

Design Excellence Strategy

600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern



‘Gura Bulga’

Liz Belanjee Cameron

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

By using the green and blue colours to represent NSW, this painting unites the contrasting landscapes. The use of green symbolises tranquillity and health. The colour cyan, a greenish-blue, sparks feelings of calmness and reminds us of the importance of nature, while various shades of blue hues denote emotions of new beginnings and growth. The use of emerald green in this image speaks of place as a fluid moving topography of rhythmical connection, echoed by densely layered patterning and symbolic shapes which project the hypnotic vibrations of the earth, waterways and skies.

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

We acknowledge the Gadigal people, of the Eora Nation, the Traditional Custodians of the land where this document was prepared, and all peoples and nations from lands affected.

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

Contact	Brendan Hoskins	BHoskins@ethosurban.com
----------------	-----------------	-------------------------

This document has been prepared by:	This document has been reviewed by:
--	--

Jacob Dwyer	30/06/2023	Brendan Hoskins	30/06/2023
-------------	------------	-----------------	------------

Version No.	Date of issue	Prepared By	Approved by
1.1 (DRAFT)	27/03/2023	JD	BH
1.2 (DRAFT)	6/04/2023	JD	JD
1.3 (FINAL)	23/06/2023	JD	BH
1.4 (FINAL)	30/06/2023	JD	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.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview

This Design Excellence Strategy has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of Bridge Housing and NSW Land and Housing Corporation (LAHC) (the Proponent). LAHC owns and maintains social housing properties across NSW and is pursuing a mixed-use redevelopment at 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern. The redevelopment seeks to provide mixed-tenure housing, a community facility and commercial floor space at the site.

Clause 6.21C of the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (the Sydney LEP 2012) requires that the development must exhibit design excellence. Clause 6.21D also requires that development on land outside of Central Sydney which will have a height above ground level (existing) greater than 25 metres, or development having a capital investment value (CIV) of more than \$100 million must undertake a competitive design process.

Development at the site will be subject to a single development application with a capital investment value (CIV) of more than \$100 million, and will therefore be State Significant Development (SSD) in accordance with clause 26 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021*, for development undertaken on behalf of LAHC with a CIV of greater than \$100 million. This Design Excellence Strategy will be applicable for the future SSD Application for redevelopment of 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), this Design Excellence Strategy defines:

- The location and extent of the competitive design process.
- The type of competitive design process to be undertaken.
- The number of designers involved in the process.
- How architectural design variety is to be achieved across large sites.
- Whether the competitive design process is pursuing additional height or floor space.
- Options for distributing any additional floor space ratio or height which may be granted by the consent authority for demonstrating design excellence through a competitive design process.
- Target benchmarks for ecologically sustainable development.

This Design Excellence Strategy is sought to be endorsed by the Government Architect of NSW (GANSW). It is noted that input has been sought regarding the design excellence process outlined in this strategy from other key stakeholders, such as the City of Sydney Council.

Redevelopment of the site seeks to provide mixed-tenure housing to deliver much needed social, affordable, key worker and purpose-built disability accessible housing, alongside private market housing. As such, it is crucial that the project proceeds in a timely manner to ensure that these dedicated housing types can be delivered and occupied as soon as possible and in accordance with the project budget.

The Design Guide which applies to the site states that *the site will 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*. This Strategy seeks to fulfil the intention of the Design Guide by setting out the processes for achieving a high-quality design outcome at the site, delivered by different architectural practices but with a coherent and logical overarching vision for the project.

For this reason, a variety of design excellence processes are proposed to maximise the amount of diverse housing that can be delivered at the site while still achieving design excellence. The overall approach to design excellence for the proposed development comprises a holistic and site-wide approach with tailored processes for each portion of the site. The proposed design excellence processes are as follows:

1. A single-building competitive design alternatives process for the market and key worker housing building, with three (3) invited competitors, in accordance with the Policy and the Design Guide.
2. An invited Expression of Interest (EOI) process comprising five (5) invited respondents for the design of the community facility building.
3. Direct appointment of the Executive Architect (Hayball) to design the affordable housing buildings and as the Executive Architect co-ordinating the site-wide approach.
4. Direct appointment of the Executive Landscape Architect (Aspect Studio) from the competitive EOI and RFT winning consortium, to design all landscaped areas of the site.

