

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
Tuesday 23rd March 2021**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rory Toomey	Chairperson	Government Architect Office
Kim Crestani	Panel Member	Order Architects
Matthew Taylor	Panel Member	Taylorbrammer

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

Richard Francis Jones	FJMT Studio
Jonathan Lynn	FJMT Studio
Barry Teeling	BUILT
Costa Dimitriadis	Ethos Urban
Chris Ferreira	Ethos Urban
Luke Feltis	Ethos Urban

OBSERVERS:

Danielle Hijazi	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
Boris Santana	Principal Planner	Liverpool City Council
Ariz Ashraf	Acting Coordinator Urban Design	Liverpool City Council
Neeraj Kumar	Senior Property Dev. Officer	Liverpool City Council
Jane Fielding	Senior Associate Planner	Architectus
Genevieve Hastwell	Senior Planner	Architectus

ITEM DETAILS:

Application Reference Number: DA-1080/2020

Property Address: 52 SCOTT STREET, LIVERPOOL

Council's Planning Officer: Boris Santana

Applicant: BUILT GROUP

Proposal: Stage 2-Construction of and use of a 22-storey commercial office building, a 9 storey co-living building as well as related works such as a 4-level basement, landscaping and public domain works.

Liverpool City Council is the consent authority and the Sydney Western City Planning Panel has the function of determining the application, on the above property

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 revised proposal for DA-1080/2020, 52 Scott Street, Liverpool.

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 appreciates the overall design outcome and acknowledges that the design development/progress on the project for Phase B/C is supported.

4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The Panel questions the detailing of the built form for wind mitigation between the co-living building and the commercial tower. The Panel acknowledges the wind tunnelling studies undertaken for the site, however, the Panel questions the comfort criteria being benchmarked under the wind analysis. The Panel requires the applicant to investigate wind conditions created due to the downward wind drafts and comfort levels being achieved within the laneway for various uses being proposed at the ground level (i.e. walking, casual seating, outdoor dining, etc.).
The Panel requires the applicant to ensure that designated spaces for outdoor activities are assessed carefully and appropriate landscape/facade treatments for wind mitigation are adopted as part of the design to ensure safety and comfort for the users, especially in seating areas .
- The Panel acknowledges that the building separation on ground plane is adequate, however, the panel notes that the separation on upper levels is quite narrow and constricted. This anomaly can be supported by the Panel as long as adequate design consideration for visual amenity/privacy is ensured for both users (i.e. residents of co-living and the users of commercial tower).
- The Panel notes that the proposed building separation (i.e. between the co-living building and the commercial tower) is inconsistent with LEP Clause 7.4. In this instance, the proposed separation distances can be supported based on the following reasons;
 - A short length of the proposed laneway;
 - Varying distances of separation towards the centre and the edges;
 - It faces a transitional space servicing a small number of co-living spaces and no habitable rooms front on to the laneway;
 - The design of the privacy screen is being detailed and will be developed further to improve visual amenity/privacy; and
 - The proposed laneway is not subject to an any adjacent development.
- The Panel recommends the applicant proposes an appropriate texture/material for the screening elements on the southern wall of the co-living building (i.e. a different treatment may be appropriate for the central portion as distinct from the east/west ends). The Panel notes that this may help with daylighting to the boarding house lift lobbies. The Panel also recommends to consider alternatives to perforated metal panels, such as louvres, mesh, corrugated light weight screens, etc.
- The Panel raises concerns regarding wayfinding for the public lobby within the commercial tower and recommends the applicant to review the internal plan configurations of the floor plate at ground level.

4.3. Density

- NIL

4.4. Sustainability

- The Panel acknowledges that the roof form of the boarding house is acceptable and appreciates the incorporation of solar panels as part of the design.

4.5. Landscape

- The Panel appreciates the design of the belvedere and notes that the proposed viewing platform is a positive outcome for the site.

