

Design Excellence Process Summary Report

600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern – Redfern Place

Panel Endorsement

By signing below, the Panel Chair (on behalf of the Design Review Panel) agrees the design is capable of achieving design excellence and endorses this report:



28/07/2024

.....

Paulo Macchia FRAIA (Panel Chair)

Date:



'Gura Bulga'

Liz Belanjee Cameron

'Gura Bulga' – translates to Warm Green Country. Representing New South Wales.



'Dagura Buumarri'

Liz Belanjee Cameron

'Dagura Buumarri' – translates to Cold Brown Country. Representing Victoria.



'Gadalung Djarri'

Liz Belanjee Cameron

'Gadalung Djarri' – translates to Hot Red Country. Representing Queensland.

Ethos Urban acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of Country throughout Australia and recognises their continuing connection to land, waters and culture.

We pay our respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

In supporting the Uluru Statement from the Heart, we walk with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a movement of the Australian people for a better future.

Contact:	Jacob Dwyer Principal, Planning	jdwyer@ethosurban.com 0429 089 504
-----------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

This document has been prepared by:

Jules Wittenoom Louw

26 June 2024

This document has been reviewed by:

Jacob Dwyer

26 June 2024

Version No.	Date of issue	Prepared by	Approved by
1.0 (DRAFT)	07/05/2024	JWL	JD
2.0 (DRAFT)	11/06/2024	JWL	JD
3.0 (FINAL)	26/06/2024	JWL	JD

Reproduction of this document or any part thereof is not permitted without written permission of Ethos Urban Pty Ltd. Ethos Urban operates under a Quality Management System. This report has been prepared and reviewed in accordance with that system. If the report is not signed, it is a preliminary draft.



Ethos Urban Pty Ltd | ABN 13 615 087 931 | Sydney NSW | Melbourne VIC | Brisbane QLD | ethosurban.com

Contents

Panel Endorsement	2
1.0 Introduction	6
2.0 Design Excellence Requirements	6
3.0 Design Excellence Process	7
3.1 Location and Extent of the Design Excellence Processes	7
3.2 Direct Appointment Process	9
3.3 Competitive Design Alternatives Process	9
3.4 Community Facility EOI Process	10
4.0 Design Review and Integrity Process	11
4.1 Members of the DRP	11
4.2 DRP Meetings	11
5.0 Design Review and Integrity Process Outcomes	13
5.1 Competition Design Integrity	13
5.2 Positive Design Outcomes from the DRP Process	15
5.3 Areas for Ongoing Refinement	15

Figures

Figure 1 Aerial photograph of the site	7
--	---

Tables

Table 1 Redevelopment site portions and processes	8
Table 2 Overview of DRP meetings	12
Table 3 Key reasons for selection from the design competition	13
Table 4 Design features from the Design Competition that required further resolution	14
Table 5 Outstanding comments from DRP #4	15

Appendices

Appendix	Author
A. Design Excellence Strategy	<i>Ethos Urban</i>
B. Building S2 Design Competition Report	<i>Ethos Urban</i>
C. Community Facility (S1) Expression of Interest Process Summary Report	<i>Ethos Urban</i>
D. Design Review Panel Terms of Reference	<i>Ethos Urban</i>
E. Design Review Panel Advice	<i>Ethos Urban</i>

1.0 Introduction

This Design Excellence Process Summary Report (Report) has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of the Design Review Panel (the DRP), for the proposed mixed use development at 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern (Redfern place). This Report has been prepared in accordance with the *Government Architect's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines* (the GANSW Guidelines), the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2020* and the documentation listed in the Table of Contents.

The purpose of this Report is to provide a summary of the Design Excellence Process, including the Design Review and Integrity Process that has occurred throughout the duration of the project.

