

# Design Integrity Process Summary Report

## Mayfair on North Penrith

160, 162 and 172 Lord Sheffield Circuit, North Penrith

**Submitted to Penrith City Council**

# Design Integrity Panel Endorsement

By signing below, the Design Integrity Panel agrees the design achieves design excellence and endorses this report:



.....  
Rory Toomey (Panel and Jury Chair)

Date: 14.11.22



.....  
Brett Newbold

Date: 5.12.22

S Moore

Stephen Moore Date: 24.2.2023



**'Gura Bulga'**

Liz Belanjee Cameron

'Gura Bulga' – translates to Warm Green Country. Representing New South Wales.

By using the green and blue colours to represent NSW, this painting unites the contrasting landscapes. The use of green symbolises tranquillity and health. The colour cyan, a greenish-blue, sparks feelings of calmness and reminds us of the importance of nature, while various shades of blue hues denote emotions of new beginnings and growth. The use of emerald green in this image speaks of place as a fluid moving topography of rhythmical connection, echoed by densely layered patterning and symbolic shapes which project the hypnotic vibrations of the earth, waterways and skies.

Ethos Urban acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of Country throughout Australia and recognises their continuing connection to land, waters and culture.

We acknowledge the Gadigal people, of the Eora Nation, the Traditional Custodians of the land where this document was prepared, and all peoples and nations from lands affected.

We pay our respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

# Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Design Excellence Process.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Overview.....	5
2.2	Competition Brief.....	5
2.3	Invited Architectural Design Competition.....	5
2.3.1	Competitors.....	5
2.3.2	Competition Jury.....	5
2.3.3	Technical Advisors.....	6
2.3.4	Observers.....	6
2.3.5	Overview of Competition Timeline.....	6
2.3.6	Competition Outcome.....	7
2.4	Design Integrity Panel.....	7
2.4.1	Members of the DIP.....	7
2.4.2	DIP Meetings.....	8
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Design Integrity Process Outcomes.....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Competition Scheme.....	9
3.1.1	Key Reasons for Selection.....	9
3.1.2	Areas for Refinement.....	9

## Table of Tables

Table 1	Key Events in the Competition.....	6
Table 2	Overview of DIP meetings.....	8
Table 3	Areas for refinement and status of resolution in the design competition.....	9

## Appendices

### **A** Design Integrity Panel Endorsement Letter

*NSW Government Architect + Jury/Panel chair*

## 1.0 Introduction

This Design Integrity Process Summary Report (Report) has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of the Design Integrity Panel (the DIP or Panel), for the Mayfair on North Penrith, located at 162, 170 and 172 Lord Sheffield Circuit North Penrith. This Report has been prepared in accordance with the *draft Government Architect's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines* (GANSW Guidelines) and the endorsed Design Competition Brief to accord with the design excellence requirements of *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010*.

The purpose of this Report is to provide a summary of the Design Integrity Process that has followed the Invited Architectural Design Competition held for the site – completed on 5 May 2022.

## 2.0 Design Excellence Process

### 2.1 Overview

In accordance with Clause 8.4 of the PLEP 2010, an architectural design competition was held in relation to the site at 160, 162 and 172 Lord Sheffield Circuit, Penrith. The applicant invited three architectural firms to participate in the design

The architectural firms invited to participate were selected due to their demonstrated ability to design high-quality and sustainable transit orientated developments and commitment to timeless design and place making.

Each of the three competing design schemes provided a distinct and inventive response to the Competition Brief, with each Competitor presenting a high-quality written submission to address the complexities of the site and the importance of the site as a key gateway site for the North Penrith Town Centre.

The Competition Jury unanimously agreed that scheme presented by SJB Architects was most capable of achieving design excellence in accordance with the LEP, subject to resolution of matters identified in the Jury Report.

