

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
Thursday the 8th of February 2024**

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lee Hillam	Chairperson	DunnHillam Architects
David Moir	Panel Member	Moir Landscape Architecture
Ian Armstrong	Panel Member	DesignInc

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

NIL.

OBSERVERS:

Amanda Merchant	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
Joshua Walters	Convenor / Acting Senior Urban Designer	Liverpool City Council
Nabil Alaeddine	Principal Planner	Liverpool City Council
Ariz Ashraf	Coordinator CDPD	Liverpool City Council
Di Wu	Senior Urban Design Advisor	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Item Number: 5

Application Reference Number: DA-471/2023

Property Address: 31 and 33 Shepherd Street, Liverpool NSW 2170

Council's Planning Officer: Nabil Alaeddine

Applicant: Lateral Estate Pty Ltd

Proposal: Demolition of all structures, tree removal and construction of two (2) residential flat buildings containing 341 residential apartments and 66 co-living dwellings (affordable housing) over basement carparking consisting of 410 parking spaces, 50 Bicycle parking spaces, 22 Motorcycle parking spaces and 20 at-grade parking spaces.

Note – Apartments are proposed to be amended to 343 overall.

The development includes construction and dedication of a new public road, bulk earthworks, the provision of ancillary services, drainage, and landscape works, publicly accessible through site link and open space, and Torrens Title subdivision in to three (3) allotments.

The proposal is Nominated Integrated Development, pursuant to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, requiring a controlled activity approval from the Department of Planning & Environment – Water under Section 91 of the Water Management Act 2000.

The proposal is Integrated Development, pursuant to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, requiring general terms of approval from Water NSW under Section 90 of the Water Management Act 2000.

The proposal is identified as Integrated Development requiring approval from NSW Rural Fire Services under the Rural Fires Act 1997.

The proposal is a Regionally Significant Development under Schedule 6 of the State Environmental Policy (Planning Systems) 2021.

Meeting Venue: Microsoft Teams Meeting

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

The Chairperson introduced the Panel and Council staff. 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 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 occurs, these may be grouped together but must be acknowledged.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

NIL.

3.0 PRESENTATION

The applicant failed to attend and present their proposal for DA-471/2023, 31 and 33 Shepherd Street, Liverpool NSW 2170.

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**.

General Comments:

1. The Panel expresses disappointment regarding the applicant's failure to attend and present to the Liverpool Design Excellence Panel, which was scheduled for the 8th of February 2024. As a result of the applicant failing to attend these notes cannot be considered complete as there was no opportunity for discussion with or presentation by the applicant.
2. Itemised responses the previous DEP recommendations (9 November 2023) were provided by the applicant immediately prior to the DEP meeting, meaning the Panel had insufficient time to review the proposed amendments. Nevertheless, the document and amendments were discussed in the meeting and reviewed afterwards.

3. The Panel acknowledges the proposals ongoing LEC matters and urges the persistence of the 'without prejudice' discussions to continue to work towards the best possible outcome. In this regard, the Panel has elected to provide this DEP report, to help guide the continuing evolution and improvement of this proposal.
4. It is noted that this development has previously been considered by the DEP on two separate occasions for PL-108/2021 (11th November 2021 and 17th May 2022) and on one occasion under DA-471/2023 (9 November 2023). Each time the Panel has had significant concerns about the design of this proposal.
5. The Panel highlights the significant opportunity for this site and the impact the development will have on the wider precinct. Frontages to the Georges River, Mill Park and proximity to the Paper Mill and the Liverpool City Centre, afford this development enormous potential to raise the standard/expectation of design in Liverpool and deliver significant amenity to residents. The proposal is not currently reaching the standard expected or taking full advantage of the opportunities of the site, for example the proximity of the public park, or the most advantageous views for the site which are to the south along the length of the river.
6. The Panel makes the below comments on the basis of a desktop study. The full history of the proposal including the changes and developments of the design that have been made through the 'without prejudice' meetings cannot be known or commented on with confidence by this Panel. Where it is noted 'No further comment' this should be understood to mean that the Panel did not feel they had adequate information to make a comment. It does not mean that the comments of the previous Panel have been satisfied, or not satisfied.

