



**URBIS**

# **DESIGN EXCELLENCE STRATEGY**

28-32 Bourke Road, Alexandria

Prepared for

**ALEXANDRIA PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT PTY LTD**

September 2022



**URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:**

Director	Andrew Harvey
Associate Director	Vijay Prabhu
Consultant	Georgia McKenzie
Project Code	P0037375
Report Number	Revised - 20220923

**Urbis acknowledges the important contribution that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people make in creating a strong and vibrant Australian society.**

**We acknowledge, in each of our offices, the Traditional Owners on whose land we stand.**

All information supplied to Urbis in order to conduct this research has been treated in the strictest confidence. It shall only be used in this context and shall not be made available to third parties without client authorisation. Confidential information has been stored securely and data provided by respondents, as well as their identity, has been treated in the strictest confidence and all assurance given to respondents have been and shall be fulfilled.

© Urbis Pty Ltd  
50 105 256 228

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without prior permission.

You must read the important disclaimer appearing within the body of this report.

**[urbis.com.au](http://urbis.com.au)**

URBIS  
DESIGN EXCELLENCE STRATEGY - 28-32 BOURKE ROAD,  
ALEXANDRIA, REVISED\_20220923

# CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1.	Design Excellence Strategy .....	3
1.2.	Concept State Significant Development Application .....	3
<b>2.</b>	<b>The Site .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1.	Site Location and Local Description .....	4
<b>3.</b>	<b>Type of Competitive Design Process .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Requirements for a Competitive Design Process .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Selection Panel .....</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1.	Allocation of up to 10% Additional Floor Space .....	7
	Target Benchmarks for Ecologically Sustainable Development .....	9
<b>6.</b>	<b>Design Integrity .....</b>	<b>10</b>
6.1.	Design Integrity Panel .....	10
	<b>Disclaimer .....</b>	<b>11</b>

## FIGURES

Figure 1 Aerial Location Map .....	4
Figure 2 Site Photograph .....	4

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. DESIGN EXCELLENCE STRATEGY

This Design Excellence Strategy (**Strategy**) is submitted to the Government Architect NSW (**GANSW**) in support of the Competitive Design Process for 'Alexandria Health Centre' 28-32 Bourke Road, Alexandria (the **site**) for redevelopment as a hospital and medical centre. The Strategy accompanies a Concept Development Application (SSD-38600121).

The development will support the intensification of B7 (Business Park) zoned land within the City of Sydney Council's (**Council**) Southern Enterprise Area and will provide a key piece of community infrastructure which will provide critical mental health services to the broader community.

This Strategy has been prepared on behalf of Alexandria Property Development Pty Ltd (the **Proponent**). This Strategy applies to the whole of the site. The parameters of the built form will be informed by the concept envelope addressed as part of the Concept state significant development application (SSD-38600121).

In accordance with Clause 1.2 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy December 2020 (adopted by Council on 14 December 2020) and section 3.3.2 of the SDCP 2012, this Design Excellence Strategy defines:

- a) *The location and extent of each competitive design process;*
- b) *The type of competitive design process to be undertaken:*
  - i. *an architectural design competition, open or invited; or*
  - ii. *the preparation of design alternatives on a competitive basis.*
- c) *The number of designers involved in the process;*
- d) *How fine grain and contextually varied architectural design variety is to be achieved across large sites;*
- e) *Whether the competitive design process is pursuing additional floor space or height;*
- f) *Options for distributing any additional floor space area or building height which may be granted by the consent authority for demonstrating design excellence through a competitive design process;*
- g) *The target benchmarks for ecologically sustainable development.*

The preparation of this Strategy has also been guided by the Government Architect's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines (Draft), as exhibited in May 2018.

The redevelopment of the site is guided by the aims and objectives of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012 and Sydney Development Control Plan (DCP) 2012, as well as the draft LEP and DCP amendments currently being progressed by Council as part of the Southern Enterprise Area Review.

## 1.2. CONCEPT STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Development consent is sought for a concept proposal for the 'Alexandria Health Centre' comprising medical centre uses and anchored by a mental health hospital (SSD-38600121).

## 2. THE SITE

### 2.1. SITE LOCATION AND LOCAL DESCRIPTION

The site is located at 28 Bourke Road, Alexandria and 30-32 Bourke Road, Alexandria within the Sydney local government area (LGA). The site is legally described as Lot 1-3 in Deposited Plan 324707. The location of the site is illustrated in **Figure 1**. A photograph of the current site condition is provided in **Figure 2**.