Hayball have been directly appointed as the Executive Architect from the competitive EOI and Request for Tender (RFT) process which was undertaken by LAHC, resulting in a consortium led by Bridge Housing being selected to deliver the project. Hayball will oversee and guide the site-wide approach to ensure the delivery of the whole site with the winning architectural teams, with design integrity. The consortium also included landscape architect Aspect Studio, who will design and document all landscaped areas across the site.

An overarching Selection Panel will be appointed for the competitive design alternatives process in accordance with this strategy and the Competitive Design Policy. The same Selection Panel will also form a site-wide Design Review Panel during the competitive design process and a Design Integrity Panel for the overall development at the site. The overarching Selection Panel will ensure there is a coherent approach to achieving design excellence across the entire site through a variety of processes.

1.2 Background and Planning Context

LAHC has worked collaboratively with the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) and the City of Sydney (Council) over a number of years to develop a planning framework that will facilitate the redevelopment of the site to deliver an increased supply of diverse housing, including social housing.

A summary of the key background and planning context for the site is provided below.

1.2.1 Planning Proposal

LAHC successfully sought amendments to the Sydney LEP 2012 via a Planning Proposal to provide site-specific controls to facilitate the redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed-tenure redevelopment and deliver diverse housing. The Planning Proposal was gazetted in February 2022 and implemented the following changes to the planning controls at the site:

- Un-deferral of the site from the *South Sydney Local Environmental Plan 1998* and rezoning to R1 General Residential.
- Amend the mapped maximum Floor Space Ratio (FSR) to be 1.5:1.
- Amend the mapped maximum height of buildings to include a range of heights from RL51.7 to RL87.5.
- Apply Category B Land Use and Transport Integration.
- Apply Category F Public Transport Accessibility Level.
- Apply Class 5 Acid Sulfate Soils.
- Introduce new active street frontage controls to the Elizabeth Street boundary of the site.
- Amend clause 1.9 Application of SEPPs to ensure State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 Division 1 does not apply to the site.
- Insert a site-specific local clause (clause 6.59) that provides:
 - A bonus floor space ratio (FSR) of 0.57:1 if a minimum 3,500 sqm of floor space used for community facilities is provided in the development.
 - A bonus FSR of 0.15:1 if the development exceeds BASIX commitments for water and energy by not less than 5 points.
 - The bonus FSR is not achievable unless development includes at least 30% of the gross floor area used for the purposes of residential accommodation being used for the purposes of affordable housing.
 - Any development on the site must not overshadow Redfern Park and Oval between 9am and 3pm.
 - The consent authority must take into consideration the Design Guidelines endorsed by the NSW Planning Secretary.
 - The site is excluded from the requirement to prepare a development control plan where the consent authority considers the development to be consistent with the Design Guide.

A site-specific Design Guide accompanied the changes to the Sydney LEP 2012, which establishes more detailed guidance for the redevelopment of the site. The Design Guide was finalised and endorsed by the Planning Secretary in February 2022.

1.2.2 LAHC Development Partner Process

LAHC held a two-staged Competitive Process to identify a development partner to deliver the redevelopment of the site, on behalf of LAHC. 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 (EOI) Process

The first part of the LAHC 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 (RFT) 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. Bridge Housing will be responsible for delivering the redevelopment of the site and the ongoing ownership and management of the affordable housing component of the development. The winning consortium also included Hayball as Executive Architect and Aspect Studio as the Executive Landscape Architect. Hayball and Aspect Studio will continue involvement in the project in the capacity outlined in this Strategy.

Key aspects of the Bridge Housing winning proposal included:

- Providing a higher number of social and affordable housing than the minimum requirements to maximise community housing outcomes at the site.
- A mixed-tenure model to deliver a variety of housing outcomes including purpose built Specialist Disability Accommodation and key worker rental housing.
- Being a CHP-led project.
- Moving the Bridge head offices back to Redfern and on-site.
- New public and communal spaces beyond the minimum requirements.
- First Nation's opportunities in design, employment, engagement and as residents.