The Design Excellence Panel makes the following recommendations in relation to the project:

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p>4.1. Context</p> <p>1. <i>The Panel seeks clarification from the applicant regarding the proposed through site link connecting to the foreshore area and whether it is closed during the night, given its indication as a gated and fenced condition. The applicant confirms that it will be closed at nighttime for safety reasons. The Panel emphasises that this contradicts the intention of the public through site link outlined in the Sheperd Street Precinct Masterplan. The gated condition may lead to the possibility of privatisation.</i></p>	<p>4.1. Context</p> <p>1. The Panel notes that the amended design indicated in the '<i>Landscape Design Response to DRP Comments, dated 08.12.23</i>', fails to adequately address the previous concerns raised by the Panel. The landscape proposal does not support unrestricted public access through to the river and doesn't create an intuitive movement path through the site.</p> <p>In the Panels view, this is an improvement on the previous landscape design. However, the landscape design works against the idea of encouraging</p>

<i>Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)</i>	<i>Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)</i>
<p><i>More clarity is required in the ground floor public domain to provide ready and easy access by the public using CPTED guidelines and accepted wayfinding outcomes. The Panel recommends that the access to the foreshore park shall be ungated in alignment with the other access pathways. Good CPTED provisions shall be developed and demonstrated in the next submission.</i></p> <p><i>The provision of large-scale cross sections which demonstrate the design of the public realm and its interface with apartments shall be provided.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Panel highlights the proposed development, comprising more than 400 units and catering to more than 800 residents, is considered a 'vertical town'. Therefore, the on-site amenity is considered significant by the Panel. The applicant is required to improve the overall residential amenity including solar access, visual privacy, ground floor COS and POS, interaction to Mill Park, foreshore activation and accessibility, etc.</i> <i>The current scheme has shown limited consideration for the adjacent Mill Park, a regional park. Therefore, enhanced interface and activation along the south boundary are highly recommended, with the possibility of replacing the loading dock with a community room.</i> <i>Furthermore, the design considerations for the foreshore area are limited. The landscape design within this space should be geared towards accommodating recreational purposes rather than functioning solely as a fire escape and access ramp. There is a need to enhance permeability and connectivity in this area.</i> <i>The Panel recommends that the applicant address the visual and acoustic impact of the railway, incorporating suitable design</i> 	<p>public movement between the streetscape and riverfront via the through site link. In this regard, the design obscures the route through, making it viable only for residents, and creating safety risks that then require gates be installed. This is not aligned with the recommendations of the previous Panel, nor was reasonable justification provided for not including a fully publicly accessible through site link.</p> <p>With regards to CPTED, public access and ground level activation, the Panel has concerns about the ground floor apartments with frontages onto the public through site link which create complexities around activation, privacy, and security. In this regard, the Panel supports a change of function to this space to accommodate (ancillary to LEP permissible use controls) commercial uses for better activation and purpose for this space.</p> <p>The Panel also notes that the CPTED and wayfinding issues remain unaddressed within the documentation and the requested 'large-scale cross sections' detailing the public domain interface have not been provided to address the previous comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is very little that could support a 'vertical village' population on this site. The relationship between Mill Park and the development has been improved by amendments to the ground floor façade of Building B and the indicated pathway (in the landscape sketch) improves movement and connectivity along the southern edge of the site. However, the potential relationship with this public park remains a significant lost opportunity for this proposal. <p>The previous DEP suggestion to</p>

