

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
13th June 2019**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | | |
|------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Rory Toomey | Chairperson | Government Architect NSW |
| Caroline Pidcock | Panel Member | Pidcock |
| Shaun Carter | Panel Member | Carter Williamson Architects |

APPLICANT REPRESENTITIVES:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Angus Nguyen | St. George Community Housing |
| George Bakopoulos | St. George Community Housing |
| Ian Lim | DKO Architecture |
| Peter Peng | DKO Architecture |
| Melissa Rodrigues | GAT + Associates |

OBSERVERS:

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Scott Sidhom | Coordinator Urban Design | Liverpool City Council |
| Emmanuel Torres | Senior Planner | Liverpool City Council |

ITEM DETAILS:

Application Reference Number: DA-257/2019

Property Address: 127-129 Flowerdale Road Liverpool

Council's Planning Officer: Emmanuel Torres

Applicant: SGCH PORTFOLIO LTD

Proposal: The demolition of existing structures, construction of a five (5) storey residential flat building comprising of 39 units to be used wholly for the purposes of affordable rental housing with at-grade parking and associated landscape and site works

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-257/2019, 127-129 Flowerdale Road 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 notes that this is a considered proposal that generally integrates well with the site and context. However the proposal can improve its contextual response with the following recommendations, which are:

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel noted concerns relating to the north-eastern corner of the building. The concern is with the undercroft at-grade parking presenting to the street, blank wall, unscreened substation and location design of the main entry. This will negatively impact the character, surveillance and safety along Smith Street, whilst possibly creating negative connotations within the minds of the community for Key Worker housing. The panel recommends exploring an alternative scheme where the south facing apartment and the service rooms are switched, sleeving services to the rear of the site and presenting apartments to improve the Smith Street frontage.
- Recommendation 2 –
The panel recommends that the secondary pedestrian entrance be relocated from its current location to in between apartments G04 and G05, to shorten the front door access to the street, to increased privacy to apartment G05, and provide increased space for

service rooms along the southern side of the site.

4.2. Built Form + Scale

In this context and for the use of Keyworker (affordable) Housing (social & community benefit) the panel accepts the minor non-compliance regarding building height, and notes that the additional building height is appropriately located on the site. Apartment design is generally encouraged to utilise the roof space as terraces and private outdoor space. However the design could be improved with the following recommendations:

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel notes the location of parapet along the eastern rooftop edge is creating a privacy issue, regarding over-looking to neighbouring properties. The panel recommends shifting the parapet/balustrade in from the building edge (minimum one metre) to limit the downward overlooking issue. Planter-boxes should be considered to improve privacy for the neighbours and amenity of the residents.
- Recommendation 3 –
The panel notes the sleeving approach of the apartments to the street and therefore creating the built form is a good approach for this site, and recommends further refining of the design to achieve a greater sleeving the car parking behind the active street frontages, to improve the Smith Street frontage (see note above).

4.3. Density

The panel supports the density of the proposal as it is largely within the spirit of the controls for the site. In this regard the panel supports the minor non-compliance of height.

- Recommendations –
NIL.

4.4. Sustainability

The panel notes meeting the minimum requires of BASIX and SEPP65 should be exactly that, the minimum, and recommends strategies and design inclusions that lifts the proposal above the minimum. The follow recommendations seek to achieve that necessary increase.

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel recommends using photovoltaic technology to generate power for lighting and electricity purposes on-site. This includes (if not implemented during initial building construction) future proofing the building to later incorporate photovoltaic panels (e.g. space for integrating panels onto the rooftop). A PV system that provides the equivalent power required for all public space lighting and energy needs should be a minimum,

whilst providing the housing provider with a net benefit.

- Recommendation 2 –
On-site detention (OSD) water tank has been provided, however, the panel recommends exploring opportunities to collect and re-use rainwater on-site. This is usually achieved by increasing the depth of the OSD tank to have the dual use of retention & detention. The panel notes that water is our scarcest commodity and fundamental to a healthy and sustainable community and therefore new buildings should future proof the community through preserving this necessary infrastructure.

4.5. Landscape

The panel notes the landscape is generally satisfactory, however believes the following recommendation will improve the design of the proposal.

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel accepts that some of the communal open space located along the southern boundary may be sacrificed in order to achieve an alternative site scheme (i.e. as per 4.1 Context, Recommendation 1). The proposal should seek alternative landscape opportunities to offset any sacrificed space.

4.6. Amenity

The panel noted that the overall amenity of the proposal is good. The building is well designed, with good façade depth and the combined site planning and building envelope offers a high level of amenity for residents. The panel makes one recommendation to improve the proposal, which is:

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel supports a reduction in car parking spaces, given that provision of the required car parking spaces is affecting the proposal from achieving design excellence. The panel recommends including bicycle parking facilities and improve lighting quality and levels for the carparking as they are to the rear of the site and building.

4.7. Safety

The panel noted the safety could be improved by the following recommendation:

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel notes that through implementing the recommendation made in section 4.1 Context (i.e. Recommendation 1), the reduction in blank walls and increased active frontages will result in improved safety outcomes. The panel also notes that increased and improved lighting to the carpark will be required with the increased sleeving of the

apartments, which will also improve the safety of the residents.

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

The panel encourages the development of affordable housing and commends the applicant for presenting a well designed proposal for Keyworker housing in the Liverpool LGA.

4.9. Aesthetics

The panel supports the building design and notes that the building is visually attractive and well resolved. The simple, well-articulated façade couple with a robust and sensible material palate is a recipe to make good architecture. The panel commends the scheme, the applicant and the architects.

5.0 OUTCOME

The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided 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/approved by Council.