2.0 Design Excellence Requirements

This Report responds to the *600-660 Elizabeth Street Redfern Design Guide* which supplements the provisions of the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP 2012) by providing more detailed provisions to guide development. Section 3.5 of the Design Guide requires development at the site be subject to competitive design processes that will ensure a variety of independent architectural practices are involved in the design of the buildings on the site. It notes that a competitive design process was not required for the community facility building on the site if it was subject to an alternate Design Excellence Strategy endorsed by the Government Architect NSW.

An alternate design excellence process has been agreed with the consent authority (being the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI)) which is in alignment with Section 3.5 of the Design Guide. A summary of the Design Excellence Process that has been adopted for the project as a whole is provided in **Section 3.0**.

It is also acknowledged that as the application contains an Estimated Development Cost (EDC) over \$100 million, there is a requirement for a competitive design process to be undertaken in accordance with clause 6.21D(1) of the Sydney LEP 2012.

3.0 Design Excellence Process

3.1 Location and Extent of the Design Excellence Processes

The site subject to this Report and of the proposed development is 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern is shown at **Figure 1**. It is legally described as Lot 1 in DP 1249145. The site covers an area of approximately 10,850m².



 The Site

 NOT TO SCALE

Figure 1 Aerial photograph of the site

Source: Nearmap and Ethos Urban

The site is bound by Phillip Street to the south, Elizabeth Street to the west, Kettle Street to the north and Walker Street to the east. Across Elizabeth Street to the east is Redfern Oval, a significant outdoor sporting facility.

The site currently comprises a Police Citizens Youth Club (PCYC) building that fronts Elizabeth Street and Phillip Street, with associated outdoor play and sports facilities in the south-eastern corner along Walker Street. The northern two-thirds of the site previously comprised 18 social housing dwellings which were demolished in 2013. The part of the site has remained vacant since then and is now grassland with numerous trees, fenced off to the public.

While development across the whole site will form a single application, each portion of the site has been allocated a tailored design process to holistically achieve design excellence for all buildings and spaces on the site. A Design Excellence Strategy was prepared for the site in accordance with the draft Government Architect's Design Excellence Competition Guidelines (GA Guidelines) and clause 1.2 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2020 (the Policy) (refer to **Appendix A**). The Strategy outlines the tailored design processes in detail. A summary of each is provided in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 *Redevelopment site portions and processes*

Portion/Location	Proposed Building	Design Excellence Process	Designer
1 (North-west)	Community Facility	<p>Invited Expression of Interest (EOI) Process</p> <p>Invited competitive EOI selection process comprising a written response and interview. The Design Guide indicates that no competitive process is required for the community facility (if it is subject to a separate application). Nonetheless, an invited EOI selection process was undertaken as described in the Design Excellence Strategy (provided at Appendix A) as well as within this Report, including the selection to be made by the project Selection Panel.</p>	Architecture AND
2 (North-east)	Affordable housing (previously Market and Key Worker Housing)	<p>Competitive Design Alternatives</p> <p>A single competitive design alternatives process was undertaken for Building S2 which at the time of the competition was identified to accommodate market housing and now comprises 100% affordable housing. The process was undertaken generally in accordance with the City of Sydney's Competitive Design Policy.</p>	Silvester Fuller
3 (South-east)	Social Housing	<p>Direct Appointment</p> <p>Direct appointment from the competitive EOI process and invited Request for Tender (RFT) led by LAHC for the purposes of selecting a Development Partner and consortium (Refer to Section 3.2).</p> <p>This process was selected to ensure that the buildings designed are fit-for-purpose and can be delivered and managed efficiently based on the operational needs of LAHC and Bridge Housing (the Development Partner).</p> <p>This building has also been subject to design review by the project DRP overseeing the design integrity for the whole Site and who were the Selection Panel for the Competitive Design Alternatives process.</p>	Hayball
4 (South-west)	Social Housing, Specialist Disability Housing (SDA NDIS) and commercial floor space	<p>Direct Appointment</p> <p>Direct appointment from the competitive EOI and RFT winning consortium.</p> <p>This building has also been subject to design review by the project DRP overseeing the design integrity for the whole Site and who were the Selection Panel for the Competitive Design Alternatives process.</p>	Hayball
Site-wide landscaping	All site landscaping, including public domain areas, pedestrian links, outdoor residential communal open spaces and rooftop areas (such as green roofs)	<p>Direct Appointment</p> <p>Direct appointment from the competitive EOI and RFT winning consortium.</p> <p>The landscape approach for the whole site has been subject to design review by the DRP.</p>	Aspect Studio

The design excellence processes for each portion of the site are described in more detail in the following sections.