Figure 1 Aerial Location Map



Source: Urbis

Figure 2 Site Photograph



Source: Urbis

## 3. OBJECTIVES

### 3.1. KEY OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Design Excellence Strategy are to:

- (a) Establish a methodology for the Proponent to implement the “invited” Competitive Design Alternatives Process for the development of the site, prepared in accordance with the City of Sydney’s Competitive Design Policy 2013 and in consultation with the GANSW;
- (b) Enable the competitive process to operate within the framework of this Design Excellence Strategy;
- (c) Confirm the type and number of emerging and established architectural practices to participate in the invited competitive design process;
- (d) Set out the approach for establishing a Competitive Design Process Brief that ensures:
  - (i) The Consent Authority’s design excellence requirements are balanced with the Proponent’s objectives;
  - (ii) Achievement of design excellence and architectural diversity;
  - (iii) Procedural fairness for Competitors participating in the competitive processes.
- (e) Set out the requirements for the proposed competitive design process for the site;
- (f) Consider the approach for the assessment, decision making and dispute resolution within the competitive design process in accordance with the City of Sydney’s Policy 2013; and
- (g) Provide that design integrity is continued in the subsequent detailed development, through to the construction phase and to the completion of the project.

### 3.2. TYPE OF COMPETITIVE DESIGN PROCESS

In accordance with Section 1.2(2) of the City of Sydney *Competitive Design Policy December 2020* and Section 6.3.19.6 of the SDCP 2012, the Proponent will undertake the following design excellence strategy for the redevelopment of the site:

- Undertake an “invited” Competitive Design Alternatives Process for the site that will inform the future detailed State Significant Development Application (SSDA).
- Appoint a minimum four (4) competitors to participate.
- Each competitor in a competitive process must be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with the NSW Architects Act 2003 or, in the case of interstate or overseas competitors, eligible for registration with their equivalent association.
- The competitive design process will include emerging and established practices.
- Include a majority of competitors as local architectural firms.

## 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR A COMPETITIVE DESIGN PROCESS

In preparing the architectural Competitive Design Process Brief (Brief) for the competitive design process, the Proponent will:

- (a) Specify all details regarding the conduct of the competitive design process contained within the Brief.
- (b) Submit the Brief and appended documents for review and endorsement in writing by the GANSW prior to distribution to competitors; and
- (c) Prepare the Brief for the competitive design process in accordance with the draft Government Architect NSW Design Excellence Guidelines 2018 and the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy December 2020.

*Note: The Competitive Design Process Brief will be provided to the City of Sydney for review and comment, however final endorsement of the Brief will be by GANSW acting on behalf of the Consent Authority.*



## 5. SELECTION PANEL

In establishing a Selection Panel (Panel) for the competitive design alternatives process, the Proponent confirms the following:

- (a) The Panel is to comprise a total of three (3) members;
  - (i) One (1) member nominated by the Proponent;
  - (ii) One (1) member nominated by the GANSW (Selection Panel Chair to be a GANSW nominated member); and
  - (iii) One (1) member nominated by the City of Sydney Council.
- (b) The proponent and consent authority/local authority must provide written acknowledgment of the nominated jurors.
- (c) Panel members are to:
  - (i) Represent the public interest;
  - (ii) Be appropriate to the type of development proposed;
  - (iii) Have no pecuniary interest in the development proposal or involvement in approval processes;
  - (iv) Include a majority of registered architects;
  - (v) Include persons who have expertise and experience in the development, design and construction professions and related industries;
- (d) The Chairperson of the Panel will have expertise in architecture and be a recognised advocate of design excellence in NSW;
- (e) The consent authority and the local government will each nominate at least one impartial observer of the competitive design alternatives selection process to verify that the competitive process has been followed appropriately and fairly.
- (f) The design team is to prepare a Competitive Design Process Brief for endorsement by the GANSW. The Competitive Design Process Brief is to include requirements such as:
  - (i) Key built form and planning parameters
  - (ii) Design objectives
  - (iii) Key uses
  - (iv) Access and ground plane requirements
  - (v) Australian Health Facility guidelines and the required area requirements for the mental health facility
  - (vi) Compliance with the cost plan contained in the CIV letter
- (g) The Panel decision will be via a majority vote, should a majority vote not be achieved, the Panel Chair will make the casting vote. The decision of the Panel will not fetter the discretion of the Consent Authority in its determination of any subsequent state significant development applications associated with the development site that is the subject of the competitive process.

