

**MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING
Thursday 10th June 2021****DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Matthew Taylor	Chairperson	TaylorBrammer
Shaun Carter	Panel Member	Carterwilliamson
Kim Crestani	Panel Member	Order Architects

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:

Nick Winberg	Centurion Group
Robert Poon	Jackson Teece
Damien Barker	Jackson Teece
Georgios Anagnostou	Jackson Teece

OBSERVERS:

Adam Flynn	Planner	Liverpool City Council
Danielle Hijazi	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
Ariz Ashraf	Convenor/ Senior Urban Designer	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Application Reference Number: DA-220/2020

Property Address: 18 Randwick Close, Casula.

Council's Planning Officer: Adam Flynn

Applicant: BESOL PTY LTD

Proposal: Construction of a Seniors Housing Development involving a 142 room residential care facility & 93 Independent living units in 3 buildings over Basement parking and retail shops

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 occurs, 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-220/2020, 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 that the applicant has appropriately addressed the issues of excessive building height and the lack of a defined entry sequence to the development/buildings through Randwick Close. The Panel appreciates the overall design outcome of the proposed scheme.
- The Panel recommends a condition be imposed on the applicant to require the retention of the project architect throughout the design process to detail out the building right up to (Occupation Certificate) OC stage to ensure design integrity, consistency and quality of the project is maintained for the built outcome.

4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The Panel notes that the proposed changes to the built form reduces the overall building height making the scheme compliant with minor breaches in building height. The Panel is supportive of the proposed built form.
- The Panel notes there appears an excessive amount of rendered concrete façade throughout the development. The Panel recommends the applicant incorporate a façade that is majority face brick as part of the development to ensure a low maintenance building.
- The Panel notes that Room 08 & Room 33 (i.e. adjoining the dining and kitchen areas) may have reduced privacy due to its proximity to the dining area/outdoor terrace. The Panel recommends the applicant to incorporate additional separation between these rooms and/or incorporate measures to achieve privacy (through landscaping) while maintaining amenity & solar access for the living areas.
- The panel requires the applicant to provide 1:20 wall sections from foundations to top of roof. Please also provide additional fenestration details for the building facade.

4.3. Density

- The Panel supports the overall density being proposed on site.

4.4. Sustainability

- The Panel questions if the applicant is proposing to incorporate Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels as part of the design. The Panel notes there is ample roof area for PV's to power all communal lighting and outdoor lighting at a minimum. This will help long-term resilience for the development & the business.

4.5. Landscape

- The Panel appreciates the holistic approach taken by the architects/landscape architects while designing the proposal and notes that the extensive landscaping being proposed on site will help improve the micro-climate during peak summer periods.

- The Panel notes that the applicant has incorporated additional landscaping to the laneway connection to Daruk Park which would provide greater amenity to the residents of the aged care and to the neighbouring residential dwellings. This is supported by the Panel.
- Panel questions the amount of solar access and levels of lighting for the Dementia courtyard especially during winter. The Panel recommends the applicant to create an environment that allows the residents to engage with nature and ensure adequate landscape/vegetation is selected to achieve some amount of solar access to the southern side of the Dementia Courtyard.
- The Panel questions the amount of shade being proposed on the rooftop communal areas and recommends the applicant to ensure adequate thermal comfort on the rooftop areas during peak summer.
- The Panel questions the scale of vegetation/trees being proposed within the development especially along the elliptical lawn area in the centre. The Panel recommends the applicant to incorporate large shade trees that complement the overall built form as part of the landscape and provide additional landscape volume to the proposal.

4.6. Amenity

- The Panel requires the applicant to ensure that there is some level of solar amenity within the Dementia Courtyard for the residents to enjoy during cold winter months.

4.7. Safety

- NIL

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

- NIL

4.9. Aesthetics

- The Panel appreciates the proposed materiality for the development and recommends the applicant to judiciously incorporate additional brick facades within the building where possible.

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 supported. Respond to recommendations made by the panel, then the plans are to be reviewed/approved by Council.

Previous Design Excellence Panel Minutes:

MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING

Thursday 9th July 2020

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rory Toomey	Chairperson	Government Architect NSW
Alf Lester	Panel Member	LFA Pacific Pty Ltd
Matthew Taylor	Panel Member	Taylor Brammer Landscape Architects Pty Ltd

OBSERVERS:

Scott Sidhom	Coordinator Urban Design	Liverpool City Council
Danielle Hijazi	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
Adam Flynn	Senior Planner	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Item Number: 2.

Application Reference Number: DA-220/2020.

Property Address: 18 Randwick Close, Casula NSW.

Meeting Venue: Via Microsoft Teams.

Time: 11:30am - 12:15pm.

Proposal: Construction of a Seniors Housing Development involving a 142-room residential care facility & 93 Independent living units in 3 buildings over Basement parking and retail shops.

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-220/2020, 18 Randwick Close, Casula NSW.

