



DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

**Campbelltown Design Excellence Panel (CDEP) Meeting held on
11 March 2024 at 9:30 am**

Panel Members	Aldo Raadik	Chair
	Iain Stewart	Member
	Michael Stott	Member

Council Staff	Rad Blagojevic	
	Karl Okorn	
	Luke	

1. Acknowledgement of Land
The Chairperson presented an Acknowledgement of Land
2. Declaration of Interest
There were no conflicts of interest noted.
3. Agenda Items

ITEM 2 – 1 KELICAR ROAD / 1 BUGDEN PLACE, CAMPBELLTOWN

NOTE:

The following Panel comments include notes from Previous DEP meetings related to this site.

The project has altered over time, particularly in relation to the uses on the ground floor. Significantly different layouts have been presented, and the Panel's comments relate to all variations presented to date.

The Panel reserves the opportunity to include all comments as a record of relevant issues applicable to this site until final clarity on design and planning direction is presented.

Comments carried over from previous CDEP sessions are noted as follows:

- Comments from 11 April 2024 in Orange
- Comments from 23 November 2023 in Red
- Comments from 30 June 2023 in Blue
- Comments from April 2023 in Black

General Comments from the Panel	
1.	<p>This is the first time this matter has come to the Panel, and the Panel appreciates that the applicant has presented at this preliminary stage.</p> <p>The Panel was addressed for a second time in relation to the application.</p> <p>This is the third time this scheme has been presented to the Panel (currently under the 1 Bugden Place address)</p>

	<p>The Panel understands that a planning proposal concurrent with this application seeks to modify all commercial activity requirements on the ground floor.</p> <p>The current site plan only suits the requirement of some ground floor commercial use and would likely require significant replanning to find an appropriate solution. The Panel supports a more differentiated approach to the ground plane, requiring a Planning Proposal. This approach should focus on creating local retail along a local street, Bugden Place, setting up the western side of what may become a future 'high-street' typology, offering an alternative environment to the shopping mall and residential-focused east-west 'Woonerf' type streets.</p> <p>REPEAT NOTE.</p>
2.	<p>The site is an essential gateway to Campbelltown. It will be a critical part of its townscape and its ongoing development of the "city image" as an essential and distinctive regional centre.</p> <p>The above comment is reiterated.</p>
3.	<p>The site's urban contextual links to the surroundings, existing shopping centres, commercial centres and pedestrian access to the railway station are essential to acknowledge and demonstrate. These links inform pedestrians' preferred movement patterns and link to existing and established city nodes.</p> <p>Further analysis of the urban links, and a ground plain structure including retail distribution, and pedestrian, bicycle, car and bus movement patterns will be analysed and investigated, particularly to/from Macarthur Station and Macarthur Square. An urban structure plan will be prepared between Macarthur Square and Narellan Road.</p> <p>Some additional analysis was provided on 23 November regarding the east-west link, but challenges with the road network still need to be addressed. The concept would benefit from a demonstrated clear hierarchy of roads and spaces, which could be done in the form of a structure plan/development framework.</p> <p>Comment Reiterated in relation to the clarification regarding an internal addressing street.</p>
4.	<p>The Panel requests that further investigation of built form arrangements and subsequent modelling and overshadowing effects be conducted to provide opportunities for integration with the surroundings and inform the potential mix of uses, streetscape, bulk and scale.</p> <p>There needs to be further building form exploration. A site of this scale requires genuine options testing, including a multi-criteria analysis. The issues of building address, activation, and overshadowing, particularly in the ground-floor communal landscaped areas, need to be satisfactorily shown to be resolved to provide an appropriate amenity to the open space areas.</p> <p>The current plans indicate that all ground-floor areas are nominated for commercial use. As discussed, this needs to meet sustainable planning practices or ground plane activation in a residential development of this scale.</p> <p>The current ground planning needs to achieve a suitable outcome that achieves Residential amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The number of apartments proposed (~700) is substantial and presents several opportunities and constraints for forming satisfactory outcomes for this new community.</p> <p>The need for a series of addresses for the built form and the reduction of the number of buildings were noted to create a stronger sense of place and entity.</p>