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
considerations.	<p>relocate the loading dock in favour of a community room was deemed inappropriate by the applicant. The Panel remains of the view that an active use in this location is preferable to the loading dock.</p> <p>4. The amenity provided within the foreshore park area appears mostly unchanged from the previous proposal. The sketch landscape plan provided doesn't appear to accommodate recreational facilities towards the river foreshore as recommended, however, additional facilities have been incorporated into the front COS. This item remains unresolved.</p> <p>5. The living areas and private balconies of the units adjacent to the railway are orientated away from the railway line, attempting provide more views towards George's River and CBD.</p> <p>The sketch landscape plan indicates more trees (1 tree per 5 car spaces) and vegetation incorporated along the railway boundary.</p>
<p>4.2. Built Form + Scale</p> <p>1. <i>The proposed building separations, including the distances between the proposed building components, the subdivided site boundary, and the common boundary shared with the newly constructed development in the neighbouring site, are of major concern. These inadequate separations create numerous issues, including concerns related to visual privacy, apartment ventilation, solar access, and visual bulk. It is recommended that the urban built form, scale and bulk is to be reconsidered to provide a more positive inclusion in the conceptualisation of this important side adjacent to the river park.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The Panel emphasises the crucial difference between building separation</i></p>	<p>4.2. Built Form + Scale</p> <p>1. Building A has been amended to incorporate an L-shaped indent into the northern façade to improve separation from the adjoining property. Although this improves articulation / modulation in the façade, privacy and building separation is still non-compliant with the ADG. This item remains unresolved.</p> <p>2. Amendments to Building B include minor changes to façade angle (northern elevation) to facilitate a slight increase separation from Building A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Level 10 and up includes only 19.7m separation (ADG requires 24m for Level 9 - 21). - Levels 5 - 9 include only 17.5m separation (ADG 18m between 5-

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p>and visual privacy numerical controls specified in the ADG. Concerns are raised about the applicant's substantial non-compliance with both requirements, specifically regarding the building separations between Buildings A and B. The ADG requires a minimum of 18m for levels 5 to 8 and 24m for level 9 and above, but the proposed development deviates significantly from these requirements. This departure jeopardizes the on-site amenity and results in a substantial bulky appearance. It is recommended that the urban built form, scale and bulk is to be reconsidered. The towers and B should be reduced in the East West direction to reduce the bulk of the towers and to increase the building separation.</p> <p>3. Couple with this increased width between Towers A and B should be the consideration of and demonstration of increased solar access to the foreshore park, and the Parks opposite on the southern shore of the river.</p> <p>4. Regarding the site's side setback and building separation from the development at 32 Shepherd Street, the Panel acknowledges the applicant has treated this interface as a habitable-to-non-habitable condition and provided a set of detailed diagrams to demonstrate compliance with ADG. However, the Panel notes that levels 9 and above do not meet the ADG separation requirement. Conformance with the ADG is required for both building separation and distance of building to boundary.</p> <p>5. It has come to the Panel's attention that the 4.6 variation does not adequately consider that ADG separations are generally greater than the LEP Clause 7.4 requirements. It is observed that the proposed development does not comply with the LEP in this regard. The proposal is to comply with the LEP and</p>	<p>8).</p> <p>The non-compliances are seen as having significant impact on the amenity of future residents.</p> <p>3. Applicant has indicated an intention to provide updated shadow diagrams as part of an amended DA package. The Panel notes that shadow diagrams before 9am would be very important as these will likely show significant impact on the houses to the west of the proposed development in the hours when residents are having breakfast and preparing for work.</p> <p>4. ADG separations remain non-compliant.</p> <p>5. The Panel do not have adequate information to comment on this.</p> <p>6. No further information was made available to the Panel.</p> <p>7. It does not appear that the Applicant has adopted this recommendation.</p> <p>8. Building forms are not regarded at this stage as being 'well-resolved and compliant'.</p> <p>9. See note above.</p> <p>10. Original Panel comment remain. This item is unresolved.</p> <p>11. The Panel does not see significant improvement in relation to this previous DEP Panel comment.</p> <p>12. The applicant has chosen not to act on the Panel's recommendations. This item is considered unresolved by the Panel.</p> <p>13. No further comment.</p> <p>14. No further comment.</p> <p>15. The Panel raised concern for the general non-compliance with solar and cross ventilation requirements on levels 1-9 of Building B and questions the use</p>