### 2.2 Competition Brief.

The bespoke Invited Architectural Design Competition was undertaken in accordance with the endorsed Design Competition Brief. The Brief was prepared to define the location and extent of the Design Competition, the type of design competition, and the key elements of the competition process, including the ongoing design integrity requirements.

### 2.3 Invited Architectural Design Competition

The main objective of the Design Competition was to select a design concept which has the potential of achieving design excellence in accordance with the requirements *Penrith Local Environmental Plan 2010*.

#### 2.3.1 Competitors

The architectural firms invited to participate were selected due to their demonstrated ability to design high-quality and sustainable transit orientated developments and commitment to timeless design and place making. The three selected architectural practices were (in alphabetical order):

- Cox Architecture with Retallack Thompson
- Scott Carver Architects.
- SJB Architects.

#### 2.3.2 Competition Jury

The Jury comprised the following three members:

- One member nominated by Penrith City Council:
  - Brett Newbold – Principal of Brett Newbold Urban Planning
- One member nominated by GANSW:
  - Rory Toomey – Principal Design Advisor, GANSW

- One member nominated by the proponent:
  - Stephen Moore – Director and Partner, City Strategy, Hatch + Roberts Day

The Jury selected Rory Toomey to act as Jury Chair for the duration of the Competition.

### 2.3.3 Technical Advisors

The Proponent made available the following advisors to provide technical assistance to all Competitors:

- Quantity Surveyor: Construction Consultants
- Structural and Services Engineer: Taylor Thomas Whiting Engineering
- Urban Planning: Ethos Urban
- Building and Construction: Urban Property Group

### 2.3.4 Observers

The following observers from Penrith City Council were present at different stages of the competition:

- Gavin Cherry – Development Assessment Coordinator, Penrith City Council
- Wendy Connell – Development Assessment Planner, Penrith City Council

### 2.3.5 Overview of Competition Timeline

An outline of the key events in the Competition is provided at **Table 1**

**Table 1**      *Key Events in the Competition*

Date	Event	Description
21 March 2022	Competition Commencement	Competition brief issued to invited competitors.
21 March 2022	Competition Briefing Session	Briefing session conducted via Microsoft Teams attended by Competitors.
8 April + 11 April	Mid-Point Check In	Online Check in with competitors.
21 April 2022	Final Submission Lodgement	Competitors submitted electronic copies of the Final Submissions to the Competition Manager for distribution to the Jury.
26 April 2022	Jury Briefing Session	Briefing session attended by part Jury.
28 April 2022	Jury Briefing Session	Briefing session attended by part Jury.
2 May 2022	Technical Advisor Reports issued to Jury	Competition Manager circulated reports by technical advisors to the Jury and Council observers.
2 May 2022	Presentation Material Lodgement	Presentations submitted to the Competition Manager for compliance check.
4 May 2022	Additional Technical Information Provide to Jury	CPTED Information provided to Jury and observers, following request at Jury Briefing
5 May 2022	Final Presentations	Competitors presented their Final Submissions, to the Jury.
	Jury Deliberations	The Jury met via Teams to discuss the submissions and make a decision.



6 May 2022	Competition Conclusion Letters issued to Competitors	Notification to Competitors of Jury decision issued to Competitors via email.
1 June 2022	Jury Report Finalised	Jury Report Completed
June - October	Design Integrity Panel Meeting	The DIP met on several occasions to confirm the
20 October 2022	Design Integrity Panel Endorsement	Letter issued by GA NSW

### 2.3.6 Competition Outcome

The Jury selected SJB team as the winner of the Competition in a unanimous vote. Following a careful consideration of all schemes, the Jury deemed SJB as most-successful – primarily due to strengths of an elegant building form; constructive responses to environmental constraints which are demonstrated by the linear building form, by effectiveness of the residential layout, by the design of facades as passive and fully integrated ‘environmental filters’; and by the consolidation of communal recreation areas upon the rooftop. The conscious design of the colonnade integrating built form, landscape, programmable pavement zones and opportunities for personalisation of shopfronts also created the most successful pedestrian experience of the three considered schemes.