	<p>As stated and discussed by the applicant, the scheme's development needs a review of the cross-site link's character and uses further to create addresses for the individual buildings on site.</p> <p>The Panel confirmed that the cross-site link should be developed to achieve clear and easily identifiable addressing for each apartment building. It was clarified that this included drop-off and pick-up opportunities and does not necessarily require through-site traffic.</p>
6.	<p>A landscape and ecological strategy incorporating roofscapes and pedestrian links through the site and to the surroundings would assist in the overall conceptual design approach.</p> <p>The concepts for landscape and ecology were noted; it would benefit the proposal to ensure that the hydraulic flows proposed aligned with existing directional flows of the adjacent fluvial patterns.</p> <p>The landscape strategy appears well-founded.</p> <p>Confirm deep soil compliances and demonstrate the variation of detailed raised soil strategies without only raised hard edge planters as the solution to provide a more integrated solution for the open spaces and connections through and around the site.</p> <p>The presented strategy addressed these issues and significantly improved the design typology for landscape grounding.</p>
7.	<p>The Panel encourages the applicant to review the concept plans in light of the comments above and present them to the Panel again.</p>
8.	<p>The Panel queries the primary orientation of the ground plane layout. The cross-site link is a positive contribution; however, the orientation drives apartment block layouts that need to be revised. Justify the link orientation regarding the local context.</p> <p>Consider the ground plane spaces around all apartments and define public and private realms to establish Communal open spaces with equitable access from all apartments and separation from public access for security. Please refer to the notes above. Reconsider starting, finishing and connection orientation options for a cross-site link.</p> <p>As noted above, the Panel does not support the amended proposal to convert all commercial spaces to ground-floor units.</p> <p>Repeat comment</p>
9.	<p>Whilst the underpass area may provide an area of opportunity, justify how this would be a beneficial focus in this outer metropolitan area. The development of the underpass as an active destination was noted. However, the adjacent retail is considered less viable in this location (refer to pedestrian flows stated above).</p> <p>The Panels suggest that any local retail hub should consider its location within the development (and possibly the future development of the adjacent sites) for its primary catchment. The current location is extremely peripheral, with poor road access and parking availability. The economic sustainability of the location needs to be justified, even if the local demand is established.</p> <p>Repeat comment</p> <p>Repeat comment</p>
10	<p>The Panel questions the need to create a separate retail focal point that does not directly support the cross-site link, given the strong retail attractions within short walking distance from the site.</p> <p>As noted above and below</p>

11	<p>Consider that a North-south link may not be required as Bugden Place could be enhanced to provide the same outcome whilst further engaging the adjacent retail and future residential neighbours. Bugden Place is an appropriate street frontage for vehicular access. This also suggests it is a prime location for retail addresses and the ability to expand on the limited local catchment. The Panel is confident that further investigating the potential to connect Bugden Place with Menangle Road (even a restricted left-in left-out proposal) would improve the outcome.</p> <p>Review and develop the cross-site link, building addresses and sustainable retail / commercial locations along Bugden Place.</p> <p>The Panel confirms that developing the cross-site link can be done without full traffic access through the site.</p>
12	<p>The Panel encourages the applicant to review the concept plans in light of the comments above and present them to the Panel again. Explored options should be presented to substantiate the preferred option's reasoning further. These can be in the simplest forms to aid discussion and assessment.</p> <p>Respond to all of the planning issues above.</p>

Further commentary to be addressed by the applicant and design team:

The current delineation of communal open space from publicly accessible space continues to leave many of the individual buildings as isolated addresses that are not instinctively found.

The current Architectural and Landscape detail sections at the site edge show significant stepdowns to the surrounding roads due to flooding level mitigation. However, many sections indicate raised platters at these edges that increase and emphasise the defensive feel of the site edge. Reduce raised landscape planters in favour of a more naturalised approach to the site edges and introduce seat walls along the edges. **Satisfied**

Regardless of the height strategy for the site (lower "internal buildings"), the Panel seeks greater detail and justification of the quality and quality of communal spaces in the middle of both stages (ground floor). **Repeated**

The Panel queries the inequitable communal open space strategy for Buildings D and H, where rooftop spaces are provided, as these buildings are isolated by public open spaces at the ground plane.

The residential carpark access to stage 2 is shared with the loading dock access. The indicated truck turning arcs are located across the residential ramps and are considered a safety issue. The mixing of cars and trucks is not acceptable at this scale of development (and is always discouraged from perceived amenity and safety issues).

The Panel reiterates this comment, subject to the demonstration of clear and easy separation between residential and loading vehicles.