<i>Previous DEP Recommendations</i> <i>(DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)</i>	<i>Latest DEP Recommendations</i> <i>(DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)</i>
<p>the ADG.</p> <p>6. Furthermore, there are uncertainties about the subdivision process and the coordination of the staged development with the common boundary. The applicant is required to provide additional clarification on these matters and provide a detailed development staging plan.</p> <p>7. It is recommended that the applicant reduce the building widths along the east-west axis to mitigate the perceived bulk of the structures along the river.</p> <p>8. It is understood the applicant has their FSR target proposed on the site, the Panel expresses their in-principle support to a variation in building height if the resultant built forms are well-resolved and compliant.</p> <p>9. The Panel seeks clarification from the applicant regarding the possibility of relocating the loading dock of Building B to the lower ground level. The current 11m wide driveway is seen as disruptive to the public domain and streetscape. Exploring the option of refining the ground plane to create active frontages along Shepherd Street and Mill Park is encouraged for a more favourable outcome.</p> <p>10. The Panel expresses concern with the 2.9m side setback to the south boundary facing Mill Park. This setback fails to provide an active frontage to Mill Park and also limits future use. According to the ADG, when there is a boundary between a change in zone from apartment buildings to a lower density area, it is preferred to increase the building setback from the boundary by another 3m. A greater setback and activation along the south boundary is highly recommended. There should be sufficient space to provide a pleasant, landscaped transition from the ground floor of the apartments down to the Mill</p>	<p>of 3- and 4-bedroom dual key apartments (with shared lobbies) to achieve the ADG requirements. These apartments must be considered as individual apartments when making the assessment of ADG compliance.</p>

<i>Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)</i>	<i>Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)</i>
<p><i>Park ground plane.</i></p> <p>11. <i>The Panel supports the massing strategy concentrating the built form on one side to open up public space at the forecourt. However, the proposed built form lacks variety, articulation, and contrast to visually break down the massing. Further design development and studies of the built form to enhance the presentation and relationship with the adjacent building and with Mill Park is required. The corbelled brick work treatment of the podium levels appear to be heavy. A 'lighter' treatment is preferred, more in keeping with the brick work treatment of the new development to the East. The redesigned podium levels should still support a low-rise scale. The forecourt should be better developed with a variety of places that the residents can utilise, in the sunshine afforded by the Northern aspect.</i></p> <p>12. <i>Ground floor apartments should have their own private space arranged to address the public open space of the northern courtyard providing incidental supervision and activation. They should have their own access to this space. The ground floor apartments should be raised for privacy purposes, above the landscaped open space by at least 1m as per the ADG recommendations. This can apply equally to the southern foreshore park.</i></p> <p>13. <i>The Panel suggests the applicant explore opportunities to set back the basement building footprint from the boundary, along Shepherd Street, allowing for a deep soil zone suitable for larger tree planting.</i></p> <p>14. <i>The proposed drop-off zone is deemed out of character and is considered inappropriate by the Panel. It is recommended that a layby treatment be considered as a suitable replacement.</i></p>	
4.3. Density	4.3. Density

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p>1. The Panel clarifies with the applicant regarding the Clause 4.6 variation request for additional floor space. The applicant acknowledges that the calculation varies due to the variable FSR controls on the site. In an overall site calculation scenario, an additional 3.21% variation in floor space is sought, and approximately 54% at the worst case in a site-by-site scenario. The Panel emphasises that the reason for seeking FSR clarification is attributed to the proposed massing, creating a larger building wall perception in multiple locations rather than two distinct built forms. This may be the result of extensive larger floor plates and limited building separations. The amalgamated site should provide a density of uses derived from the application of the FSR from each of the individual sites comprising the total site. Additional FSR to this figure is not recommended, because of the demonstrated difficulty in providing the area in an acceptable form.</p>	<p>1. The Panel remains unsupportive of the additional FSR. The applicant is to reference the above comments about the width and bulk of the building and the significant impact of shadow on low-rise neighbourhoods (to the west) before 9am.</p>
<p>4.4. Sustainability</p> <p>1. It is required to improve solar access for those units that currently receive no direct sunlight and to provide daylighting to the common circulation corridors.</p> <p>2. The applicant is required to confirm the NCC star rating, considering the extensive glazing proposed in the development.</p> <p>3. Although the principle of Sustainability was not particularly discussed at this meeting, the applicant is required to consider recommendations provided in the previous DEP for item PL-108/2021.</p>	<p>4.4. Sustainability</p> <p>1. The Panel recommends that the floor plans be reconsidered to achieve minimum compliance with solar access guidelines. The justification provided by the applicant does not relate to proposals such as this, where views and light are unencumbered.</p> <p>2. No further comment.</p> <p>3. The concerns of previous DEP's remain relevant. This proposal seems to have only the minimum concern for issues of sustainability, thus much opportunity for addressing the long-term risks of climate change is being lost. This item is considered unresolved by the Panel.</p>
<p>4.5. Landscape</p> <p>Foreshore Area</p>	<p>4.5. Landscape</p> <p>1. See comments above.</p>