3.2 Direct Appointment Process

This section of the Report provides a summary of the Homes NSW (previously LAHC) Development Partner process which led to selection of the Direct-Appointment architects.

3.2.1 Homes NSW Development Partner Process

Homes NSW held a two-staged Competitive Process to identify a development partner to deliver the redevelopment of the site, on behalf of Homes NSW. The process sought to select a development partner team that was capable of delivering a high-quality and fit for purpose design at the site that could achieve design excellence and ensure appropriate ongoing management of diverse housing. A brief summary of the process undertaken is provided below.

Expressions of Interest Process

The first part of the Homes NSW Development Partner process was an invitation for EOIs. The EOI process was conducted from October to December 2021 for a period of 6 weeks and required prospective EOI respondents to submit a project vision, and concept design that considered the draft planning controls and draft Design Guide available at the time, as well as the location, amenity and quality of social housing dwellings and the alignment with social housing requirements. The purpose of this process was to shortlist consortiums to participate in a more detailed RFT process.

Invited Request for Tender Process

The second stage of the procurement process comprised an invited RFT process, which was conducted from April to June 2022 for a period of nine weeks. This process required the shortlisted participants to prepare a more fully developed vision and concept design for the site, based on and in accordance with the final version of the Design Guide and gazetted planning controls adopted in February 2022. Respondents were required to submit a description of the project vision and design approach, an overall site plan, a concept plan, typical floor and basement plans, an area schedule, a description of key sustainability initiatives, a staging plan and information relating to the design requirements and technical specifications for social housing. Respondents were also required to outline their planning approvals process, delivery program/timing, precinct management and place making strategy and project delivery team members.

The winning consortium was led by community housing provider Bridge Housing. The winning consortium also included Hayball as Executive Architect and Aspect Studio as the Executive Landscape Architect.

3.2.2 Architect Direct Appointment

Hayball, as the Executive Architect for the winning consortium, were directly appointed as Executive Architect for the project and designer of buildings S3 and S4. As directly-appointed architects, Hayball's design work was subject to a design review process undertaken by the project's DRP to ensure the relevant design excellence matters at clause 6.21C(2) of the Sydney LEP 2012 could be achieved.

3.2.3 Landscape Architect Direct Appointment

As noted above, Aspect Studio were directly appointed as the Executive Landscape Architect as a result of the EOI and RFT. Aspect's role as Executive Landscape Architect involves the design of public domain, pedestrian links, outdoor communal open spaces and green roofs. The appointment of Aspect Studio has ensured consistency in the approach to the landscape design and access and circulation at the site, providing a coherent solution that helps tie together all buildings across the site. Public domain and landscape design have been undertaken considering the site-specific Design Guide and also the relevant matters relating to design excellence at clause 6.21C(2) of the Sydney LEP 2012. Aspect Studio's design work was subject to a design review process undertaken by the project's DRP.

3.3 Competitive Design Alternatives Process

The building within Portion 2 of the site (S2) has been subject to a competitive design alternatives process which is described below in further detail.

3.3.1 Competitive Design Alternatives Process

As set out in **Table 1**, in consultation with GANSW and the City of Sydney, the Proponent elected to undertake a competitive design alternatives process for Building S2. The Proponent invited three (3) competitors to participate in the process and supplied each of them with the Design Competition Brief provided at **Appendix B**.