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 development needs to be sympathetic to providing an inclusive environment, however it needs to be more public and feel more open. Revise the proposal so that it is more inviting and connects better to the adjacent park and to other areas around the site including considering broader neighbourhood connections and movement patterns (e.g. to Casula Mall).*
- The current proposed entry from Randwick Close is not welcoming; it does not read as a publicly accessible entrance to the site or consider the broader connections to the site (e.g. Connections to Casula Mall). Reinforce or clarify the sense of arrival and connection to the site and through the site, for the community that will be approaching from the south. Hard and soft landscape strategies may be employed to achieve this (e.g. lighting, legibility and signage).*
- The panel acknowledges that building bulk to the south has responded to earlier DEP comments.*
- Consider the relationship between the height of this development (i.e. Block A), and the development located on the other side of Kurrajong Road.*

4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The proposal has improved from a built form perspective since the last DEP meeting, however, a building height of 22.050m (i.e. a 6m non-compliance with Council's DCP controls) is not supported. Adhering to a maximum building height of 18m is recommended by the panel, in line with Council objectives. Review the massing of the development to achieve compliance.*
- The panel notes that overall, this is quite an intense and built-up development given the intention to achieve internal open spaces within the site. Given the proposition to develop higher and more dense building forms, focus should be directed toward how individual blocks relate to each other, to the intermediate open spaces and to the surrounding residential areas, the laneway and recreation area.*

- *Demonstrate how consolidation of built form and opening of ground plane as a design strategy, is helping to benefit the community and the relationship with neighbouring properties and open space.*
- *A clear response has been made to previous panel recommendations, including the stepping of building heights across the development. However, the treatment of edges of those buildings and how they relate to the buildings to the south, and to each other is important. Re-work the section drawings to illustrate the relationship between interior spaces, adjacent outdoor spaces and to neighbouring properties.*

4.3. Density

- *The proposal is compliant with Council's FSR controls of 1.5:1 for the site. However, this density results in a lot of GFA on site. Ensure that the distribution of GFA on the site achieves quality amenity outcomes for neighbours and the community.*
- *There appears to be communal space (constituting GFA) on level 5 of one of the buildings. This is located above the 18m recommended height limit and needs to be relocated to be below the 18m limit.*
- *Provide Council with confirmation of density calculations. Page 21 of the submitted presentation document notes an FSR of 1.62:1 and needs to be clarified.*

4.4. Sustainability

- *The panel notes that the sustainability aspects of the proposal are developing and becoming a core part of the proposal – this is commended, however, details have not been provided to the panel. The comments made in the previous DEP meeting still apply and need to be considered as the proposal is further developed. (Refer to previous Minutes of Meeting).*

4.5. Landscape

- *The panel commends the applicant for the approach to the open space design on the building rooftops.*
- *There is still a lack of clarity in terms of which areas of ground-level open space are public, semi-public or private. The use and nature of these open space typologies need to be clearly communicated on the plans.*
- *The relationship of desire lines and pathways created through the site (i.e. in terms of who can use which pathways and at what times of the day/night) needs to be clearly communicated on the plans.*
- *The relationship between the margins of the site and adjacent development in a landscape sense is important. Select appropriate plant species to moderate interfaces between public and adjacent private open spaces.*
- *Clarify relationship between Landscape Design and the proposed Deep Soil Zones on the plans.*
- *A successful and realistic landscape design is critical to overall success of this*

proposal. Species need to be chosen for their long-term performance in their specific locations on this site.

- *Despite the reference to an open lobby located between the two wings of building C, the lobby does not address Randwick Close, and is effectively a wall rather than a gateway into the site. Revise the proposal to achieve a more direct physical and visual link between the adjacent open space and frontage to Randwick Close. (Refer to recommendations made in previous DEP meeting).*

4.6. Amenity

- *The panel recommends more intense consideration of the amenity of the neighbourhood and broader community. As noted in the previous DEP meeting, provide a proposal to upgrade and embellish the walkway located between Randwick Close and the adjacent park, so that it is improved for community benefit.*

4.7. Safety

- *Given that this is an Aged Care Facility with neighbourhood access through the site, provide greater clarity on public access into and within the site. Demonstrate a more balanced approach to permeability and legibility to the site, considerate of neighbours and residents.*

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

- *NIL. The panel supports the mixed type of housing and notes that the allocation of aged care facilities and other uses on the site is clear.*

4.9. Aesthetics

- *The panel notes and supports the careful approach that has been taken, regarding the finishing to the exterior of the building. Overall, the aesthetics of the proposal have been well handled and well modelled.*
- *The articulation of buildings B and C has been well resolved and is supported.*
- *The southern side of the development interfaces with the adjacent low-density neighbourhood. Ensure that the materials selected and building details are sympathetic to the context.*

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 not supported in its current form and needs to return to the panel once the recommendations and comments above have been addressed.

**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 biophilic 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.