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p>1. <i>The Panel queries the overshadowing impacts on the foreshore planting and seeks clarification from the applicant regarding the potential use of this area in wintertime. The applicant acknowledges the limited uses during the colder months but emphasises that, in the context of Western Sydney, people appreciate both winter gardens and summer gardens. Further design development is required so that there are a range of spaces and environments that provide satisfactory recreational options for residents, their guests and the public. The applicant is to improve the solar access to the foreshore park through an increased separation between the Towers and B and the existing eastern building.</i></p> <p>2. <i>As discussed in 4.1 above, the landscape treatment in the foreshore area appears inadequate. Additional landscape design considerations are necessary to transform it into a desired recreational destination.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Furthermore, the only access to the foreshore area is currently through the gated through site link in the centre of the proposed development. It is imperative to reassess the accessibility and permeability of the foreshore area and beyond, including establishing a connection to the regional park - Mill Park and the development (s) to the East.</i></p> <p>Forecourt Area & COS</p> <p>4. <i>The Panel acknowledges the substantial landscape space proposed in the forecourt area, that provides potential significant public benefit. However, the use of this forecourt area is unclear - specifically, whether it is intended for use as communal open space (COS) for the proposed development or if it is open to the public. The applicant has confirmed that this area is publicly accessible. An open</i></p>	<p>2. No further comment.</p> <p>3. See Comment above regarding through site link.</p> <p>4. This landscape area is unlikely to be welcoming to public users, however the design as it contributes to the public domain is supported.</p> <p>5. No further comment.</p> <p>6. See Comments above regarding the level of amenity that should be expected for a population as large as is proposed on this site. This item remains unresolved.</p> <p>7. A design for the wind mitigation features must be included in the DA package.</p> <p>8. No further comment.</p> <p>9. No further comment.</p> <p>10. No further comment.</p> <p>11. No further comment.</p> <p>12. The Panel emphasises the importance of the public domain design and the necessity for it to facilitate a high level of amenity for the residents. It is crucial for the landscape, COS, public domain, and architectural designs to work cohesively to support the integration of the overall development within the precinct and provide both high quality public and private amenity and facilitate strong relationships with Mill Park, Georges River, the Paper Mill and the Liverpool CBD.</p>

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p>space strategy is highly recommended by the Panel, outlining the different uses between private and public, and the relationship to the surrounding open space network and to demonstrate a clear hierarchy of external spaces for a range of recreational needs.</p> <p>5. Furthermore, the Panel emphasises that if the forecourt area serves as a shared space between the public and future residents, there is an opportunity to designate it as COS. This, coupled with ground floor unit courtyards, could contribute to creating established and defined spaces, enhancing the identity and amenity for future residents.</p> <p>6. The Panel further reiterates the importance of providing on-site facilities and amenities considering the scale of the proposed development. While the applicant mentions collaboration with Council to renovate Mill Park to the south of the site and implementing recommendations there, the Panel insists on additional design considerations to cater to a variety of uses and activities within the development itself.</p> <p>7. It is noted that with the scale of the development that a wind study is critical to assessing the overall use and enjoyment of the place, particularly with the existing multi storey buildings adjacent and the exposure to southerly winds across the river.</p> <p>Streetscape</p> <p>8. Clarification is sought regarding the lack of tree planting adjacent to the railway corridor. The Panel inquires the rationale to allocate space for car parking rather than tree plantings. The applicant justifies this by citing a shortage of public parking in Liverpool and the need to provide public parking in conjunction with the accessible open space. The applicant expresses a</p>	