Landscaping, including public domain areas, pedestrian links, outdoor residential communal open spaces and rooftop areas (such as green roofs) within Portion 2 of the site have been designed by the incumbent landscape architect, Aspect Studio.

3.3.2 Competition Outcome

The Selection Panel selected the Silvester Fuller scheme as the winning scheme. In consideration of all three schemes, Silvester Fuller presented a compelling scheme that had the potential to achieve design excellence. In comparison to the other schemes, the Selection Panel believed that the Silvester Fuller's scheme was the most robust in concept, and therefore more capable of further development and refinement.

Detail on the architectural firms invited to participate, the Selection Panel, and an overview of the competition timeline can be found in the Building S2 Design Competition Report at **Appendix C**.

3.4 Community Facility EOI Process

The building within Portion 1 of the site (S1) was subject to an EOI Process where the Proponent invited five (5) architecture firms to respond to a brief that was provided requested the firms to demonstrate a sound understanding of the project vision as well as a strong approach and methodology to designing a new community facility on the site. It was noted in the EOI Brief that the selected architect would be required to design an exemplar building, befitting of its location and reflective of the purpose and vision of the redevelopment of the site. The building was to celebrate Country, engage community and promote sustainability and design excellence.

An EOI Process Summary Report was prepared and is provided at **Appendix C**. The Report provides detail around the invited firms, the Selection Panel, and the Selection Process.

3.4.1 Outcome

Following deliberations, the Selection Panel scored Architecture AND as the highest in the non-price criteria. After price evaluation, and in light of the overall combined scores, Architecture AND were selected as the winning firm.

The Selection Panel noted the following in regard to the winning submission:

- The acknowledgement of Connecting with Country, the understanding of the site and the broader context, including the urban design setting, was outstanding.
- The inclusion of the specific team that would be working on the project was appreciated.
- The project-specific response and diagram was appreciated and was a sophisticated response.
- The submission proposed a commendable methodology and provided a variety of project experience.

A copy of the Expression of Interest Process Summary Report is provided at **Appendix C**.

4.0 Design Review and Integrity Process

Following the completion of the competitive processes, a DRP who also performed a design integrity role was formed to provide design advice prior to lodgement and through to completion. The DRP has been associated with the delivery of the site in its entirety. A copy of the DRP Terms of Reference is provided at **Appendix D**.

The DRP provided (and continues to provide) advice as to whether the integrity of the development's design (and design intent) had been maintained after the competitive processes had been completed. To ensure that design quality continued throughout the design development of the project, and as noted in the terms of reference for the DRP, the DRP is to perform the following roles:

1. Identify any key measures of the design that are required to be retained to achieve design excellence.
2. Review the development of these key measures prior to the SSD Application submission.
3. Review any proposed changes to the key measures after the SSD Application is obtained.
4. In the event of any S4.55 modification, review the submission against the key measures to ensure design excellence is maintained.

4.1 Members of the DRP

The DRP comprises a quorum of the members from the Selection Panel associated with the EOI process for Portion 1 and competitive design process for Portion 2. For the integrity process, continuity of panel members occurred on the DRP, and the panel is comprised of design practitioners in the disciplines of architecture, urban design and landscape architecture. It should be acknowledged that the non-practitioner nominated by Bridge Housing being Daniel Khong on the Selection Panel was replaced by practising architect, Liz Westgarth.

The DRP was established with five (5) members, as listed below:

- **Paulo Macchia FRAIA** (Chair) – Director Design Governance, GANSW.
- **Ingrid Mather FAILA** – Director, JMD Design.
- **Graham Jahn AM LFRAIA** – Director, City Planning Development and Transport, City of Sydney.
- **Emily Wombwell** – Director, SJB
- **Liz Westgarth** – Managing Director, Hassell

4.2 DRP Meetings

The design review and integrity process commenced on 21 November 2023 and has comprised a total of four (4) pre-lodgement DRP meetings. The DRP meetings were held in-person at Ethos Urban. Where in-person attendance was not able to be achieved, an alternate method was established via Microsoft Teams.