The Jury believed that the SJB scheme exhibited the potential of achieving design excellence following the retention of the key features for its selection, and resolution of matters that required further refinement. The Jury was conscious that some technical aspects of the winning scheme were unresolved, particularly the centrally-located vehicle access and continuity of the activated street frontage; retail areas are relatively small and include spaces without direct exposure to the street frontage; retail potential is not optimised by a large public room which faces Station Plaza; and commercial areas do not have dedicated lift access. Notwithstanding these, the SJB scheme was considered to have the capability to accommodate straightforward amendments which would render it capable of achieving design excellence.

## 2.4 Design Integrity Panel

The DIP was established to review and provide advice in regard to the architectural design outcome for the project. The role of the DIP was established to assist in the ongoing achievement of design excellence and to ensure that design integrity is maintained.

In accordance with the GANSW Guidelines and the Design Competition Brief and DIP Terms of Reference, the intent of the design integrity process was to provide input/direction to the project design in relation to the achievement of design excellence.

The DIP has provided advice prior to the lodgement of the DA and is expected to be retained during the assessment and post approval stages of the project to review any substantial amendments made to the design and as required by any future condition of consent.

### 2.4.1 Members of the DIP

The DIP Terms of Reference requires members of the competition Jury to have an ongoing review role in the form of a DIP. The Panel members were the original Jury members for the Design Competition.

## 2.4.2 DIP Meetings

There have been four (4) DIP meetings prior to lodgement of the SSDA, which are summarised in **Table 2**.

**Table 2** Overview of DIP meetings

Date	Purpose	Focus
<b>Meeting No. 1 – Design Review Post Competition</b>		
9 June 2022	The purpose was to review the design and documentation roles for the SJB Team. The design team provided an initial presentation of design progression and approach to resolution of key matters from the Design Competition.	Discussion on post-competition design evolution and next steps
<b>Meeting No. 2 – Design Review</b>		
6 July 2022	Progression of the design in response to initial comments from Meeting 1	Discussion on post-competition design evolution and items for next meeting
<b>Meeting No. 3 – Design Review</b>		
2 August 2022	Further progression of the Design with other consultant inputs and updates from Council and agencies	Resolution of combined items identified from competition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ground floor plate – retail tenancies, layout, entries and colonnade</li> <li>Colonnade/Parapet</li> <li>Landscaping overall</li> <li>Eastern façade and activation/deactivation</li> <li>Southern elevation to the trail corridor</li> <li>Podium landscaping</li> <li>Rooftop structure and design</li> <li>Northern façade, notches and interface with the colonnade</li> <li>ADG Compliance</li> <li>Connecting to Country</li> <li>Public Art Plan</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting No. 4 – Pre-Lodgement of Development Application</b>		
20 September 2022	Prior to lodgement of the DA to facilitate design development and resolution of key matters from the Design Competition.	Finalisation and refinement of scheme + ensuring all matters identified in this DIP Report



### 3.0 Design Integrity Process Outcomes

This section outlines the status of the design competition outcomes in the context of the design integrity process. Throughout the design integrity process, the Panel has provided advice on design development outcomes that were supported and those that required further refinement.

#### 3.1 Competition Scheme

The Architectural Design Competition Report included key information associated with the design, including key reasons why the SJB scheme was selected, as well as areas for further refinement in the pursuit of design excellence. These matters have been examined through the design integrity process, and are addressed below.

##### 3.1.1 Key Reasons for Selection

The Competition Jury identified key features of the Bates Smart scheme that contributed to its selection, which were fundamental to the achievement of design excellence. **The matters identified in the Jury Report** outline these, which have been maintained through the design evolution and progression in the DIP process.