1.3 Objectives of Design Excellence Strategy

The objectives of this Strategy are to:

- Establish an overarching approach to design excellence for the whole site,
- Define the different types of competitive and non-competitive processes to achieve design excellence in each portion of the site.
- Establish a methodology for the Proponent to implement a competitive design process for a portion of the site which will enable the development of the subject site, in accordance with the Policy.
- Ensure that the design excellence processes work within the framework of this approved Design Excellence Strategy.
- Confirm the number of design practices to participate in the EOI and competitive process and how these will be selected.
- Establish the process for the composition of a Selection Panel.
- Set out the approach for establishing an Invitation for EOI and Competitive Design Process Brief that ensures:

- The Consent Authority's design excellence requirements are balanced with the Proponent's objectives.
- The achievement of design and architectural diversity.
- Procedural fairness.
- Ensure sustainability initiatives and ecologically sustainable development targets are defined and developed through the design excellence processes, detailed design development and construction phases through to completion of the project.
- Ensure that design excellence integrity is continued in the subsequent detailed development Proposal through construction phase to completion of the project.
- Achieve the intent of the Design Guide that the redevelopment of the site will be designed by a variety of independent architectural practices.

2.0 Design Excellence Strategy

2.1 Location and Extent of the Design Excellence Processes

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



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. This part of the site is has remained vacant since then and is now grassland with numerous trees, fenced off to the public.

The redevelopment site can be divided into four portions, shown below in **Figure 2**.



Figure 2 Aerial photograph indicatively showing each portion of the site

Source: Nearmap and Ethos Urban

The redevelopment of the site as a whole will form a single SSD Application since the cost of development will be over \$100 million. This also triggers the requirement for a competitive design process to be undertaken in accordance with clause 6.21D(1) of the Sydney LEP. While development across the whole site will form a single application, each portion of the site has been nominated a tailored design process to achieve design excellence for all buildings and spaces. The strategy for each portion of the site is described in **Table 1**.

Table 1 **Redevelopment Site Portions and Processes**

Portion/Location	Proposed Building	Design Excellence Process	Designer
1 (North-west)	Community Facility	Invited EOI Process Invited competitive EOI selection process comprising a written response and interview. The site-specific Design Guidelines indicate that no competitive process is required for the community facility (if it is subject to a separate application). Nonetheless, an invited EOI selection process will be undertaken as described in this Strategy, including the selection to be made by the project Selection Panel.	TBC subject to outcome of EOI
2 (North-east)	Market and Key Worker Housing	Competitive Design Alternatives A single competitive design alternatives process will be undertaken for the market housing building. The process will be undertaken in accordance with the City of Sydney's Competitive Design Policy.	TBC subject to outcome of competitive design alternatives process
3 (South-east)	Social Housing	Direct Appointment Direct appointment from the competitive EOI and RFT winning consortium. This is 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. These buildings will be subject to design review by the project Selection Panel, who will act as a Design Review Panel (or similar).	Hayball
4 (South-west)	Bridge Affordable, Specialist Disability Housing (SDA NDIS) and commercial floor space	Direct Appointment Direct appointment from the competitive EOI and RFT winning consortium.	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)	Direct Appointment Direct appointment from the competitive EOI and RFT winning consortium. The landscape approach for the whole site will be subject to design review by the Design Review Panel.	Aspect Studio

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

2.2 Single-Building Competitive Design Alternatives Process

The building within Portion 2 of the site will undergo a competitive design alternatives process. The process for this building is described in the following sections.

2.2.1 Type of Competitive Design Process

Competitive Design Alternatives Process – Description + Process

As set out in **Table 1**, In consultation with GANSW, the Proponent has elected to undertake a competitive design alternatives process for the building within Portion 2 of the site. The Proponent will invite three (3) competitors to participate in the process and supply each of them with the competitive design process brief. 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 will be designed by the incumbent landscape architect, Aspect Studio, who were part of the RFT winning consortium accordance with clause 2.1(5) of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy.

The competitive design alternatives process will broadly comprise a single stage competition with the following key components over a schedule of approximately 6-7 weeks as shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2 Competitive Design Alternatives Process Schedule

Week	Description/Milestone
Prior to commencement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GANSW endorsement of Design Excellence Strategy GANSW endorsement of Competitive Design Process Brief and assessment criteria Briefing for competitors with the Executive Architect Hayball, Executive Landscape Architect Aspect Studio, Hickory (builder) on their approach to buildability, prefabricated elements and systems and Yerrabingin (Connecting with Country).
Weeks 1-4 (4 weeks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An initial Competitor briefing Competitor working time (minimum 28 working days required) Mid-point check in with competition manager and technical advisors Final submissions by competitors to Competition Manager
Weeks 4-6 (2 weeks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake technical review of submissions. Provide summary of reviews to the Selection Panel prior to panel presentations.
2 Days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Day 1 - Executive Architect Hayball and landscape architect Aspect Studio to present the site-wide design strategy to the Design Review Panel for context and comment. Day 2 - Competitor presentations to the Selection Panel and Selection Panel deliberations to recommend a winning scheme.
Total: 6.5 weeks	
After completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation and endorsement of Competitive Design Alternatives Report (including the panels comments and recommendations for both the Hayball and Aspect Studio schemes).