Each DRP session was held for three (3) hours which allowed for the resolution of administrative matters, presentations by the design team, discussions and formulation of advice by the panel (which included closed sessions) and the provision of verbal advice. The format of each DRP meeting aligned with the agenda which was issued prior to each DRP. Closed Panel sessions which occurred at the end of each of the sessions were observed by Ethos Urban in their capacity as the Panel Secretariat. Following each of the DRP meetings, advice was endorsed by the DRP Panel and issued to the Project Team (refer to **Appendix E**).

There have been four (4) DRP meetings prior to lodgement of the SSD Application, which are summarised in **Table 2**.

Table 2 Overview of DRP meetings

Date	Focus
Meeting No. 1	
21 November 2023	Overall design concept, public domain approach, key matters associated with Buildings S3 and S4.
Meeting No. 2	
30 January 2024	Overall design concept including the urban design and site layout, landscape and public domain. The session also incorporated the S1 Community Facility Building, S2 Affordable Housing Building, S3 Social Housing Building and S4 Mixed-Use building.
Meeting No. 3	
12 March 2024	Overall design development including the urban design and site layout, landscape as well as the detailed design of the S1 Community Facility Building, development of the S2 Affordable Housing Building, and built form/planning of the S3 Social Housing Building and S4 Mixed-Use Building.
Meeting No. 4	
16 April 2024	Detail design of the S4 Mixed-Use Building, S3 Social Housing Building and the S2 Affordable Housing Building, with a design update on the S1 Community Facility Building. The public domain and landscape design were also presented and discussed.

5.0 Design Review and Integrity Process Outcomes

5.1 Competition Design Integrity

5.1.1 Key Reasons for Selection

The Selection Panel identified key features of the Silvester Fuller scheme that contributed to its selection, which were fundamental to the achievement of design excellence. **Table 3** outlines these and provides comment on how the final design retains or is an improvement upon the design excellence qualities exhibited in the winning competition submission following the completion of the pre-lodgement design integrity process.

Table 3 Key reasons for selection from the design competition

Design Excellence Features	Retained/Improved
The scheme achieved the key vision of the project to deliver a flexible built form accommodating key worker housing and market housing that placed community and country at the forefront.	The Proposal continues to provide a built form that will accommodate housing. The project brief has changed so that Building S2 will be affordable housing, however the intent of the design has been retained. The response to Country has been further developed through consultation and incorporation of new elements into the design such as the breezeway popouts.
The inclusion of the 'Internal Street' was a compelling proposition, providing an open-to-air breezeway to encourage community interaction and a physical connector between Kettle Street and the southern portion of the competition site. The orientation of the breezeway towards the central courtyard space was commendable and capable of being an activating feature to the internal courtyard, albeit the Selection Panel noted that further consideration should be given to the location and orientation of living spaces within units accessed from this space.	The inclusion and orientation of the 'internal street' has been retained as part of the Proposal.
The significant amount of communal space consolidated on a single level, referred to as the 'Family Park', is innovative and expected to foster interaction between residents.	The 'Family Park' has been retained on Level 10 and will provide considerable amenity (internal and external) for the tenants of the building.
While the scheme did not provide private open space to many apartments, this was intelligently offset by the generosity of the Family Park.	
A high level of internal amenity was achieved, particularly in respect to cross ventilation and solar access. The option of a naturally ventilated building was highly supported by the Panel.	The building continues to result in a high quantum of apartments achieving cross ventilation (64% of apartments in the first nine storeys of the building) and solar access with 82% achieving a minimum of 2 hours between 9am and 3pm during mid-winter
The logical entry sequence from Kettle Street was well-considered with a clear sense of arrival for residents and visitors.	The entry sequence from Kettle Street has been retained and further developed as part of the Proposal.
The distinctive pitched roof design is integral to the design and will achieve a unique contribution to the Redfern skyline.	The proposal has retained and further developed the pitched roof design to be a motif through the building.
The design demonstrated a solid foundation in Connecting with Country principles, and the Panel were convinced that the developed design could be informed by further engagement.	The Proposal's commitment to Connecting with Country principles has been strengthened throughout the design development process and the

consultation that has occurred since initially presented, including Design Jams with the local Aboriginal community facilitated by Yerrabingin.

