an arboricultural study, it is assumed that their removal is purely to accommodate a greater degree of vehicular circulation. As there are multiple solutions to site circulation and set back that could facilitate the retention of these trees, further evidence would be required to support their removal. In the event that one or multiple trees require removal, the impact of canopy loss and habitat removal should be reviewed, and appropriate species recommended for replacement by a suitably qualified consultant.
- Under the DCP for the Croydon Precinct in Chapter 11.4, a 10m pedestrian connection and landscaped overland flow pathway is required for the site's western boundary. Whilst achieving a 10m setback, the proposal does not include a safe accessible path of travel for pedestrians, nor a landscaped overland flow path of adequate scale. This landscape setback should be reconsidered with water sensitive urban design (WSUD) principles in mind to treat and slow the passage of water across the site; hard scape should be limited with all parking below grade; and safe and equitable circulation of pedestrians and cyclists included.
- The viability of planters above the ground plan is recommended for review as several of them are not readily accessible for maintenance, and there are some located below deep eaves.

The proposal includes additional landscape which addresses the DCP requirement which is welcomed by the panel.

The panel makes the following comments:

- The panel continues to question the viability of planters to southern elevation.
- Landscape and architectural drawings are not consistent. Are planters removed or not? (e.g. level 1).
- For a project seeking design excellence, it would be appropriate to understand key criteria such as overall canopy cover and landscape cover with respect to heat-island effect.
- The intuition of the panel is that the site organisation, particularly the dominance of vehicle movement on the ground plane, inhibits the resolution of the landscape design.

Given the above, the panel is not of the opinion that the landscape response achieves the high-quality design required by the CBLEP Design Excellence clause.

The meeting closed at 11.45 am