### 5.1. ALLOCATION OF UP TO 10% ADDITIONAL FLOOR SPACE

It is noted that pursuant to Clause 6.21D of the Sydney LEP 2012:

*(3) A building demonstrating design excellence—*

*(a) may have a building height that exceeds the maximum height shown for the land on the Height of Buildings Map by an amount, to be determined by the consent authority, of up to 10% of the amount shown on the map, or*

*(b) is eligible for an amount of additional floor space, to be determined by the consent authority, of up to 10% of—*

*(i) the amount permitted as a result of the floor space ratio shown for the land on the Floor Space Ratio Map, and*

*(ii) any accommodation floor space or community infrastructure floor space for which the building is eligible under Division 1 or 2.*

Through the competitive design alternatives process, the Proponent seeks up to 10% additional floor space for development on the site. Under clause 6.21D(3)(b) of the LEP, the distribution of which will be explored through the design competition and is to be consistent with the Concept DA consent and relevant provisions of the LEP and DCP.

Any additional floor space pursued under clause 6.21D3(b) of the LEP must not result in a breach of the maximum height control.

Nothing in this document is to be taken as an approval or endorsement of the potential additional floor space available under clause 6.21D(3)(b) of the LEP.

## **6. TARGET BENCHMARKS FOR ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The brief will require the design to demonstrate sustainability commitments through achieving 5-star Green Star Design & As Built rating applicable to the use of the building.

ESD targets and sustainability initiatives will be carried through the design competition, design development and construction stages to completion of the project to deliver the ESD targets.

## 7. DESIGN INTEGRITY

The architect of the winning scheme, as selected by the selection panel is to be appointed as the Lead Design Architect. The Lead Design Architect is to maintain a leadership role over design decisions until the completion of the project. Where the winning architect is a consortium, partnership or other joint authorship, each must retain representation and a leadership role in all processes following.

The role of the Lead Design Architect will include at a minimum the following:

- Prepare architectural documentation for a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for the winning design, including all required information to lodge with the SSDA;
- Prepare the design drawings for the construction certificates for the winning scheme;
- Prepare the design drawings for contract documentation;
- Maintain continuity during the construction phases to the completion of the project;
- Provide any documentation required by the consent authority verifying the design intent has been achieved at completion; and
- Attend all marketing meetings and meetings that pertain to design issues with the community, authorities and other stakeholders, as required.

The Lead Design Architect may work in association with other design practices but is to retain a leadership role over design decisions.

### 7.1. DESIGN INTEGRITY PANEL

A Design Integrity Panel (DIP) shall be established by the Proponent prior to the lodgement of any future Development Application(s). The DIP shall comprise the full Competition Selection Panel, or a sub-group of the Selection Panel, to be agreed with the Competition Selection Panel during the competition.

Prior to the establishment of the DIP, a Panel Recommendation shall be prepared and agreed in consultation with GANSW, outlining:

- The role of the DIP to review and advise on the detailed building design to ensure the achievement of design excellence consistent with the winning proposal selected by the Selection Panel;
- That the DIP will review and provide advice prior to the lodgement of any future DA and be retained during the assessment and post approval stages; and
- Governance arrangements including meeting frequency, dispute resolution and deliverables.

The detailed design shall be presented to the DIP both prior to the lodgement of any future Development Application(s) (DA) and if significant design modifications are proposed following lodgement or approval. The DIP must formally endorse the final scheme prior to the lodgement of the DA.

The DA submission must include the endorsed Competitive Design Process Brief, the Competitive Design Alternatives Report including Panel recommendations and evidence of the agreed design integrity process.

Meetings of the DIP may be called for at the following key stages:

- Prior to lodgement of any future DA
- Prior to lodgement of RtS documentation
- In the event of any significant design modification application
- Prior to the application for a Construction Certificate
- To review significant external elements (eg. facade material samples, prototypes etc)
- Prior to the issue of the Occupation Certificate

# DISCLAIMER

This report is dated September 2022 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Alexandria Property Development Pty Ltd (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Design Excellence Strategy (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