2.2.2 Competitive Design Process Brief

The Competitive Design Process Brief will be prepared by the Proponent in accordance with the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy. The Proponent will seek endorsement from GANSW, as well as feedback from other stakeholders during the preparation of the Competitive Design Process Brief including the City of Sydney. In establishing the Competitive Design Process Brief, the Proponent will ensure that:

- All details regarding the conduct of the competitive design process are contained with the Competitive Design Process Brief.
- The selection criteria and associated weightings are clearly defined and agreed in the Competitive Design Process Brief.
- The objectives of the project and aspirations of the project are expressly stated in the Competitive Design Process Brief.
- The commercial terms, fees and/or prizes offered to competitors is clearly defined.
- The Competitive Design Process Brief and appended documents (including relevant design documentation prepared by Hayball and Aspect Studio, for broader site context) are reviewed and endorsed in writing by GANSW prior to its distribution to competitors, Panel and Technical advisors.

2.2.3 Selection of Competitors

In accordance with clause 4.1 from the Policy, the Proponent will invite three (3) competitors. The selection of the invited competitors will be determined by the Proponent, undertaken in consultation with the GANSW and Council. Competitors will be well-experienced registered architects with proven capabilities and design skills in residential housing projects.

The invited Competitors will be required to satisfy the following eligibility requirements:

- Each competitor must be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with the *NSW Architects Act 2003*.
- Each competitor will be a single firm.
- Competitors will be a range of medium size and boutique architectural firms.

2.2.4 Establishment of the Selection Panel

The Selection Panel will be endorsed by the GANSW, with members nominated by the consent authority, Council, and the Proponent. All Panel members should have sustainability, architectural, urban design or landscape architectural industry recognised expertise.

A detailed set of obligations will be provided in the Competitive Design Process Brief for Panel members, but in general, they are to:

- Represent the public interest.
- Be appropriate to the type of development and context of the site.
- Include persons who have expertise and experience in the design and construction professions and industry.
- Include a majority of registered architects with urban design and architectural expertise and experience.

The selection panel will comprise five (5) members as follows:

- 1 x GANSW nominee (chair).
- 1x GANSW nominee (appointed from the State Design Review Panel or similar).
- 1 x City of Sydney nominee.
- 2 x Bridge Housing nominees.

The chairperson of the Selection Panel will be nominated by GANSW and will have expertise in architectural design and be a recognised advocate of design excellence.

The Selection Panel will also form a site-wide Design Review Panel and a Design Integrity Panel for the overall development at the site. This overarching Panel will ensure there is a coherent approach to achieving design excellence across the whole site through a variety of processes.

Table 3 summarises the scope, roles and responsibilities of each panel.

Table 3 *Competitive Design Process Panel Responsibilities*

Competitive Design Process Panel Responsibilities		
Design Review Panel (5)	Whole of site	Site-wide design review, up to the point when all designers have been selected.
Selection Panel (5)	Portion 1	Selection of winner for the Community Facility EOI process.
	Portion 2	Selection of competitive design alternative process winning scheme.
Design Integrity Panel (quorum of 3)	Whole of site	Design integrity assessment of the developed scheme after all designers have been selected, up to completion of the development.

2.2.5 Technical advisors

Technical advisors will be engaged by the Proponent to provide technical information and input into the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief, provide guidance to the Competitors as instructed, provide advice to the Proponent and the Selection Panel during the Competitive Design Alternatives Process, provide technical assessment of the competitor submissions and present to the Selection Panel on their relevant disciplines.

Technical advisors may also be called upon to provide advice, post competition, in the design integrity phase. For the purposes of the competitive design alternatives process, Hayball and Aspect Studio will be considered technical advisors in relation to their role as Executive Architect and Executive Landscape Architect. Hickory (the builder) and Yerrabingin will also be appointed as a technical advisors. The confirmation of technical advisors will be included in the competitive process brief.

The Competitive Process Brief will detail the procedures for competitors to seek feedback from technical advisors, including Aspect Studio and Hayball.

2.2.6 Assessment and Decision

A minimum of three (3) submissions must be assessed and each of the design alternatives will be presented to the Selection Panel.