5.1.2 Areas for Refinement

In acknowledging the limited competition working time and complexities of the Brief, the Selection Panel identified a range of matters that, at the time of the Design Competition, required resolution during the design development phase of the project to ensure the design continue to respond to all aspects of the Brief, maintains the key design intent and principles, and ensures the scheme achieves design excellence. These matters were identified within the Competition Report provided at **Appendix B**. Commentary around when each of the matters were resolved throughout the DRP process, as well as the identification of any outstanding matters, is provided in **Table 4** below.

Table 4 Design features from the Design Competition that required further resolution

Item	Resolution
Refinement of the tower component and redistribution of floor space to ensure there is no overshadowing to Redfern Park and Oval or Walker Street as required under the Brief, while retaining the concept of a distinctive roof form. It was noted that the specific form and orientation of the roof may need to adjust as part of design development to remove overshadowing of public open spaces.	Resolved as part of the documentation presented at DRP #3. Compliance with the relevant overshadowing controls (to Redfern Park/Oval and surrounding residential dwellings) is achieved through reduction in height of the main S2 tower form.
Further effort to realise greater deep soil areas and increased canopy coverage, particularly along the Walker Street frontage where the oversized terraces could be reconsidered.	Resolved as part of the documentation presented at DRP #2. Compliance with the numerical guidance in the Design Guide has been achieved for both deep soil and canopy coverage.
The scale and program of the communal space on Level 10 is to be further reviewed to achieve a balance between a high level of amenity, sufficiently offsetting a lack of private open space, resilience of the facility and achieving the project requirements in respect of maximising the delivery of apartments.	Resolved as part of the documentation presented at DRP #3.
General floorplate and apartment planning refinement is required to ensure the objectives of the Brief are achieved, including achieving a diversity of layouts, provision of greater number of apartments with private open space, maximisation of views and general usability. The depth of apartments located on the ground level at Walker Street requires review, particularly with regard to the viability of the live-work apartments.	Resolved as part of the documentation presented at DRP #3. The live-work apartments have been retained, however their design has been refined to better interface with the external breezeway.
Further consideration of the use of colour and materials is required, noting there is an opportunity to consider the context of the whole precinct with the broader design team.	Site-wide consideration of colour and materials were explored as part of the documentation presented at DRP #4 and are to be further documented as part of the SSD Application lodgement package.
The basement ramp location should be tested and investigated to increase the ability for viable dwellings at ground floor with appropriate levels of privacy and an engaging frontage to the corner of Kettle and Walker Streets.	Resolved as part of the documentation presented at DRP #2.
Further investigation of the interplay between flood and public domain levels is required to maximise accessibility, while retaining the entry sequence and sense of arrival.	Resolved as part of the documentation presented at DRP #2.

Item	Resolution
Exploration of the opportunities for integration of public art should seek to understand how these features can contribute to the unique identity of the building as part of a precinct wide solution.	Remains outstanding. To be resolved throughout the SSD Application process.
Refinement is required to maximise the project objectives to the best ability of the design and constraints of the budget, while maintaining the core principles of the design.	Throughout the duration of the entire DRP process, the project has evolved to align with project objectives while maintaining the core principles of the design.
Investigation of meeting the minimum deep soil requirements of the Design Guide and opportunities for tree canopy cover.	A consolidated approach to deep soil and canopy coverage has been adopted for the broader site as a whole. The Proposal achieves 1,794m ² deep soil (1,650m ² required by the Design Guide) and 1,961m ² (18%) canopy cover (15% required by Design Guide).