The Panel acknowledges the varied building height strategy. However, as presented the corner buildings are used to create singular "high points" which serve to frame the overall mass but not break it down and add further visual interest. More variation in heights is required, particularly along the boundaries. In addition, more building variation is required (finishes, colour, texture) to assist with this massing relief. **This variation in height addresses the issue however further definition of building parapets needs be stronger, as they are not currently evident.**

Specific Issues/comments identified by the Panel in relation to:

<p>1. Architectural Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Functionality b. Aesthetic c. Material d. Facades 	<p>The presentation of an urban village concept for the site is welcome, with the acknowledgement of the contribution that the proposal may make to the site and its surroundings. The Panel encourages further design development and investigation of options for pedestrian access and links that may determine the proposed arrangement of the built form. It must be more prominent and explain why the through-site link runs NW/SE. running it East/West would provide better solar access.</p> <p>References to Campbelltown as a distinctive urban entity, a city in a valley, are noted and encouraged. The Panel notes that further investigation of the site's functionality would assist in the overall concept resolution. Options in relation to vehicular access through the site (Woonerf/ 'Living Street' concept, for example) could be investigated for safety and security attributes combined with a structure plan.</p> <p>The Panel looks forward to more details on the scheme's fine-grain elevation treatment. Note that the concept perspectives depict a high proportion of deep solid wall massing relative to window and door openings. Consider the opportunity to lighten the proportions.</p> <p>The further detail noted above has been partially supplied; however, the massing of the proposal does not acknowledge the various aspects of the site, resulting in a block form that does not respond to the current and desired future character of the site.</p> <p>The Panel reiterated the expectation of a very high design standard for such a key development in Campbelltown. The presentation submitted prior to the DRP meeting promised a built form, tectonic and materiality that can be supported - Recommendation is to continue to develop these directions throughout.</p>
<p>2. Urban Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Human scale b. Integration with the surrounding environment c. Overall aesthetic d. Fit 	<p>The Panel encourages further investigation into Campbelltown's urban and regional context to inform meaningful and site-specific placemaking strategies. Connection to Country is encouraged to inform the design process further. Note is made of the size of the project and the projected population with pedestrian links to surrounding areas, the relationship with the road and railway network and the satisfying of exemplar city and urban design principles for the project. Nodal points for places and community gatherings are encouraged. The carpark entry appears too close to the intersection: has Traffic advice been sought?</p> <p>The Panel notes that the traffic advice has been sought, and the carpark entry has been moved away from Kellicar Road. A single entry is questioned for the number of apartments</p>

	<p>proposed and the resultant traffic volumes. Additional 'Woonerf' type streets will create opportunities for extra car parking entries.</p> <p>The development of the concepts using Connection to Country is encouraged, with further reference to the fluvial patterns of the immediate area, for example. Further recognition of the role of Macarthur Square, Macarthur Station, MarketFair and pedestrian links is needed so that the proposal responds to the opportunities provided by these existing key nodal points.</p> <p>While further analysis was provided, the change to all commercial use to the ground floor has resulted in unresolved outcomes for using the open space areas around the building forms. Clarifying the hierarchies of spaces will assist with the location of ground floor uses – local street with local retail along Budgen Place and residential-focused east-west 'Woonerf' type streets.</p> <p>The east-west street needs to allow cars. This can be in the form of a shared way or other arrangement. A port-cochere type of arrangement is not acceptable for a development of this density. Buildings need a proper address reachable by residents, taxis, delivery drivers, etc.</p> <p>The Panel clarified that the cross-site link does not need to be a through-access road but should provide deep access to the site to achieve a proper street address for each separate building.</p>
3. Landscaping	<p>As noted above, an unambiguous landscape and ecological strategy for the site as part of cooling and greening cities outcomes is a significant component of the overall strategic outcome for the site.</p> <p>The landscape provides both ground-level and roof-level amenities. Overshadowing and focal areas need to be addressed in the overall conceptual framework. Acknowledgement and analysis of the broader cultural landscape patterns (Gilchrist Avenue and Narellan Road and their landscape plantings as key entry points into the City of Campbelltown) must be unified into the overall analysis of the site and its surrounding ecological urban framework.</p> <p>The landscape concept has developed. However, apportioning all ground floor units to commercial use raises issues of legibility and clarity of use of the landscape spaces.</p> <p>Repeated Note</p>
4. Heritage (if relevant)	N/A
5. Streetscape	<p>As noted above, links to the surrounding and broader destinations are needed, as is a considered approach to a pedestrian amenity that includes street trees. A Structure Plan needs to address existing and proposed street typologies, including typical sections.</p>