These can be summarised as providing an elegant building form; constructive responses to environmental constraints which are demonstrated by the linear building form, by effectiveness of the residential layout, by the design of facades as passive and fully integrated ‘environmental filters’; and by the consolidation of communal recreation areas upon the rooftop. The conscious design of the colonnade integrating built form, landscape, programmable pavement zones and opportunities for personalisation of shopfronts also created the most successful pedestrian experience of the three considered schemes.

##### 3.1.2 Areas for Refinement

As set out at Section 5.1 of the Jury Report, the Jury also identified key areas for further refinement of the winning scheme. These matters for further resolution were identified to ensure the design continues to respond to all design and technical aspects of the Competition Brief (including the project budget), maintains the key design intent and principles, and ensures the scheme is capable of achieving design excellence.

Key matters that the Jury identified for further resolution and their respective status at the conclusion of DIP Meeting 4 are listed in **Table 3**.

**Table 3** Areas for refinement and status of resolution in the design competition

Areas for Refinement	Resolution
<div>1. Vehicle access</div> <div><div>a. Current conflicts between vehicles and the pedestrian colonnade should be eliminated by relocation of the driveway to the eastern end of the Site.</div><div>b. Subject to terms of the busway easement and traffic safety, the relocated driveway <u>might</u> share the northern portion of the dedicated busway.</div><div>c. Relocation of the driveway should be supported by appropriate reconfiguration of the pedestrian colonnade, retail areas, apartment lobbies, and activated interfaces with the community garden.</div><div>d. Relocation of the driveway should not result in extensive reconfiguration of the current eastern apartment building, or the eastern-most wing of that building.</div></div>	<div>This has been resolved by relocating vehicle access to the east of the site, whilst still allowing for access, circulation, and community garden at the southern edge of the site.</div> <div>The potential future busway has been resolved, with TfNSW confirming it is not required.</div> <div>In reconfiguring the driveway, parking and access, the eastern apartment building has been largely retained.</div>

Areas for Refinement	Resolution
<p>2. Retail areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Retail areas should be increased by better-considered space planning which demonstrates clear regard for commercial exposure, pedestrian access, and back-of-house services.</li> <li>b. The western “public room” which occupies prime retail exposure should be allocated to retail use.</li> <li>c. Relocation of the driveway should investigate opportunities for increased retail in lieu of the current central landscaped courtyard which is a ‘residual’ space, but without compromising configuration or character of the current colonnade.</li> <li>d. Dimensions of increased retail areas should demonstrate flexibility to accommodate a variety of tenancy-sizes and operators.</li> </ul>	<p>The ground floor plane has been refined with input from a retail expert and services requirements in discussion with Council as part of a pre-DA meeting. This provides shallower tenancies and area of servicing at the rears.</p>
<p>3. Commercial lift access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The commercial level should have dedicated lifts and lobbies;</li> <li>b. Access from basements and ground level should not share residential lifts or lobbies.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal has been refined to provide separate lobbies and entry points for residential and commercial</p>
<p>4. The community garden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Relocation of the driveway, together with associated reconfiguration of lobbies and retail areas, should maintain the interim community garden as an activated element of streetscape.</li> <li>b. Reconfiguration of lobbies and retail areas should maintain reasonable visual and pedestrian links to the interim community garden.</li> <li>c. Reconfiguration of the community garden, if necessary to accommodate the relocated driveway, should maintain designed qualities of the current arrangement which presents as a publicly-accessible ‘parterre plaza’.</li> </ul>	<p>The relocation of the driveway and access, and confirmation from TfNSW has allowed the community garden to be retained on site in the south western corner of the site.</p>
Further information and design development was recommended in relation to the following	
<p>1. Building height and the communal rooftop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Architectural illustrations should address the <i>LEP</i>’s objectives for building height in order to demonstrate likely impacts of the current rooftop pavilions which exceed the permissible maximum building height.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed height variation has been addressed by the Clause 4.6 Variation Request that is appended to the SEE at Appendix II.</p> <p>The Clause 4.6 Variation Request acknowledges that the maximum permitted building height of 32m that applies across the site is a development standard under Clause 4.3 of the PLEP 2010 as the statutory trigger for the height variation. Section 3.2.2 of the</p>

