

# MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING Thursday 11th March 2021

### **DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kim Crestani Chairperson Order Architects
Matthew Taylor Panel Member Taylorbrammer

Alf Lester Panel Member LFA

### **APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:**

Tony Owen Architects

Anna Johnston FPD Pty Ltd Ross Shepherd Site Image

### **OBSERVERS**:

Danielle Hijazi Panel Support Officer Liverpool City Council Ariz Ashraf Acting coordinator urban Liverpool City Council

design

Nabil Alaeddine Senior Development Liverpool City Council

Planner

Adam Flynn Acting Team Leader Liverpool City Council



### **ITEM DETAILS:**

Application Reference Number: DA-33/2021

Property Address: 164 CROATIA AVENUE, EDMONDSON PARK

Council's Planning Officer: Nabil Alaeddine

Applicant: FILE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Proposal: Concept DA for a mixed-use development as part of the Edmondson Park Town Centre comprising of 676 residential apartments, 2000sqm

of retail floor space, a childcare centre and supporting roads and infrastructure

Liverpool City Council is the consent authority and the Sydney West City Planning Panel has the function of the determining authority

### 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-33/2021, 164 CROATIA AVENUE, EDMONDSON PARK.

### 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; and in light of the previous recommendation made by the Panel (i.e. on 10 Dec 2020 and 9 June 2020):

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
<ul> <li>4.1. Context</li> <li>Strengthen the Urban Design relationship between this development, the station site, thestation plaza and surrounding development.</li> <li>Explore the potential for an increased setback at ground level, to create useful and usable spaces around the retail zone. This includes wide enough footpath areas for seating and outdoor dining, and facilities/amenities along the south-eastern sector of thedevelopment, to take advantage of the vista to the Railway Station plaza.</li> <li>Ensure that the Landscape Design (and the ground plane in general) is sympathetic toand responds to the adjacent RE1 zone.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The Panel advises the applicant to provide a clear representation of the design fundamentals being considered for the development and recommends the applicant to elaborate these design principles through diagrams, to ensure that the ideas/principles of urban design are conveyed and explained clearly. The diagrams should also establishhow the project satisfies the nine design quality principles required of the Apartment Design Guide / SEPP 65; the urban framework for the site and 'Connection to Country' (see next point). The diagrams should also clearly define the Private Open Space, PublicDomain, Communal areas and all entries to apartment buildings and commercial premises.</li> <li>The Panel notes that the 'Connection to Country'</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The Panel raises concern regarding the security of communal open spaces given the nominated public cross-site links. The Panel notes that the unlimited access to communal spaces might create safety issues for children and residents.</li> <li>The Panel questions the location of the childcare centre within the development and the potential impacts on residents as well as issues relating to overlooking the childcare centre. The Panel recommends the applicant explore an alternative location for the childcare centre (i.e. relocate the childcare centre towards the retail functions along Soldier's Parade).</li> </ul>



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
	needs to be established for the designproposal and requires the applicant to ensure the design acknowledges and incorporates a seamless flow of ideas/connections with the context through all the various aspects of design. The Panel recommends 'Connections to Country' be incorporated at the master planning stage and be engrained within the structure of the design proposal.  • The Panel notes that the proposed setback for the development is less than the recommended setbacks set out in the DCP. Cantilevered setbacks are not recommended and not be in breach of the minimum street setbacks. The Panel recommends the applicant to have a wider setback for the commercial areas and ensure compliance with the requirements of the DCP.  • The Panel notes that the building entrances are not well defined within the development. The Panel recommends that the applicant considers a more defined and easily visible entry for each building with adequate architectural definition and landscaping. The Panelalso requires the applicant to ensure that all buildings have an access from the street (i.e.Public Domain) to establish its relationship with the street and ensure street activation.	<ul> <li>The Panel questions the interface of the riparian zone with the proposed development. The Panel recommends the applicant consider additional measures to reinforce connections to the open space within the riparian zone.</li> <li>The Panel questions the location of the pedestrian entrance for Building A. The Panel suggests the applicant reconsider the location of the pedestrian entrance, and legible wayfinding to the building and provide an additional entry for Building A along the through site link and/or the local ring road.</li> <li>The Panel questions the design of the north-south shared way within the development. The Panel requires the applicant to clearly articulate the space allocation within the shared way (i.e. within plan and sections) and identify the character of the shared way with additional sections through Buildings D &amp; F.</li> </ul>
	The Panel notes that the proposed car	



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
	parking exceeds the required number of car parking for the development. The Panel recommends the applicant to optimise the number of proposed car parking for the development so it can increase the amount of proposed Deep Soil Zone (DSZ) for tree planting within the site.	
	The Panel recommends Council ensure that the following stages of development be reviewed by the same set of panel members for the future DEP meetings to ensure design integrity for the project.	