- The Panel recommends the applicant ensures that the soil volumes being proposed for the trees on site are appropriate. The Panel notes that the trees proposed within the laneway will be subject to deep shade and an appropriate tree species/vegetation form needs to be considered for this location.

4.6. Amenity

- The Panel requires the applicant to clearly identify and define the seating areas within the laneway to ensure that adequate public domain is available for people to walk along the laneway. Public and private /licenced zones must be defined.
- The Panel raises concern regarding the quality of light within the lobby/corridors for the co-living building and requires the applicant to ensure that adequate natural light filters through the proposed screens.

4.7. Safety

- NIL

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

- NIL

4.9. Aesthetics

- The Panel questions the visibility of the artwork on the southern wall of the co-living building. The Panel recommends that the applicant reconsiders the artwork with regards to the narrowness of the space and the location of possible public viewpoints.
- The Panel raises concern regarding the materiality of the eastern/western wall of the co-living building. The Panel recommends that the applicant consider the scale of the eastern/western walls and propose a high quality, durable materiality, designed for appreciation from a distance/close view. The Panel recommends the applicant to refer to precedents that have withstood the test of time (e.g. MLC building in North Sydney). The Panel requires the applicant to provide a proposed material palette for this phase of development and the detailing of the eastern/western façade of the co-living building. The Panel also requires the applicant to provide a high-quality 3D render for the building that accurately identifies the materiality and quality of the design outcome.
- The Panel recommends that FJMT prepares a detailed design guidance for the interior works for the Commercial Tower to ensure design integrity is maintained and design excellence maintained for the site, post occupation.

5.0 OUTCOME

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

The project is supported. Respond to recommendations made by the panel, then the plans are to be reviewed/endorsed by the Panel through a desktop review.

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
FOR STAGE 1, 2 AND DESIGN WORKSHOP FOR CIVIC
PLACE 52 SCOTT STREET LIVERPOOL**

Tuesday 1st December 2020

DEP PANEL MEMBERS:

Rory Toomey	Chairperson	Government Architect Office
Matthew Taylor	Panel Member	Taylorbrammer
Kim Crestani	Panel Member	Order Architects

OBSERVERS:

Boris Santana	Principal Planner	Liverpool City Council
Ariz Ashraf	Acting Coordinator Urban Design	Liverpool City Council
Danielle Hijazi	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
George Nehme	Coordinator Development Assessment	Liverpool City Council

1. ITEM DETAILS:

Application Reference Number: Stage 2 PL-78/2020

Property Address: 52 Scott Street Liverpool

*Council's Planning Officer: External consultants – Cameron Nixon and Jane Fielding
(Architectus)*

Applicant: BUILT DEVELOPMENT GROUP PTY LTD

Proposal: Construction and use of a mixed-use commercial office building and construction and use of a temporary tourist and visitor accommodation building, integrated with public domain and landscaping.

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 Stage 2 PL-78/2020, 52 Scott Street Liverpool (Phase B & C for the development).

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 concurs that the proposed design aims to achieve design excellence and encourages the applicant to continue with the detailing of the finer elements of design to achieve an exceptional design outcome for the development.*
- *The Panel questions the design response to the building on the eastern side of George Lane and recommends the applicant to have a closer look at the interface on either side of George lane. The Panel recommends that the proposed design should ensure that the existing width of the laneway (i.e George Lane) is retained as part of*

the future public domain.