5.2 Positive Design Outcomes from the DRP Process

The DRP played an integral and influential role in advising on critical design and operational components of the development. The matters that were particularly fundamental to the design as noted by the DRP are listed below:

- Alignment of the north-south, east-west through-site link to achieve visual permeability.
- Replacement of the south facing pocket park with a clear building frontage and lobby on Phillip Street.
- Relocation of the at-grade waste and servicing from Building S3 on Walker Street to the basement level accessible via Building S2 on Kettle Street, resulting in better ground level activation.
- Delineation of landscaping across the site to ensure the ground level landscaped areas that are private and public are perceived as such without the need for physical intervention (such as fencing).
- Prioritisation of deep soil provision across the site which has in turned reduced the extent of basement.
- Introduction of breezeways into the design of all buildings, adopting a tenure blind approach.
- The provision of high amenity rooftops that can be adapted to meet the needs of residents with flexibility for alternate programming.
- Resolution of the entry sequence for Building S1 (PCYC) including the alignment of the building entry and staircase.

5.3 Areas for Ongoing Refinement

In the last DRP prior to lodgement a series of general comments were made by the DRP on each component of the site which were to be addressed by the relevant architects. The comments and a response to each is provided in **Table 5**. It should be noted that the design development that has occurred since DRP #4 has not been presented to the DRP for comment.

Table 5 Outstanding comments from DRP #4

Component	Outstanding Panel Commentary	Response (since DRP #4)
Landscaping and Public Domain	The Panel highlighted the need for sun, shade and wind to be further explored to encourage biodiversity in this microclimate and reinforce the principles of Connecting with Country in the landscape design.	Sun and shade studies have informed the landscape strategy across the site, ensuring appropriate species have been selected for certain areas of the site.
	The Panel noted a potential misalignment between deep soil provision and the location of canopy trees. The landscape design should ensure appropriate soil volume is provided where canopy trees are proposed.	Aspect Studios have coordinated the location of canopy trees and deep soil to ensure adequate soil volume is provided across the site within the appropriate areas.
	The landscaping plans indicate a feature tree in the centre of the site which is expected to require a large volume of soil. The species of the tree should be clarified and adequate deep soil included in its location.	The feature tree identified within the centre of the site is a Waratah Tree (Alloxylon Flammeum) and will be provided with a sufficient volume of soil.

Component	Outstanding Panel Commentary	Response (since DRP #4)
	The Panel requested detail on the selection of species across the site.	A detailed landscaping strategy has been embedded within the design which has identified specific species for certain areas on the site.
	The Panel recommend an alternative to the retaining walls at the street frontages of S3 be explored, with an aim to not fragment the deep soil.	Deep soil has been maximised where possible. Direct access to the apartments along Phillip Street has been removed, which has in turn removed the need for retaining walls and stairs, allowing for more continuous deep soil. Along Walker Street, the extent of retaining walls has been minimised to allow for greater continuous deep soil.
	The rationale for the varying width of the north-south through-site link pathway was queried. Further explanation for this approach was requested as this impacts deep soil provision.	The curved pathway has been provided to contribute visual appeal to the site's public domain and to allow for canopy trees to have groundcover around their base. Permeable pavement is proposed within the curved areas of the north-south through-site link, contributing to the total provision of deep soil.
	The Panel supported the design team's further consideration of CPTED principles and requested the landscape interface with the buildings' breezeways and lower-level balconies be further developed to clarify territorial reinforcement, considering clearly signalling primary semiprivate community entry points while restrict sightlines into ground level apartments.	The design of the landscaping has been further refined with input from a CPTED assessor. The landscape design now has greater legibility and clarity. The landscaping strategy across the public domain has created a clear delineation between the more publicly accessible areas located within the through-site links on the site and what are intended to be semi private courtyards. The positioning of the courtyards discourage public use through narrow paths and acute angled entries. While landscaping will be provided along the interface areas of ground level apartments, the species have been selected to ensure they will thrive considering the site's flooding constraints.
Building S1	The Panel recommended careful selection of landscape species around the building, particularly along the eastern façade to provide height and minimise the scale of the built form as well as the view over the building roof.	Aspect Studios have carefully selected species around the perimeter of Building S1. Deep soil planting has been provided along the eastern façade of Building S1 to support mature planting which will minimise the scale of the built form and complement views out to the west from the apartments within Building S2.
Building S2	The Panel recommended privacy be further considered at the interface of apartments and the breezeway.	Privacy has been further considered in the detailed design development of the proposal. The pop outs within the breezeway have been positioned to minimise direct visual connections through to apartments and their geometry further optimised based on anticipated uses.
	The Panel recommended that appropriate detailing of the façade, particularly where concrete materiality is proposed, is retained where possible.	Further detailing of the building facades has been undertaken to avoid any vast areas of concrete facade. The EIS includes details on façade design and materiality.