#### 4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The panel acknowledges that a low built form (4-8 storeys) is proposed for the site. As such, the panel would like to see diversity in the spatial quality of the built forms. Consider how solar access and diversity of experiences is achieved in the open spacesbetween the continuous massing arrangements. The spaces between buildings A&C and B&D are crucial and need to be an inviting scale and comfortable for people using the spaces, as a journey through the site.
- The approach to further open-up the spaces between building E&F is supported.
- Variations in height are encouraged and supported, rather than a monotone pattern ofbuilding heights across the site.
- Look at design elements to moderate the perceived length of the buildings.

#### 4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The Panel notes that the overall design has the opportunity for improvement to make it more cohesive and establish a strong urban framework for the development. The Panel advises the applicant to have a closer look at the overall built form and the proposed architectural expression for the buildings within the development to ensure that they include a variety of expressions, while the overall proposal reads as a cohesive whole.
- The Panel notes that the built form does not acknowledge the crescent profile of the adjoining road or the riparian corridor that it adjoins. The Panel recommends the applicant establish the urban form for the development that strongly responds to the context of the subject site.
- The Panel notes that a portion of the built form/architectural projections cantilevers onto the setback area. The Panel requires the applicant to ensure that all projections and cantilevers are restricted and to be within the proposed setback.
- The Panel notes the potential of the design proposal to incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives as part of the master plan. The Panel recommends the applicant explore the capture of rainwater within the built form and provide water storage facilities or chambers within the car parking area, which can then be connected to a site wide WSUD systems to irrigate the landscaped areas. This will need to be managed by the body corporate/strata

#### 4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The Panel raises concerns regarding the scale and length of the building (i.e. Buildings E & F especially with a curved profile). The Panel recommends the applicant reconsider the proposed length of the buildings; and where possible split the built form to achieve a more considered scale of built form with better amenity for the residential units. The Panel suggests that a portion of the building on the north-east corner could be slightly higher ( subject to further design resolution) to accommodate the loss in floor
- The Panel raises concerns for design of the built form being overscaled (i.e. in regard to the built form for building F). The Panel recommends the applicant reconsider the design of the built form to achieve design excellence.

space as a result of the built form modulations.

- The Panel recommends that Buildings A, B, C and D be subject to further design refinement to explore additional modulation of height and massing. The Panel requires the Applicant to reconsider redistributing the built form across the site.
- The Panel confirms that the Applicant is required to achieve a consistent setback as per the Growth Centre DCP (i.e. a consistent 4.5/6 m setback) for the built form across the site.



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
	<ul> <li>management for the development.</li> <li>The Panel notes the minor inconsistencies with the proposed building height for the development. The Panel confirms that some additional building height can be supported provided the applicant ensures complete compliance with the requirements of Communal Open Space (COS) for the development and high levels of amenity for all apartments. Any non-compliant buildings due to height needs to explain the reason whythe non-compliance exists.</li> </ul>	Setback deviations will set poor precedents for subsequent development.



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
• The 2:1 FSR applies to the developable portion of the site and is considered reasonable. The development of the proposal needs to be focused around the distribution of the density across the site, to achieve maximum amenity. This includes considering the distribution of massing across the site and the spatial quality of the spaces between thebuildings (See recommendations made in 4.2 Built Form, above).	The proposed density is supported by the Panel.	4.3. Density  No further comment provided the above issues are addressed.
• In discussion with Council, consider minor deviations from the DCP height limits for the site, in order to achieve variation in the distribution of height across the site, to achieve quality amenity outcomes. Graded height changes throughout the complex are important(e.g. a taller tower on the corner of the site or a partial upper level within a block).		



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
<ul> <li>4.4. Sustainability</li> <li>The panel would like to see more evidence of sustainability principles included within theproposal.</li> <li>Include mature trees and planting around the buildings to support environmental performance and help mitigate the extreme temperatures experienced within WesternSydney.</li> <li>The Landscape Design for the site needs to relate to the RE1 zone and in doing so, helpachieve a continuous habitat zone. Consider appropriate vegetation species to support/encourage habitats.</li> </ul>	• The Panel recommends the applicant incorporate the principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) as an inherent part of the design proposal. Ideas could include: passive solar design within the built form; high performance building envelopes; photovoltaic (PV) panels to provide lighting and other power for common areas; bulk water capture and storage for irrigation, etc. The Panel advises the applicant to providea summary of all sustainability measures being adopted as part of the design proposal.	4.4. Sustainability No additional comments.