- *The Panel supports the increase in the width of public plaza along Terminus Street, however, the Panel questions the proposed width of the staircase that connects the upper-level plaza to the lower-level central civic plaza. The Panel recommends that the applicant reconsiders the proposed width of the staircase to facilitate a range of pedestrian movements especially during public events/gatherings.*
- *The Panel acknowledges the overall rigour and level of detailing for the building at this stage of the project and supports the overall design intent. However, the Panel questions the design of the southern facade for the boarding house and encourages the applicant*

to reconsider the detailing of the façade to incorporate green elements/vertical planting to improve the overall aesthetics. This approach would be particularly appropriate as the wall faces south with lower evaporation rates than other aspects and is suitable for vertical green elements

- *The Panel notes that there is significant opportunity for the design/detailing of the laneway between the proposed boarding house and commercial buildings and recommends the applicant to ensure adequate privacy/visual amenity for the users within the two adjoining buildings.*
- *The Panel supports the relationship between the proposed east-west laneway connecting the pocket park and Civic Plaza. The Panel recommends that the design of the laneway should prioritise the safety of pedestrians egressing on to the shared way and ensure adequate design measures to achieve a high-quality public domain outcome.*
- *The Panel recommends that the proposed design should ensure adequate linkages to various elements located around the site and should clearly establish connections with the existing urban framework of the immediate CBD area to improve the visual comprehension of the site.*
- *The Panel acknowledges the efforts of the design team and appreciates the design outcome despite the nature of constraints that exist for the subject site. The Panel requires the applicant to have a closer look at the management and maintenance of the site once it is developed. The Panel recommends the applicant to outline the ownership and governance aspects for the site and develop a comprehensive management/maintenance plan to ensure proper maintenance/management for the proposed public spaces within the site.*
- *The Panel notes that the proposed design could incorporate appropriate wayfinding measures to improve the legibility of the site. The Panel advises that the wayfinding measures could be integrated as part of the proposed public art strategy for the site.*

4.2. Built Form + Scale

- *The Panel supports the proposed built form for the commercial tower and appreciates the sculpting of the corner for the proposed tower to increase the separation between the buildings.*
- *The Panel raises its concern regarding the inadequate separation between the boarding house and the commercial tower. The Panel recommends that the distance*

between the two buildings could be investigated to improve the articulation between the two buildings.

- *The Panel recommends that the design should incorporate adequate articulation within the southern façade for the boarding house to ensure privacy and visual amenity from the office floor space. The Panel recommends the applicant to consider incorporating green elements within the detailing of the façade to provide visual relief within the built form.*
- *The Panel recommends that the design quality of the upper plaza (i.e. along Terminus Street frontage) should be in line with the design quality/materiality of the Civic Plaza. The Panel notes that the tree canopy cover being indicated within the drawings should be realistic and should not extend beyond the building line within the drawings.*

4.3. Density

- *The Panel notes that there are no departures from the proposed building envelope that were approved within the concept DA.*

4.4. Sustainability

- *The Panel notes that there are a number of open areas being proposed as part of the development. The Panel questions the design response towards the environmental conditions and the level of thermal comfort within these open areas especially during peak summer/winter months.*
- *The Panel raises concern regarding the microclimatic conditions that will be evident in the western Sydney region and encourages the applicant to incorporate adequate design measure to ensure resilience and achieve a sustainable design outcome that works efficiently throughout the day/night cycles all through the year.*
- *The Panel questions the design of the roof level crowning elements for the boarding house and recommends the applicant to have a closer look at the design of the roof level. The panel recommends that the applicant should consider integrating green roof/solar panels as part of the design.*
- *Panel recommends incorporating a green wall on the southern side of the boarding house to achieve a good design outcome/increased visual amenity for the pedestrians/users.*

4.5. Landscape

- *The Panel raises concerns regarding the wind movements within the proposed development and requires the applicant to undertake adequate wind modelling/wind studies to understand the overall wind pattern/movements especially around the public spaces. The Panel supports the concept of the proposed tree canopy within the development; however, the Panel expresses its concerns regarding the sustained effects of wind movements over the tree canopy cover.*
- *The Panel notes its concerns regarding the proposed soil volumes for the trees located within the east-west laneway. The Panel recommends the applicant to ensure the provision of adequate soil volume for tree planting and recommends the applicant to comply with ADG requirements for minimum soil volumes for the tree*

plantings. To that end, the Panel notes the arboricultural needs for trees and the requirements for the rootplate of trees to spread laterally for stability and form requirements to ensure a sustainable outcome