Component	Outstanding Panel Commentary	Response (since DRP #4)
	The Panel questioned the design team's continuation of the pitched roof motif on the lower levels of the building, noting it confused the bold gesture on the skyline as portrayed in the competition scheme.	The pitched roof motif has been retained within the proposal and will provide for design continuity through the building.
Building S3	The simplicity of materials adopted was considered refined and elegant. The Panel recommended that the textural elements were retained, noting they contributed significantly to the façade.	The textural elements of the Building S3 material palette have been retained.
	The Panel recommended further consideration be given to the relationship between the central portion and the southern portion of the building and the transition of materiality between the building volumes.	Hayball have further developed the façade design of Building S3, providing a further 280mm setback on the central portion of the building as well as a 100mm gap between the concrete panelling of the southern portion and the metal balustrade on the central portion.
	The Panel recommended that façade detailing should be retained where possible so that the building does not read as an expanse of concrete or other materials.	Additional façade detailing has been incorporated within the Building S3, in particular on the northern elevation to avoid expansive use of concrete.
	The Panel questioned why the communal terrace area could not comprise the full rooftop space at that level. It was noted that the provision of a terrace space could be considered as "tenure blind" when compared to the other buildings in the development.	The communal space that has been allocated on the rooftop of Building S3 is considered sufficient when considering the ground level communal open space courtyards. Homes NSW have reviewed the extent of rooftop terrace from a need and ongoing maintenance perspective, and deem a larger extent is not necessary or viable. Tenants will also have access to the recreational facilities located within Redfern Park located adjacent to the site and within walking distance.
	The Panel recommended further consideration of the stepped rooftop areas that will be overlooked by apartments.	The rooftop areas of Building S3 have been refined through detailed design development. Only a few residents will be directly overlooking these areas and the residents generally have other outlooks.
Building S4	The approach to materials was generally supported and it was acknowledged that the adoption of natural materials has resulted in a built form that responds contextually to its surroundings. It was queried if the use of lighter, contrasting materials for the upper level was necessary to differentiate from the lower levels given the upper-level setback.	A darker material has been adopted for the upper level, similar to the lower levels of the building (setbacks retained).
	The Panel acknowledged the importance of the Elizabeth Street frontage. The Panel supported the recessing of the building's western façade. It was requested the design team further explore the design of the stepped landscape planters, particularly in consideration of seating opportunities near the bus shelter and potential for accumulation of litter.	Additional concrete areas have been provided for within the stepped planters to enable seating areas.
	The Panel noted the use of materials, and opportunities for seating, along the Elizabeth Street frontage should appropriately respond to the proximity to the bus shelter.	Robust materials have been selected along the Elizabeth Street frontage of Building S4. Additional seating directly adjacent to the bus shelter is not proposed nor considered necessary.

In addition to the above matters and in the last DRP prior to lodgement, the Panel provided detailed commentary for consideration during design development. The commentary can be found at **Appendix E**.