The Selection Panel will select a winning architect based on an assessment of their submission against the weighted assessment criteria presented in the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief. The winning architect will be appointed to design, document and deliver the market and key worker housing building in Portion 2 of the site.

Hayball, in their role as Executive Architect over the broader site redevelopment subject to the future SSD Application, will review any design development post-Competitive Design Process to ensure a coherent site-strategy is implemented. All landscaping across the site, including for the building in Portion 2 of the site, will be designed by the project landscape architect Aspect Studio.

The Selection Panel, will also have a role as Design Review Panel providing comment and design excellence recommendations for the overall site development proposal (described elsewhere in this Strategy). This includes the Hayball and Aspect Studio schemes.

2.2.7 Competition Design Alternatives Report

After competitive design alternatives have been prepared and considered by the selection panel, the consent authority will require that a Competitive Design Alternatives Report is prepared and endorsed. The report will be submitted with the relevant detailed development application. The report will also describe and document the Design Integrity Process undertaken for the broader site prior to lodgement of the SSDA.

2.2.8 Impartial Observers

A number of impartial observers will be invited to attend and observe the key milestones of the competitive process, including a review of Final Submissions and attendance at Competitor presentations. The impartial observers will also attend the design review of the wider scheme and landscaping undertaken by Hayball and Aspect Studio, respectively.

The impartial observers include:

- **Department of Planning and Environment:** GANSW and DPE Key Sites Assessments will each nominate an impartial observer/s.
- **City of Sydney:** Council will nominate an impartial observer/s.

2.3 Direct Appointment Process

The remaining two buildings in Portion 3-4 of the site will comprise a mix of housing tenures, including social housing, affordable housing, and purpose-built SDA NDIS Housing.

It is critical to the success of the project that these buildings are designed to be fit-for purpose and meet ongoing functional management requirements for social, affordable, key-worker and SDA housing tenants as well as generally high levels of residential amenity. These buildings must also exhibit design excellence.

As such, both buildings will be designed by the incumbent Executive Architect, Hayball. Hayball were part of the winning consortium selected as part of the competitive EOI and RFT stage of the project. The design of these two buildings will be required to consider the site-specific Design Guide and the matters relating to design excellence under clause 6.21C(2) of the Sydney LEP 2012.

It is essential that the designer of these buildings has a demonstrated knowledge of the application of social housing technical specifications and design requirements, LAHC's 'Good Design for Social Housing' and 'Dwelling Requirements', and the Liveable Housing Australia Design Guidelines.

Bridge Housing and Hayball have demonstrated this knowledge and experience to LAHC as part of the competitive development partner RFT process and were selected by LAHC in part due their confidence in the team's ability to deliver and manage social/affordable housing effectively in partnership with LAHC.

2.4 Community Facility EOI Process

Portion 1 of the site relates to the community facility building fronting Elizabeth Street. Under the Design Guide, a competitive process is not strictly required for this building. Notwithstanding, an invited EOI process is proposed to ensure design excellence is achieved for this portion of the site. The key parameters of the EOI process to be undertaken are described in the following sections.

2.4.1 Selection of EOI Respondents

Respondents will be invited to provide an EOI in accordance with the following:

Five (5) respondents will be invited to provide EOIs, all registered architects.

- The invitation criteria are to include the following:
 - Emerging firms.
 - Boutique firms.
 - Community / cultural design experience.
 - Sustainable design experience.
 - ESG principles.
- A short brief will be provided to invited respondents requesting a limited response including vision, capabilities, experience, approach and methodology.
- Opportunities for engagement with the PCYC will be provided.

2.4.2 Selection Panel

A Selection Panel will be formed to make a recommendation to Bridge Housing and PCYC, to then make a final decision. The EOI Selection Panel will be the same panel as nominated for the Single-Building Competitive Design Alternatives Process described in **Section 2.2.4**.

Process and Timeframe

The process will be undertaken in accordance with the following steps:

- Invited respondents provided a short brief.
- Individual briefings with PCYC.
- Two weeks to prepare a written response (short form – providing limited information as described above).
- Two weeks for Selection Panel to review, deliberate and make a recommendation to PCYC and Bridge Housing.
- PCYC and Bridge to make the final decision and appoint a winning architect.

The winning architect will be retained to design, document and deliver the community facility building within Portion 1 of the site, in association with Hayball, as Executive Architect over the broader site redevelopment subject to the future SSD Application.

