

31 August 2022

218264

Mr David Gibson
Team Leader
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Locked Bag 5022,
Parramatta NSW 2124

Attn: Tom Stanton

Dear Mr Gibson,

**SSD 10389 MOD 2 – LIVERPOOL HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

On behalf of the applicant, Health Infrastructure, this submission has been prepared by Ethos Urban in response to the Department of Planning and Environments (the Department) Request for Additional Information dated 5 July 2022 regarding the above application.

On 17 August 2022 the project team met with representatives of Liverpool City Council to discuss the comments provided, with the outcome being that the proposed responses below were satisfactory and Council was supportive of the design intent and satisfied with the issues as discussed. The meeting minutes are attached.

A response to your queries is provided below.

Request	Comment
Department of Planning and Environment	
Provide additional information addressing the advice provided by Liverpool City Council.	See below comments.
Liverpool City Council	
1. The reduction in floor-to-floor heights for levels 3 to 5 resulting in an overall lower building height is supported.	Noted.
2. A comparison of the approved and proposed elevations seems to indicate a level of articulation has been lost. Whilst features have been introduced like the brick extrusion pattern, this detail lacks coherence and consistency. This is exemplified along the western elevation where the extruded bricks do not align with the vertical brick bands. This is similarly shown along the brick façade facing Goulburn Street. Furthermore, the internal brick façade for the Caroline Chisholm building and along the retail block do not include an extruded brick pattern. Council therefore recommends a more consistent approach towards detailing / façade articulation is adopted throughout the development.	The original SSD submission only included a protruding brick pattern to the western brick walls screening the Oncology Bunkers. Mod 2 incorporates additional areas of protruding brick pattern (not less) which contributes to additional articulation, depth and visual interest for the brick facades. The design has intentionally located these areas of additional articulation in the most public and visible areas of the redevelopment.
3. The extruded bricks may also be a concern with regards to maintenance and undesired staining of the façade when exposed to rain and dust.	The protruding bricks do not require any additional ongoing maintenance and will not create excessive staining when installed correctly. There are a number of examples of this type of brick application, including on the facade of the recently completely Maitland Hospital in Metford NSW.
4. The selected metal panels (i.e., to match the brick colour) are not anticipated to age at the same rate as the	The metal panels are proposed to be a 'corten' colour that compliments the colour of the brickwork but does not seek to be an exact match. The change to

Request	Comment
bricks and will begin to stand out within the overall building façade. It is recommended that the bricks are retained as a material where possible (especially along the entry portals on the east elevation) and a more robust / contrasting material is chosen for locations where a face brick façade is difficult to achieve.	metal panels on the east elevation entry portals is an appropriate selection that is consistent with the pop-outs on the north elevation and wellness centre balcony adjacent.
5. The approved design iteration for the western brick façade along Goulburn Street includes multiple cut outs / glass elements to break the monotony of the bricks (i.e., the Breezeway bricks). This has now been replaced by a solid brick wall with minor modulations. To improve this, additional elements / building up-lighting need to be incorporated to break the monotony of this long brick façade along Goulburn Street. Council would suggest exploring the possibility of incorporating lookouts / fixed glazing that would provide a view of the landscaped strip between the external brick façade and the Oncology Building.	The original SSD submission included breezeway bricks (ie openings in the brickwork) to provide some articulation in the wall but did not propose any glass elements. There is little visual benefit to be gained from this narrow strip of landscaping which is likely to be gravel or hard surface. Mod 2 proposes a solid wall with articulation provided through the use of a protruding brick pattern.
6. The Schedule of Finishes East View shows a laser cut aluminium panel has been selected for the lift lobby. Clarification is required as to whether the design of the laser cut aluminium panel would be identical to the panel along the main entry lobby.	The notation should be 8 (charcoal aluminium panel) and 9 (charcoal aluminium baguettes). An amended Drawing A-SSDA-MW-34 (Issue 11) is attached.
7. In light of the proposed design changes, it is recommended that a comprehensive lighting strategy be developed for the site, which should also include building lighting.	The changes are not materially different from that approved by the SSD and would not require a comprehensive lighting strategy in addition to the existing SSD Approval.
8. The proposed changes to the main entry façade and inclusion of an artwork on the metal screen are supported. The artwork will be developed through the LHD Arts Working Group and in consultation with Council and other stakeholders. It is recommended that the working group liaise with Council's Public Art Officer to frame the narrative for the artwork and preferably engage local artists / fabricators to create the artwork.	Noted. The project will continue to work with the existing project Arts Working Group. However procurement and engagement of artists is separate to the planning approval and should not form part of this planning application.
9. The timing requirements for the completion of the Caroline Chisolm courtyard is intended to be changed to 36 months. Council notes the impact of Covid on development however suggests a timeframe of 24 months may be more appropriate.	36 months reflects the NSW Health operational requirements due to the Covid emergency. Council's advice in this regard is not supported.
10. The modification application seeks to delete the building identification sign located on the western elevation and proposes a location for signage on the podiums. The south facing building sign location is supported, however, the main building sign (i.e., location 01) is located on a glazed façade which may present challenges. Council in its previous submission identified the need for institutional buildings to contribute to legibility within the built environment and assist with wayfinding in the CBD. This is achieved through signage that is legible, prominent and modern. To ensure this outcome is achieved, further studies / design development for signage should be undertaken at the earliest stages. Furthermore, a comprehensive signage and wayfinding strategy should be developed for the site. This may be inserted as an additional condition of consent.	This application seeks approval for the modification of approved signage and the imposition of a condition for comprehensive signage wayfinding strategy would not be appropriate. The modification is minor and is a result of detailed consultation with the Hospital and relevant user groups to consider the appropriate operational location for appropriate signage.
11. The architectural plans show the End of Trip facilities in the basement car park have expanded into the area previously marked for bike storage. In this regard, it is unclear if the bike storage area is still retained in this location and if so, whether the bike storage area has	The project incorporates bike parking in accordance with the number of bicycle spaces proposed in the original SSD submission. There is no reduction in bicycle spaces proposed by this modification. Notwithstanding, bike parking provision forms a condition of consent in the notice of determination.

Request	Comment
<p>reduced in size. Council in its previous submission stressed the importance of improving cycling infrastructure, as evidenced in the Liverpool Bike Plan 2019-2023 and the Public Domain Masterplan 2020. Any reduction in bicycle spaces would therefore not be supported by Council.</p>	

We trust that the responses will enable the Department to finalise their assessment. Should you have any questions, please contact me on the details below.

Yours sincerely,



Chris McGillick
Associate Director
+61 4 1104 7748
cmcgillick@ethosurban.com