#### 4.5. Landscape

- The panel is concerned with what appears to be limited public domain connections and linkages to the Railway Station plaza and precinct (as shown in the concept documentation). The panel encourages the applicant to look further at the work that has already been completed in the Edmondson Park Master Plan. Given the excessive temperatures experienced in Western Sydney, the effects of global warming, and denserliving, people are increasingly wanting to use outside spaces. These spaces need to be sustainable and comfortable for people to use, with appropriately considered form throughout the spaces, shade and appropriate facilities and amenities.
- The role of the landscape is critical as a binding element between the diversity of the built expression of the building. (See recommendations made in 4.2 Built Form, above).
- The limited proposed Deep Soil Zones (DSZ) are clustered in gaps between the basement car parks. The DSZs need to be increased and more evenly distributed acrossthe site. They should be included along key pedestrian routes within the site, to provide mature trees for shade.

#### 4.5. Landscape

- The Panel notes that the amount of Deep Soil Zone (DSZ) being proposed as part of the development appears non-compliant with the minimum requirements as per SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guide (ADG). The Panel requires the applicant to achieve a full compliance with the minimum requirements of DSZ and encourages the applicant to go beyond the minimum requirements to achieve larger canopy trees for the precinct.
- The Panel questions the dimensions and volume of soil being proposed for tree plantingabove the basement car park. The Panel requires the applicant ensures adequate soil depth and widths for tree planting and adequate area for the tree roots to spread so as to provide a sustainable outcome for the development. Soil depths and widths need to be proved as suitable and sustainable by the relevant expert report (see Edmondson Park Commercial Centre and associated residential development by Frasers for guidance in this regard).
- The Panel questions the proposed tree species for the development and recommends the applicant to consider tree species that are appropriate for the region, ideally indigenous to the area, acknowledging the cultural landscape being created as part of the Edmondson Park masterplan and will be able to be sustained and thrive within the climate of western Sydney.
- The panel requires a detailed hydraulic design of

#### 4.5. Landscape

- The Panel notes that the general intent of landscape design is acceptable and is supported. The Panel requires the Applicant to carefully assess the interface of the landscape design with the built form and ensure additional thresholds within the development that connect to the landscaped areas and the riparian zone.
- The Panel notes that the proposed central open spaces within the development (i.e. between Buildings A & B and Buildings C & D) are very constricted and need to be reconsidered/widened. The Panel requires the Applicant to consider increasing the distance between the buildings to achieve a better design outcome.
- The Panel questions the percentage of tree canopy cover being proposed for the site and the size of the tree canopy adopted for this calculation. The Panel recommends the Applicant consider actual tree canopy diameter that is achievable on the subject site.
- The Panel raises concern regarding the soil volumes being provided for the trees on podium/basement slab. The Panel requires the applicant to provide greater soil volumes for the trees on podium/slabs. In particular, the width of planters for trees on podium appears to be insufficient and not exhibiting an understanding



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
	automatic watering system that will help sustain and allow the landscape to thrive. The design of the system needs to acknowledge the differing seasonal water requirements and adjustments as the landscape matures. The primary source of water shall by via rainwater tanks, with mains backup for drier periods.  • The Panel questions the relationship of the development with adjoining open space RE1 zoned land. The Panel recommends the applicant establish and illustrate appropriate connections with the riparian corridor and the surrounding context so that it is integratedinto the overall design approach for the development.  • The Panel questions the extent of pedestrian priority within the development, which should be overarching. The Panel recommends the applicant provide raised thresholdsand pedestrian priority crossings at key locations to promote walking/cycling within the development.  • The Panel notes the potential of the design proposal to incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives as part of the master plan. The Panel requires the applicant to provide detailed landscape plans including treatments for WSUD and locations of swales, and recommends the applicant incorporate water harvesting methods to collectrainwater from the building rooftops.	of the needs of sustainable widths of root plates for the canopies shown on the drawings.  The Panel notes that stormwater management needs to be an integral part of the landscape design and needs to be resolved up front. The Panel requires the applicant to establish the storm water management plan for the site and identify the quality/quantity of water that will be fed on to the riparian zone RE1.  The Panel raises concern regarding the landscape design for the shared way and requires the Applicant to detail out the design for the shared way. The applicant needs to demonstrate that the space allocation within the shared way is appropriate for all users (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists, vehicular traffic, landscaping and parking).



