

CAMPBELLTOWN CITY COUNCIL

Minutes Summary

Campbelltown Design Excellence Panel Meeting held at 9:30am on

Friday 21 April 2023

Panel Members	Matthew Taylor	Chair
	Tony Quinn	Member
	Aldo Raadik	Member

Council staff	Rana Haddad	

1. Acknowledgement of Land
An Acknowledgement of Land was presented by the Chairperson Matthew Taylor
2. Declaration of Interest
There were no conflicts of interest noted.
3. Agenda Items
4. Minutes from the meeting of the 11 August 2022 are highlighted in red

Item 4.3 – 22-32 Queen Street, Campbelltown

General Comments from the Panel	
1.	This is the third time that this proposal has come before the panel. The proponent needs to explain how they have responded to the previous DEP comments. This is the fourth time that the proposal had come before the panel. It is noted that the applicant provided information in relation modifications proposed from the last panel meeting.
2.	The site is an important gateway site to Campbelltown and will be a critical part of the townscape of Campbelltown and its ongoing development of the “city image” as an important and distinctive regional centre. The panel reiterates the principle of this site being a gateway site and the need of the proposal to address the contextual relationship for the future vision of Campbelltown as a vibrant and important centre.
3.	In light of the continuing issues that have not been resolved including overshadowing, streetscape, bulk and scale, the concept of the proposal requires further consideration. The panel notes that the fundamental issues of overshadowing, bulk and scale have not been resolved, despite the modifications made.
4.	It is the proposal by the panel that two design workshops be held so that a balanced and considered direction for the proposal reflect the townscape and amenity issues that have been brought up by the panel be proactively addressed. The panel is aware that the proposal by the panel for design workshops was not taken up by the applicant.

5.	The proposal that these design workshops will be facilitated by Council and held in at Council offices
6.	Delivery access off Queen Street remains problematic and the panel has suggested a modified arrangement of a sleeve to the delivery access and separation from the residential lobby location. The current street edge access is confronting and confusingly close to the boundary and is likely to create queues on Queen street. Provide commitment to quality of internal entry drive finishes (floor, walls ,ceilings and enclosed services) visible from Queen Street
7.	The shadow diagrams ...
8.	The shared footpath zone appears to be non compliant due to a lack of verge / separation to the street edge.
	The new elevations suggest very open balcony balustrades. If plant is located on balconies , sections of opaque materials should be used to screen these
9.	Clarify the podium / tower elevations to mitigate the intermediate podium design language. Reduce the heavy floating brickwork balconies on these upper podiums. Increase the diversity of elevation treatment for identifiable separate addresses
10	The southern elevation contains a Residential lobby flanked on both sides by loading docks and car ramps. Adjust planning to alleviate this island entry impression.
11	As per previous panel meetings reduce the North podium levels at Eat Street, to admit more consistent light onto the public realm. Increase Southern podium height proportionally if required.

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

<p>1. Architectural Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Functionalityb. Aestheticc. Materiald. Facades	<p>The presentation of two high podiums with 5 towers presents continuing issues for the site and its urban context. This is a gateway site for Campbelltown and will have importance as a key urban entity to the city. There is a degree of a self-referential outcome where references to Campbelltown and its setting have not been stated or referred to. The fundamental issues remain with the proposal despite the modifications made. The Panel notes that the applicant has addressed concerns of façade treatment to Queen Street and some attempt has been made to differentiate the architectural expression of the towers. It is the opinion of the panel that this treatment has not gone far enough in reflecting the site’s gateway location with the result that the proposal remains essentially inert and inward looking. While the proposal conforms in principle to the DCP, some further height differentiation of the tower forms would assist in creating a more memorable outcome for the site and its surroundings. Some further architectural expression and modulation to the roof lines would assist in the perception of the proposal as unique site that further acknowledges the gateway status of the location.</p>
<p>2. Urban Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Human scaleb. Integration with the surrounding environmentc. Overall aestheticd. Fit	<p>The architectural palette is quite dark and heavy. It is not clear to the panel why this is so and how this relates to the urban and regional context of Campbelltown. Note is made of the size of the project and the projected population with pedestrian links to surrounding areas, the relationship with Queen Street mall, railway stations (Campbelltown and Leumeah) and the satisfying of exemplar city and urban design principles for the project. The architectural palette has been lightened and modified; it still has not been demonstrated to the panel the expression of the proposal as part of the overall city fabric of Campbelltown. It is noted that the site looks to the main railway and this portion of Queen Street is somewhat “one sided” in relation to built form. This makes the relationship of the surrounding landscape and built environment to be acknowledged even more important for this gateway site. The proposed road to the southern edge of the proposal is treated essentially as a service road with no acknowledgement of the existing and proposed future character. The site is focused on the central street for the purposes of amenity and pedestrian focused environment. It is noted that the service road that formerly accessed from the central road has been relocated thus freeing up the central road. This is a positive outcome; however this has led to issues of service access from Queen Street that diminishes the urban response of the proposal to the site by creating a void to the leading edge of the northern building at its most critical point. The panel</p>