	<p>This issue still needs to be addressed comprehensively to assist in the proposal's integration into the surroundings. This analysis around structure and hierarchy would also help in a planning proposal narrative. Repeated Note.</p>
6. Solar Access	<p>The present arrangement of built form creates substantial self-shadowing. Investigation of alternate arrangements of built form will assist in clarifying this issue. There is no explanation or justification as to why Building D is above the height plane, and the separation from Building E doesn't appear to comply with the ADG. The Panel is particularly concerned about the solar access to communal open spaces on each side of the site. Solar penetration appears minimal due to self-shadowing created by the building placement. The options testing should include more significant variation in building heights to achieve better solar outcomes.</p> <p>Sun-eye diagrams are noted, and a better outcome has been produced in response to the Panel's queries. Due to the scale and importance of the proposal as part of the future city image of Campbelltown, further development of the building massing and detail needs to adhere to and surpass minimum sun access. ADG compliance for all buildings, especially A and G, which appear to have poorer amenity, is to be demonstrated.</p>
7. Privacy	<p>Buildings D and E have questionable separation. The Panel noted that some of the floor planning changes addressed this issue.</p>
8. Lighting/natural/artificial	<p>The options testing should include lighting to arrive at a balanced preferred scheme.</p> <p>Note remains</p>
9. ventilation	<p>In principle, the block arrangements The options testing should include ventilation to arrive at a balanced preferred scheme.</p> <p>Note remains</p>
10. wind	<p>The Panel notes the arrangements of the built form and that the applicant should consider wind effects through the site. For example, the southwest corner under the elevated portion of Gilchrist Avenue would be a very exposed environment in winter. Consider wind studies to confirm the conditions of the ground plane in this area.</p> <p>Further testing is required with the development of the massing and form of the scheme to ensure that environmental comfort zones between and around buildings are maintained through the inland climate of Campbelltown.</p>
11. Sustainable Design	<p>The extensive use of green roofs is noted. The site strategy and planning need to include an approach to Country and natural systems and needs to address the Sustainable Buildings SEPP.</p>

	<p>Greening is encouraged across the site as a biophilic approach to the site that incorporates Country principles.</p> <p>It is noted that a significant increase in roof Gardens has been introduced.</p>
12. Retail planning	<p>Retail needs to be in a better place and face Bugden and other retailers to create a hub and have any chance of surviving. Refer to the above and provide a microanalysis of location options.</p> <p>The Panel does not support changing all commercial units to ground floor units. Repeated Note</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the section proposed for Bugden Place – if retail is to be provided here, thought needs to be given to accessibility and presentation of retail to the street – convenient access, sightlines to shopfronts, space for outdoor seating where appropriate, and landscaping, all need to be considered. Retail should, preferably, be entered at footpath level.</p>

The submission and any redesign must provide an upfront statement that addresses the Panel's previous and current comments. The Panel looks forward to being reviewing the next iteration of design development.

The amended scheme needs to address comments from the first design review. Additional comments have been provided to clarify the required scope and design development. In particular, we note

- The requirement for a Structure Plan to explore the site's integration into the broader urban structure of Macarthur and
 - A genuine testing of design options, say three, to explore alternative site configurations, including building massing and associated solar access, open space and road typologies, and local retail locations. **Not presented. Comment Repeated**
 -
 - Address detailed issues raised by the Panel.
 - **The Panel understands that a planning proposal, concurrent with this application, seeks to modify the requirement for all commercial activity on the ground floor level.**
 - If submitting a planning proposal: Consideration could be given to shifting area/yard of buildings A and G into other towers, either as ground floor units or by increasing building height (with appropriate study etc.) The result would be improved ground floor and public realm amenity.
 - The Panel outlined the proposal's shortcomings as a major insertion into Campbelltown's urban framework.
 - The Panel believes that the proposal fails to address the design requirements of the site and requires further design development.
- The Panel acknowledges that the scheme is very large and that resolution development of items and issues requires significant input. However, the Panel requests that individual issue resolution be conducted in the broader context and presented as a whole development to demonstrate design excellence outcomes.