- *The Panel notes its concerns regarding the design of the pocket park on the eastern side of the subject site and questions if there has been any reference made to the river, fluid forms and the context of Liverpool within the design of the pocket park/civic plaza.*
- *The Panel notes its concerns regarding the Jacaranda trees being proposed along Terminus Street (i.e. on the southern side of the site) as there would be adequate shade on the footpath due to the built form and the proposed Jacaranda trees might not thrive. Alternative species are to be considered*
- *The Panel recommends the applicant to incorporate the recommendations of Liverpool City Centre Public Domain Master Plan for the design of public spaces and streetscape within the development.*

4.6. Amenity

- *NIL*

4.7. Safety

- *The Panel raises its concern regarding the detailing of the shared way in terms of pedestrian safety especially during the peak office hours. The Panel recommends that the design should incorporate adequate warning measures along the shared way (e.g. rumble paving strips, warning signs, etc.) to inform the pedestrians of any incoming vehicle. The Panel recommends the applicant to encourage and promote pedestrian priority throughout the development.*

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

- *NIL*

4.9. Aesthetics

- *The Panel seeks clarifications on the artwork being referenced in the drawings. The Panel recommends that the applicant should engage local artists as part of the Public Artwork Strategy for the project and consider a combination of local artists with other selected artists to deliver the required artwork for this project.*

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 in principle and must return to the panel, with all feedback incorporated or addressed for subsequent stages of assessment by the Panel.

From: [Rory Toomey](#)
To: [Boris Santana](#)
Cc: [Matthew Taylor](#); [Kim Crestani](#)
Subject: DA/1080/2020 Phase B/C Liverpool Civic Place
Date: Wednesday, 20 October 2021 5:06:41 PM

CAUTION: External emails may be unsafe.

Dear Boris

A desktop review of the material supplied via file transfer link in your email dated 13/9/21 has been undertaken by me, acting in my role as Chair of the Public Domain DEP.

Review of documents considered FJMT's documents:

Attachment A: Detailed response to RFI

Attachment D: Supplementary Design Report

Attachment E: Updated Architectural Drawings

The following comments are provided in response to the items as they appear in Attachment A:

ITEM	DEP RESPONSE
2A (i), (ii)	Satisfied
2A (iii), (iv), (v)	Visual amenity concerns are satisfied by the concept presented for DA purposes – it is recommended that a rigorous and highly ambitious approach be employed for this screening element to ensure it is realised with exceptional quality and attention to detail. The screen forms the majority of one of the long elevations of the building and requires careful consideration at every scale.
2B (i)	Satisfied subject to compliance with policies and documents nominated
2B (ii)	Satisfied subject to review and endorsement by Council's arborist
2C (i)	Addressed at item 2A (i)
2C (ii)	See comments above at 2A
2D (i)	Satisfied subject to high quality alternative – See 2A (v) above
2D (ii)	Supported
2D (iii)	Supported
2D (iv)	No render supplied – high quality Sketchup perspective viewed and supported when considered alongside materials palette provided
2D (v)	The recommendation remains and may be dealt with by Council at CC stage

We trust this is useful and recommend the Design Integrity process is now implemented.

Best

Rory Toomey
Public Domain DEP Chair

Principal Design Excellence GANSW
NSW Architect Registration 7743

Rory.Toomey@planning.nsw.gov.au
(02) 9860 1458

GOVERNMENT
ARCHITECT
NEW SOUTH WALES

4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcy Street
Parramatta NSW 2150

ga.nsw.gov.au



Planning,
Industry &
Environment

Our Vision: Together, we create thriving environments, communities and economies.

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment acknowledges that it stands on Aboriginal land. We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land and we show our respect for elders past, present and emerging through thoughtful and collaborative approaches to our work, seeking to demonstrate our ongoing commitment to providing places in which Aboriginal people are included socially, culturally and economically.