	acknowledges that there are servicing requirements and notes that more consideration needs to be made in relation to the impact on streetscape and urban delivery outcomes to the site and its surroundings. An outcome of this is the southern road that has a major service function but has resulted in the diminishing the streetscape and pedestrian amenity with minimal active edges and a lack of consideration of public domain (street trees, paving etc) that results in a poor outcome for this portion of the proposal. Differing podium heights on either side of the main internal street is not good urban design.
3. Landscaping	There are extensive landscape areas noted on the proposal that include on grade and podium areas. Many of these areas are subject to extensive overshadowing that diminishes the use and enjoyment of these areas. It noted that the extensive park to the rear of the development is subject to further design and agreement with Council. This park area represents an important public benefit because of the project. Further detailed landscape plans were noted by the panel and consideration of the central street provides a reasonable level of amenity to support the concept of an active streetscape. Further consideration of the needs of street trees by the creation of soil chambers into the carpark level under will increase the landscape volume potential of the proposed street trees. This will enhance the outcomes for the street through the reduction in raised planters thereby increasing the amenity of the public domain and encouraging a more accessible and diverse pedestrian flow resulting a better public amenity that is commiserate with accepted standards of urban design.
4. Heritage (if relevant)	The location of the proposal is mindful of the adjacent heritage property
5. Streetscape	The substantial podium form to both Queen Street and new roads proposed creates issues in relation to scale and overshadowing. The panel notes that there are street trees to the centre. While the podium has been modified, the issues of scale and overshadowing remain. Differing podium heights are problematic from an Urban Design perspective.
6. Solar Access	Note overshadowing above
7. Privacy	
8. Lighting/natural/artificial	
9. ventilation	The panel requests further detail on how the cross ventilation works as there are a number of “u” shaped cross ventilation diagrams. The panel notes the further development of cross ventilation to apartments.
10. wind	The panel is concerned in relation to how wind will affect the amenity of the central street in its east west configuration and the elevated podium landscape areas in relation to the apartment towers. The panel’s concerns remain.

11. Sustainable Design	Further details are requested in relation to sustainable outcomes, PVs, water reuse ??
12.	
13.	

Specific Actions Required – proposed design workshop to address specific and fundamental design issues	
1. Architectural Design	
2. Urban Design	
3. Landscaping	
4. Heritage (if relevant)	
5. Streetscape	
6. Solar Access	
7. Privacy	
8. Lighting/natural/artificial	
9. ventilation	
10. wind	
11. Sustainable Design	

Is the overall Design:

- ~~— Acceptable with no changes~~
- ~~— acceptable with changes~~
- not acceptable and needs to be redesigned

Is the overall Design:

- ~~— Acceptable with no changes~~
- ~~— acceptable with changes~~
- not acceptable and needs to be redesigned
-

If the application needs to be redesigned, provide dot points justification

- 1- Proposed design workshop
- 2- Fundamental issues remain as noted above.
- 3- The proposal fails to meet Design Excellence