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p><i>willingness to replace some parking spaces with additional tree planting if deemed necessary. The applicant is to investigate opportunities for more tree planting and landscape in this area.</i></p> <p>9. <i>The panel recommends that the screening treatment for the railway viaduct be continued towards Mill Park and that the proposed 90-degree public car parking be reduced to parallel parking and the remaining space be landscaped with appropriate screen planting and trees. This is to be supplemented by additional deep soil planting on the southern side of Shepherd Street.</i></p> <p>10. <i>As discussed in 4.2, the Panel recommends the applicant provide more deep soil zones by reducing the basement footprint along Shepherd Street and Mill Park to accommodate more large tree deep soil planting.</i></p> <p>11. <i>The Panel recommends that the applicant incorporate additional design considerations to enhance the interfaces between the street and the forecourt area. This would contribute to creating a more cohesive and well-integrated streetscape and forecourt within the development.</i></p>	
<p>4.6. Amenity</p> <p>1. <i>The Panel suggests elevating the ground-level units to a minimum height of 1-1.5m above the ground and incorporating private courtyards for these units. This design adjustment aims to effectively soften the interface with the publicly accessible COS and enhance visual privacy for the residents.</i></p> <p>2. <i>As highlighted in 4.5 above, there is a need for a more comprehensive design approach for the COS. Given the scale of the proposed development and the anticipated number of residents, it is crucial to ensure that the COS offers suitable facilities and amenities catering</i></p>	<p>4.6. Amenity</p> <p>1. The applicant has chosen not to act on the Panel's recommendations. This item is considered unresolved by the Panel.</p> <p>2. The landscape proposal includes spaces that can accommodate different users and programs. The placement of some of these could be re-considered, e.g. the play structures in the main entry route.</p> <p>3. The recommendation to include a truly public through site link has not been adopted by the applicant, as is shown</p>

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p><i>to residents of all age groups and meeting various needs within close proximity to the building on the site.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The gated through-site link raises concerns about potential privatisation, which may compromise the envisioned public amenity outlined in the Masterplan. A clear strategy and hierarchy of open space use and amenity is required. See the earlier recommendation.</i></p> <p>4. <i>The location of co-living communal room should be in close proximity to the co-living units on the same level, mitigating potential conflicts in use with other residents within Building B.</i></p> <p>5. <i>The internal common circulation corridors for typical floors in both Buildings A and B are poorly lit and lack adequate daylight access.</i></p> <p>6. <i>The applicant is advised to revisit the internal layout design, ensuring compliance with relevant ADG requirements concerning apartment layout, private open space and balconies, storage, etc.</i></p> <p>7. <i>There is a significant departure from the maximum allowable number of units without solar access, as required by the ADG.</i></p> <p>8. <i>The extensive concentration of co-living units (22 units) on level 4 significantly exceeds the maximum number of units typically served by one circulation core (12 units) as per ADG.</i></p> <p>9. <i>The Panel raises concerns about the cross-ventilation compliance calculation provided by the applicant, noting that plenum ventilation is “generally not suitable for cross-ventilation” ...according to the ADG Paragraph 4B-2 and that to achieve Natural Ventilation and effective cross ventilation the opening areas of the glazing on different sides of the building should be the same</i></p>	<p>by the inclusion of gates and the landscape design which obscures entry.</p> <p>4. No further comment.</p> <p>5. No further comment.</p> <p>6. A review of the apartment layouts has not been done by this Panel. It is recommended that LCC engage a peer review of the ADG compliance issues or require a separate session of the DEP to discuss this matter.</p> <p>7. See comments above at 4.4.1.</p> <p>8. The applicant has refuted the need to provide a reasonable proportion of lifts to co-living units, as being not required by the Housing SEPP. This ignores basic amenity provisions that would consider the number of lift movements. The applicant should provide a report on the lift movements and the suitability of the lift cores to provide timely and safe movements in the building for residents and visitors to these floors.</p> <p>9. No further comment.</p> <p>10. No further comment.</p> <p>11. No further comment.</p>

