

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
Thursday the 13TH of April 2023**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Mandl	Chairperson	Mandl Consults Pty Ltd
Garth Paterson	Panel Member	Paterson Design Studio
Sam Crawford	Panel Member	Sam Crawford Architects

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

Amit Julka	Plus Architecture
Angelica Wu	Bathla Group
Anthony Betros	ABC Planning
Anusha Mandanna	ABC Planning
Gloria Ha	Plus Architecture
Kean Lim	Bathla Group
Vandana	Bathla Group

OBSERVERS:

Amanda Merchant	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
Ariz Ashaf	Convenor / Acting Coordinator City Design	Liverpool City Council
Nabil Alaeddine	Principal Planner	Liverpool City Council
James Martinez	Technical Admin Officer	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Item Number: 1

Application Reference Number: DA-1099/2022

Property Address: 164 & 170 Croatia Avenue, Edmondson Park NSW 2174

Council's Planning Officer: Nabil Alaeddine

Applicant: ABC Planning Pty Ltd

Proposal: Demolition of the existing structures and construction of a mixed-use development comprising 598 apartments, 1289.90sqm of retail space, basement parking accommodating 926 car parking spaces, landscaping and associated structures over 4 Stages.

Stage 1: Construction of a 1 x 4-storey and 9 x 8-storey mixed-use development containing 94 apartments.

Stage 2: Construction of a 1 x 4-storey and 1 x 8-storey, and 1 x 9-storey development with 164 apartments.

Stage 3: Construction of 2 x 8-storey residential flat building containing 148 apartments.

Stage 4: 1 x 5-storey, 1 x 8-storey and 1 x 9-storey residential flat building containing 192 apartments.

The proposed development is identified as Nominated Integrated Development requiring an approval from the Department of Planning and Environment – Water under the Water Management Act 2000.

The proposed development is identified as Integrated Development requiring an approval from the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.

The proposed development is identified as Integrated Development requiring an approval from the NSW Rural Fire Service under the Rural Fires Act 1997

Meeting Venue: Microsoft Teams Meeting

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-1099/2022, 164 & 170 CROATIA AVENUE, EDMONDSON PARK NSW 2174.

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 the proposal was previously presented to the DEP under a different DA. The Panel notes that the applicant has responded to the recommendations made on the previous scheme which has been considered as part of the assessment. The Panel commends the applicant for preparing the presentation / documentation for the site. The Panel recommends the applicant to strive for design excellence throughout the design development process.
- The Panel notes that the subject site is quite significant in size and needs to be considered as a precinct. The Panel recommends the applicant provide detail on the three sites individually and present to the DEP as separate items or in a longer DEP session. This would enable the panel to provide a more detailed review of the proposed scheme.
- The Panel is concerned with the proximity of the commuter car park (under construction) with Stage 1 buildings. The Panel requires the applicant to reconsider the design / orientation of the built form facing the commuter car park. Provide details of the interface and amenity being achieved for the units facing south (i.e., towards the multi-storied car park).
- The Panel notes that the extension of Buchan Avenue connecting Macdonald Road needs to be co-ordinated with TfNSW. The Panel recommends the applicant resolve the design / layout of proposed ILP road with TfNSW prior to progressing the design. Given the current design / construction status of the commuter car park, a reconfiguration of the ILP road layout can be explored to achieve a different built form/ orientation for

Stage 4 buildings. Resolution of the road layout is required prior to the next DEP meeting.

- The Panel notes that the proposed design of the public domain is not adequate for the density proposed on site. The Panel requires the applicant to establish the right structure plan for the proposal to resolve the broader constraints / challenges with the current scheme. For instance:
- consider additional building setback for landscaping / streetscaping within the public domain.
- Incorporate the proposed substations as part of the building instead of kiosks located along the street.
- Provide the appropriate complying distances between buildings

4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The Panel notes that the proposed building separations are not adequate and needs to address Part 2 of the ADG. The Panel requires the applicant to achieve full building separation compliance as per SEPP 65 Apartment Design Guide (ADG).
- The Panel notes that the revised scheme has multiple built form variations compared to the previous DA (e.g., addition of a 5-storey building in Stage 4, addition of 4 storied built form on top of North-South green link, etc.). The Panel recommends that the applicant maintain the openness of communal space in Stage 4 with a direct East-West through site link, and to re-establish the North-South through site link without being built over by Stage 1 & Stage 2.
- The Panel raises the following concerns regarding the internal layout of buildings:
 - ⊖ Long corridors (without adequate natural light and ventilation)
 - Large number of apartments per floor per lift core
 - ⊖ A number of cores with one lift
 - Efficiency and planning of some of the apartment units is poor, and;
 - Escape distances to fire stairs needs to be reviewed, etc.

The Panel recommends that the applicant address these and other deficiencies as part of the revised design.

- The Panel commends the applicant for the diversity expressed in the elevations, however notes that the diversity is quite superficial, and the actual depth of the architectural element / modulation is not evident. The Panel requires the applicant to detail the elevations for all buildings (through 1:20 façade sections) and demonstrate the architectural character / modulation of the building façade through form as well as colour and materiality.
- The Panel requires the applicant to re-assess the location / size of car park and loading docks. Explore “diversifying” the car park access systems to achieve smaller less disruptive openings along the street.
- Consider multiple controlled entry points for pedestrians along the street.
- The Panel requires the applicant to detail the interface of the retail shops along Buchan Ave. Provide information regarding the servicing of these commercial tenancies.
- Reconsider the provision of subterranean apartments between the loading dock and car park entry (in Stage 2 building D).
- The Panel requires the applicant to provide street address / access for ground floor apartments with access gates and courtyard entry.

