

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

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

APPLICANT REPRESENTITIVES:

Damian Barker	Jackson Teece
Daniel Wold	Summit Care
Marian Higgins	Higgins Planning
Nick Winberg	Centurion Group
Simo Corda	Jackson Teece

OBSERVERS:

Scott Sidhom	Coordinator Urban Design	Liverpool City Council
Adam Flynn	Senior Planner	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Application Reference Number: PL-4/2019

Property Address: 18 Randwick Close Casula

Council's Planning Officer: Adam Flynn

Applicant: HIGGINS PLANNING

Proposal: Proposal of a residential aged care facility with residential units

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 PL-4/2019, 18 Randwick Close Casula

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 the building is similar in scale to adjacent developments, and also supports increasing the building height and density from the low-rise scale of the single residences (along the Randwick Close frontage) to a higher scale along the Kurrajong Road frontage. The panel believes the proposal will be improved with the following recommendation:

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel recommends revising the proposal so that it better addresses Randwick Close, and acts as a gateway that terminates the street in an inviting way. Pulling open the building form at the end of Randwick Close could help achieve this.

4.2. Built Form + Scale

As noted in section 4.1 'Context' – Although the proposal exceeds the maximum building height controls for the site, the panel supports the gradation of built forms, with the low density & low activity areas located adjacent to the low density neighbourhood (i.e. along Randwick Close) and the high density & high activity areas located along the busy Motorway (i.e. Kurrajong Road). The panel notes that the additional height is in a suitable location within the site. However, the panel requests the following recommendations be adopted to improve the proposal.

- Recommendation 1 –
Although the panel is supportive of the additional building height, the panel encourages the reconfiguration of the built forms and redistributing of the Gross Floor Area (GFA) to achieve an 18 metre maximum building height along the Kurrajong Road frontage.
- Recommendation 2 –
In the redesign of the scheme to achieve a maximum building height of 18 metres investigate re-distributing the volume in a 3, 4 & 5 storey format, rather than the 2, 4, 6 storey format of the current proposal.

4.3. Density

The panel notes that the proposal is compliant with Council's FSR controls and therefore supports the density of this proposal.

4.4. Sustainability

The panel notes the consideration to self-ventilating and well-insulated apartments is good. However notes the following recommendations are required to improve the design.

- Recommendation 1 –
On-site detention (OSD) water tank has been provided, however, the panel recommends exploring opportunities to collect and re-use rainwater on-site. This is usually achieved by increasing the depth of the OSD tank to have the dual use of retention & detention purposes. The panel notes that water is our scarcest commodity and fundamental to a healthy and sustainable community and therefore new buildings should future proof the community with this necessary infrastructure.
- Recommendation 2 –
The panel recommends using photovoltaic technology to generate power for lighting and electricity purposes on-site. This includes (if not implemented during initial building construction), future proofing the building to later incorporate photovoltaic panels (e.g. space for integrating panels onto the rooftop). A PV system that provides the equivalent power required for all public space lighting and energy needs should be a minimum, whilst providing the housing provider with a net benefit.

4.5. Landscape

The panel notes that the overall landscape strategy is working well, including the inclusion of through-paths, a central open space and generous amount of open space. The panel requires greater resolution and detail of the landscape plan and makes the following recommendations to improve the landscape design.

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel recommends engaging a registered Landscape Architect to develop a landscape master plan for the site. The panel encourages the continual development of the landscape master plan as the massing of the buildings is finalised.
- Recommendation 2 –
The panel recommends encouraging public access to the site during the daytime. The landscape design should explore the idea of ‘buildings within a campus’ that people can move through, which the panel believes is a good approach.
- Recommendation 3 –
The panel recommends that the landscape masterplan includes a proposal to upgrade the laneway located between Randwick Close and Daruk Park. This could include (but not be limited to) Community Gardens, lighting and repaving the laneway in better quality materials.

4.6. Amenity

The panel notes that the majority of dwellings are facing towards sunlight, which is a good design strategy. The panel requires the following recommendations to be addressed to improve the design.

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel recommends ensuring that privacy is considered for some of the internal courtyard-facing apartments (particularly the corner apartments which in part could be solved with a strategic planting of a well considered landscape plan. Incorporate biophillic design elements within the site, to increase the amenity of the apartments and the well being of the residents.
- Recommendation 2 –
The panel recommends engaging an expert lighting designer, and including circadian rhythm driven lighting (i.e. appropriate to a health care facility) for improved wellbeing and better day/night rhythm response.
- Recommendation 3 –
The panel recommends the appropriate acoustic treatments along the Kurrajong Road frontage, to reduce road noise to the appropriate levels for a contemporary residential facility.

4.7. Safety

The panel recommends a high level of safety be prioritised in the redesign of the building and the design of the landscape. The panel believes safety will be improved by adopting the following recommendation.

- Recommendation 1 –
Whilst the panel supports the approach to achieve site permeability and the vision for an 'open village', the panel recommends seeking advice on site management issues, including security edges and sight lines to avoid undesirable behaviour.

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

The panel are very supportive of a mix type of housing (apartments all the way through to assisted living units) for an aged-care facility which they believe is a more sophisticated brief and design response than the older single mode type.

- Recommendations –
NIL.

4.9. Aesthetics

The panel notes that the design was of a good quality and encourages the redesign of the building (in massing and scale to achieve the 18 metres height limit) maintain the same or a higher level of design standard.

- Recommendation 1 –
The panel supports the architectural language of the proposal and encourages the continuation of this approach in the redesign and landscape design.

5.0 OUTCOME

The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided final direction to the applicant as follows:

The project is generally supported however, the applicant is to respond to recommendations made by the panel, with the resubmitted design returning to the panel for re-assessment.