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p>...Figure B.3...standards.</p> <p>10. In general, some of the apartment layouts, particularly in Building B, exhibit poor arrangement, such as the placement of bathrooms across living areas, which may impact functionality and amenity.</p> <p>11. There are some apartment layout concerns such as internal apartment circulation, realistic space for dining areas, depths of some apartments, location of glass lines, poorly proportioned balconies and so on. However, the Panel believes the apartment layouts will most likely adjust in the next iteration.</p>	
<p>4.7. Safety</p> <p>1. BCC/NCC report on basement exit strategy. Some travel distances appear to be too long.</p> <p>2. BCC/NCC report on typical floor corridor exits. Some travel distances appear to be too long.</p>	<p>4.7. Safety</p> <p>1. The Panel would consider fire-engineered solutions with regards to safe egress in an entirely new building, with access to outdoor areas on all sides, to be unacceptable, as well as being unnecessary and an indication that the design is not being thoroughly resolved.</p> <p>2. As above.</p>
<p>4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction</p> <p>1. As discussed in 4.6, the Panel emphasises the importance of locating the co-living communal room in close proximity to the co-living units to ensure better access, security, and amenity for other residents.</p>	<p>4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction</p> <p>1. See previous comments.</p>
<p>4.9. Aesthetics</p> <p>1. The Panel suggests lightening the heavy brick treatment on the lower levels, taking into consideration the adjacent facade treatment of the newly constructed development at 32 Shepherd Street.</p> <p>2. To enhance the activation of Shepherd Street and improve the streetscape</p>	<p>4.9. Aesthetics</p> <p>1. No further comment.</p> <p>2. The Applicant has not adopted the recommendations of the Panel. This item is considered unresolved by the Panel.</p> <p>3. The Applicant has not adopted the</p>

Previous DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)	Latest DEP Recommendations (DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)
<p><i>amenity, the Panel recommends reconfiguring the driveway, loading dock, and garbage room as the car parking entry/exit of Building B currently significantly interrupts the public domain.</i></p> <p>3. <i>As discussed in 4.2, the overall development may require reconfigurations to address amenity issues, especially concerning apartment layouts and building separations.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Additionally, when revising Building B, it is crucial to provide additional design considerations for the southern façade facing Mill Park. This area is highly visible from a distance and serves as the gateway to the Shepherd Street Precinct.</i></p>	<p>recommendations of the Panel.</p> <p>In general, the response of the applicant has been to make small adjustments, for example to setbacks and building separation, that have had the effect of making the overall design appear less coherent and thoughtful. The Panel's recommendations for changes to achieve better amenity and compliance should not result in a lesser result overall, in terms of the public appearance of this proposal. The recommendation that broad scale issues such as building massing, orientation to achieve amenity and views, site planning for public and resident amenity, modulation of facades, whole of floor layout strategies and other elements of the design usually considered in early design stages be re-considered in order to achieve better compliance, amenity and contribute positively to the wider landscape.</p> <p>4. The Panel acknowledge the addition of glazing rather than blank walls, which will in part provide views into the loading dock, however this does not address the amenity issues for the building or for the park.</p> <p>5. The buildings visual prominence from the adjoining park and river precincts was discussed by the Panel. This is a site of significance to Liverpool that must achieve a high architectural quality.</p> <p>There is further opportunity to make improvements within the façade to respond to the significance of the site and provide more opportunities for river views. The proposal should contribute positively to the Liverpool area,</p>

<i>Previous DEP Recommendations</i> <i>(DEP Meeting held on 9 November 2023)</i>	<i>Latest DEP Recommendations</i> <i>(DEP Meeting held on 8 February 2024)</i>
	especially given the visibility of these buildings from the surrounding region.
<p>5.0 OUTCOME</p> <p><i>The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided final direction to the applicant as follows:</i></p> <p><i>The proposal is not supported by the DEP and must return to the panel, with all feedback incorporated or addressed.</i></p>	

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.