### 4.6. Amenity

- The proposal is heading in the right direction (i.e. from an amenity perspective), and thepanel commends the consideration to solar access, cross ventilation, privacy and the relationship of open spaces between buildings. The panel looks forward to seeing how the proposal develops.
- Prepare schematic section drawings to show the relationship between the built form andopen space areas.
- Amenity at key access points to the complex is questionable. The clustering of vehicularramps and pedestrian path systems at key openings (i.e. within exterior areas between buildings) results in an aggregation of hard surface areas. Design attention is required toachieve outcomes with both a high architectural and landscape quality.
- Explore Landscape Design elements to improve amenity on the site, in particular shade, including through tree canopy cover.
- Treat the "internal" local road in a more sensitive manner, including through exploring ashared-zone design (i.e. rather than a road), with landscape treatments that provide priority for pedestrians over motorists.

#### 4.6. Amenity

 The Panel requires the applicant to ensure high solar amenity for the residential unitsand open space proposed as part of the development, and requires the applicant to achieve compliance with all minimum requirements of ADG. Solar diagrams are to be proved by sun-eye diagrams, highlighting in yellow the minimum 1m2 of solar access onliving room windows & doors.

#### 4.6. Amenity

- The Panel notes that the neighbouring site on the north western corner of the subject site (i.e. owned by Landcom) will be developed in future which might affect the amenity of Building A. The Panel requires the Applicant undertake appropriate studies to identify any issues relating to solar amenity and access as a consequence of future development on the Landcom site.
- The Panel appreciates the solar "sculpting" for the built form and requires the Applicant to ensure solar compliance for Building A.
- The Panel raises concerns regarding large western walls and solar heat gain during peak summer months. The Panel recommends the Applicant undertake studies to identify solar heat gain on the western walls during peak summer months and incorporate relevant measures, such as external shading devices to mitigate solar gain.



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
<ul> <li>Ensure that there is a clear delineation between publicly accessible and private open space areas. Explore opportunities to allow the public to move through the site, whilstbalancing the priorities between through-site links for public use and communal openspace for residents.</li> <li>Consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles (CPTED) as thedesign progresses.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The Panel recommends the applicant to consider Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles as part of the design to ensure a safer environment for pedestrians/future residents of the area.</li> <li>Provide a detailed design of CPTED principles explained through diagrams for the entire development.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4.7. Safety</li> <li>The Panel requires the Applicant to undertake a detailed CPTED analysis for the site.</li> </ul>
4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction  • Explore different building typologies that allow for entrances directly from common space/street areas. This will enable residents to enter their properties directly from thestreet and help to activate the ground plane.	4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction  • The Panel notes that the proposed design has good potential to incorporate an element of affordable housing within the development and recommends the applicant to considerwhere this could be incorporated as part of this proposal.	4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction NIL



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
<ul> <li>4.9. Aesthetics</li> <li>The panel notes that a range of design images were presented for the various buildingswithin the development. The panel encourages an integrated theme/approach to the treatments of the built form, whilst achieving diversity and a relationship between the buildings. Look to local, place specific inspirations when developing an aesthetic character.</li> <li>Consider including a marker building, which will transfer some of the proposed GFA andfree-up some additional space on the ground plane.</li> <li>Greater diversity is encouraged and could be facilitated by re-working the north-southroad so that it is closer in form and shape to a laneway-style street. (See recommendations made in 4.6 Amenity, above).</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4.9. Aesthetics</li> <li>The Panel recommends the applicant provide an outline of the materiality being considered for the project, and advises the applicant to consider appropriate materialsand finishes that will survive the harsh weather conditions prevalent in the western Sydney region.</li> <li>The Panel recommends the applicant to consider solid balustrades (to a minimum of 760mm above the FFL) for lower levels as part of the design to ensure privacy and appropriate street presentation.</li> <li>The Panel requires a range of architectural expressions be included across the entire project to bring a variety in architectural expression but achieved in such a way, so the development reads as a cohesive whole.</li> </ul>	4.9. Aesthetics  The Panel appreciates the diversity of architectural expression indicated in the Applicant's proposal but recommends that further design refinement focus on a more balanced range of architectural expression which could draw on datum levels, materiality and other "design guidelines". This would allow for individual architectural expression but ensure that the total development is more cohesive and integrated whole.



Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 June 2020)	Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 10 Dec 2020)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 11 March 2021)
5.0. Outcome	5.0. Outcome	5.0. Outcome
The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided finaldirection to the applicant as follows:	The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided final direction to the applicant as follows:	See below.
The proposal is supported by the DEP, but must return to the panel, with all panel feedbackincorporated or addressed.	The proposal is supported in principle by the DEP and must return to the panel, with all feedback incorporated or addressed.	

### **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 in principle by the DEP and must return to the Panel, with all feedback incorporated or addressed.