- Provide adequate landscape screening to preserve amenity whilst ensuring passive surveillance.
- The height plane diagram indicates almost every roof exceeds the height limit. The Panel requires the applicant to detail the extent of non-compliances as part of the development.

4.3. Density

- The Panel notes that the proposal seems to be an over development of the site (especially with respect to the FSR of RE1 land)
- The Panel recommends the applicant reconsider the distribution of the buildings and density proposed to reduce the multitude of issues evident in the design.

4.4. Sustainability

- The Panel requires the applicant to consider adequate sustainability measures as part of the development.
- Provide photovoltaic (PV) panels,
- Provision for ceiling fans for habitable areas, rainwater harvesting / capture for irrigation, etc.
- Provide details of all sustainability initiatives being considered as part of the development.
- Consider ESD principles as part of design development.
- Mitigation of Heat Island Effect through deep spoil planting which can provide shade for streets.

4.5. Landscape

- The Panel notes that the applicant has not provided landscape plans as part of the submission. The Panel requires the applicant to submit detailed landscape plans prepared by an AILA registered landscape architect for the site. The Panel requires the landscape architect to be in attendance for the next DEP session.
- The Panel notes that the ground floor communal open spaces provided as part of the development is very constrained (especially with the location of basement entry / loading docks). The Panel requires the applicant to detail the public realm for the site and prepare detailed ground level plans with interface sections to demonstrate the quality of the public domain being proposed.
- This should include a detailed description of the road hierarchies and the treatment of the public realm. Including the demonstration of adequate planting zones for shade trees within the public realm, and adequate foot path widths.
- Car Parking basements should not extend into the street setbacks so that mature trees could be planted in these areas.
- The Panel appreciates the provision of significant COS at rooftop level (almost 50-50), however, the Panel emphasizes the importance of COS at ground level. The panel believes that too much of the required open space has been provided at roof level with a commensurate loss of amenity on the ground plane. This should be addressed within a subsequent submission.

- Demonstrate the level of amenity / facilities being provided as part of the communal open space.
- The applicant should also demonstrate how the communal open space can be shared in perpetuity by the occupants in different buildings/stages
- Compliance with open space requirements has been noted per stage. The applicant shall indicate how each building, in each stage, has complied with the communal open space requirement, and whether this space is on ground or on roof top.
- Ensure adequate soil depth (as per ADG) for all vegetation / planting being proposed on slab.
- Planting within the Deep Soil Zone (DSZ) is minimal as a result of perimeter block design of the buildings. Consider a more elaborate planting palette (especially within DSZ) to complement the built form and to achieve a higher tree canopy percentage for the site. The Panel recommends the applicant to strive for 40% canopy cover for the site (including the streetscape and public domain).
- The Panel recommends the applicant increase the area or extent of DSZ being provided as part of the development. And include deep soil planting zones around the perimeter of the buildings along the streets.
- Detailed arrangements of the interface of Maxwell Creek, Macdonald Road and the built form are required. Provide details regarding the embellishments proposed as part of the development for Maxwells Creek.
- The proposed open space for Stage 1 will remain in shade throughout the year. Consider alternatives / relocation of the COS to achieve better amenity for this open space.

4.6. Amenity

- The Panel notes that there is a significant loss of amenity within the latest proposal compared to the previous scheme. The Panel requires the applicant to re-evaluate the design in terms of outlook / amenity provided for the proposed units.
- The Panel notes that the through site links will have poor visual and acoustic amenity. Reconsider the width, alignment and design of the through site links to achieve a better outcome. For instance, the east west Green link is heavily comprised by the loading dock and vehicular entries at Stage 2.
- The east West links and the North Site links should lead to “somewhere”, to an important greenspace or town square, at the moment this is undefined.
- Below grade apartments should be deleted
- On grade apartments should have street addresses and entries, and have privacy landscaping elements and or be slightly raised above street level, as per ADG guidelines.

4.7. Safety

- The Panel notes that the applicant needs to establish the safety provisions being considered as part of the development. Demonstrate the provisions for safety / surveillance within the through site links.
- The Panel requires the applicant to undertake a CPTED analysis for the revised design scheme and demonstrate all safety provisions being considered as part of the proposal.

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

- The Panel supports the overall diversity / unit mix being proposed as part of the development and will assess the details of housing diversity / unit mix in the next presentation.

4.9. Aesthetics

- The Panel requires the applicant to detail the façade elements / modulation proposed for all buildings.
- The Panel makes the following recommendations for the overall aesthetics;
 - Consider a more subtle double storey emphasis for Stage 2 Building C (i.e., a recessed white slab band on the second level with a projecting edge every 2nd storey).
 - The design for Stage 4 Building H needs more work to achieve the base-middle-top expression as other elevations.
 - The corner treatment for Stage 2 Building D needs further resolution as the loading dock access is not discrete and will dominate along the local road.
 - The notional facade treatments and their zones is a reasonable concept but building façade modulation should reinforce these concepts. There should be deeper recessed and projecting forms, elements and the use of deeper setbacks.
 - Relocate and perhaps diversify the access to the car park(s) and loading dock(s). Consider deleting an apartment between the two loading docks on the local road stage 2 East
 - Reinstate the communal open space along the East-West link.
 - The stepping back of built form for Stage 4 Building G works well to modulate the facade and should be considered at other locations.

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 not supported by the DEP and must return to the panel, with all feedback incorporated or addressed.