Areas for Refinement	Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. In addition, alternative design solutions for the roof-top pavilions should demonstrate conformity with the <i>LEP's</i> definition of <i>architectural roof features</i>.</li> <li>c. Collectively, it must be demonstrated that the scheme (including the communal roof-top) would not be fundamentally inconsistent with the <i>LEP's</i> statutory requirements in relation to building height.</li> </ul>	<p>Clause 4.6 Variation Request demonstrates that the objectives of Clause 4.3 are achieved notwithstanding the proposed height variation.</p> <p>The Clause 4.6 Variation Request has also sought to address the provisions of Clause 8.4, which are assessed in detail within Table 1 of the report. The proposed variation to Clause 4.3 of the PLEP 2010 presents an acceptable outcome for the site that will not give rise to any unacceptable environmental impact.</p> <p>The Clause 4.6 Variation Request establishes a strong justification for the proposed height variation that satisfies this response item. This justification is supported by visual material that is provided throughout Section 10 of the Design Report (refer to Appendix C of SEE).</p> <p>The proposed development does not seek to justify the proposed height variation under Clause 5.6 of the PLEP 2010. Generally speaking, the proposed roof structure does not constitute an Architectural Roof Feature (ARF) as defined by Clause 5.6. However, it is noted in passing that the proposed roof structure does not contain any habitable floorspace. It is our understanding that the Jury agree that any reference to Clause 5.6 in support of this DA would not be appropriate.</p> <p>Table 1 of the Clause 4.6 Variation Request (refer to Appendix II of the SEE) demonstrates that the objectives of Clause 4.3 are achieved notwithstanding the proposed height variation. The Clause 4.6 Variation Request further demonstrates that the proposal is consistent with the objectives for the B2 Local Centre Zone, and does not present an outcome for the site that is discordant with the height, bulk and scale of the existing and desired future character of the locale.</p>
<p>2. Length of the street-wall elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Architectural illustrations should demonstrate that the overall length of proposed street-walls would not be inconsistent or incompatible with existing buildings in the Thornton village centre.</li> <li>b. Additional architectural illustrations should further explain the effect of façade articulation which currently is provided by vertical recesses and brise-soleil elements.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal provides a number of montages and diagrams that demonstrate the suitability of the proposed building façade and street walls. These are thoughtfully articulated to break down the mass of the scheme visually, whilst providing effective environmental performance and interest in the facade</p>
<p>3. The eastern elevation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. It must be demonstrated that easterly-presentation of the Development would provide a companionable backdrop to future development upon the neighbouring property as well as to lower-rise development to the north.</li> </ul>	<p>The eastern facade has been a key focus of the DIP. The panel feels that this has been well resolved by the SJB team to provide practical servicing requirements and access, but also to meet the interface of the site to any future development further east.</p>

Areas for Refinement	Resolution
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. An architectural elevation of the eastern elevation should be provided.</li> <li>c. Together with that elevation, three-dimensional views from ground level should demonstrate 'backdrop' presentation to the neighbouring Defence property and to smaller-scale residential to the north.</li> </ul>	
<p>4. The street forecourt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Concept details of paving and landscaping along the street frontage and colonnade should be provided.</li> <li>b. Concept details should confirm that <i>DDA</i> requirements would be satisfied by the arrangement of pedestrian paths and potential obstacles such as café seating, and that works would match or complement the design character of <i>Station Plaza</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>These details have been included in the proposal and discussed with the DIP, with suitable clearances and clever design in response to level change of the colonnade, building entries (for flooding purposes) and footpath levels.</p>

# Appendix A

## Design Integrity Panel Endorsement for DA Submission