2.5 Landscaping and Public Domain

All landscaped areas throughout the site, including public domain, pedestrian links, outdoor communal open spaces, green roofs etc. will be designed by the incumbent landscape architect, Aspect Studios, who were part of the winning consortium for the site-wide competitive EOI and RFT process. This will ensure consistency in the approach to the landscape design and access and circulation at the site, providing a coherent solution that will help tie together all buildings across the site. Public domain and landscape design will be required to consider the site-specific Design Guide and also the relevant matters relating to design excellence at clause 6.21C(2) of the Sydney LEP 2012.

The Design Review Panel will have the opportunity to review the proposed landscaping to ensure it contributes to achieving site-wide design excellence.

2.6 Proposed allocation of up to 10% additional floor space

The future SSD Application will seek up to an additional 10% floor space in accordance with clause 6.21D(3) of the Sydney LEP 2012. The 10% additional floor space will be allocated to the building in Portion 2 of the site. The remaining buildings across the site will not be allocated any of the additional floor space. The Proponent is not seeking additional height.

2.7 Ecologically Sustainable Development Targets

The Competitive Design Process Brief will require ecologically sustainable development (ESD) targets to be considered for the future development as set out in this Strategy. The key ESD targets will comply with the Design Guide and the site-specific provisions of the Sydney LEP 2012. These are as follows:

- All development:
 - 6-star Green Star communities rating.
 - 5-star Green Star Design and As-Built.
- Residential development:
 - BASIX Energy 40, but only where additional floor space under clause 6.59 in the Sydney LEP 2012 is utilised.
 - BASIX Water 40 with a target to exceed by 5 points.
- Commercial areas:
 - NABERS Energy rating of 5.5 stars.
 - NABERS Water rating of 4.5 stars.
- All development is to have a combination of green roofs, roof-top solar PV and communal open space on rooftops. Other areas should be designed with high albedo qualities to reflect heat, but also minimise reflectivity to streets and public spaces.
- The site is to be planned to minimise paved areas and maximise stormwater infiltration. All public access paving must be permeable except where accessibility requirements restrict it.
- All development is to be designed to maximise passive design approaches including provision of external sun access and shading to all apartments except where tree canopy provides shading over an extended summer period.
- All apartments should have access to external clothes drying facilities, either private or communal.
- All parts of the development must include piping for use of recycled water in irrigation, toilets and the like.
- Development must follow the guidance of the City of Sydney Guidelines for Waste Management in New Development
- Connection into the water storage located in Redfern Park should be considered in consultation with the City of Sydney.

ESD targets and sustainability initiatives will be carried through the competition phase, design development, construction, and through to completion of the project to deliver an exemplar of environmentally sustainable development.

2.8 Role and Scope of the Executive Architect and Landscape Architect

The Policy states that the designer of the winning scheme is to be appointed as the Design Architect to prepare the DA and the accompanying drawings, and that they may work in association with other architectural practices but is to retain a leadership role over design decisions.

In the case of this proposal, the winning architect for the single-building competitive design alternatives process and the community facility in Portion 1 will design and document each building respectively, with Hayball presiding as Executive Architect and Aspect Studio as Executive Landscape Architect for the broader site subject to the SSDA.

Hayball and Aspect Studio will review and provide feedback on the design development of the winning architects schemes. The architecture will be documented by the winning architects while Aspect Studio will document the landscape areas. The winning architects will collaborate with the Hayball, as Executive Architect, who will guide the whole development to the SSDA.

The scope of all design appointments is as follows:

- **Executive Architect – Hayball:**
 - Design and document the Portion 3 and Portion 4 buildings.
 - Design and document the common basement across the site.
 - Provide feedback and review as technical advisor to competitors in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for Portion 2.
 - Provide design review and feedback to the winning designers in relation to integration and consistency with the overall site design.
 - Coordinate the architectural documentation of the SSDA and Construction Certificate for the whole site with the winning architectural teams.
- **Executive Landscape Architect – Whole Site – Aspect Studio:**
 - Design and document all landscaped areas across the site, including public domain, pedestrian links, outdoor communal open space and green roofs.
 - Provide feedback and review as technical advisor to competitors in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for Portion 2.
 - Provide design review and feedback to the winning architects in relation to integration and consistency with the overall site.
- **Winning Architect – Portion 2 – Market and key worker building**
 - Design and document the Portion 2 building through to completion.
 - Production of architectural drawings as required by the Executive Architect for the SSDA and Construction Certificate.
 - Collaborate with the Executive Architect and Executive Landscape Architect and incorporate design review and feedback throughout progression of project to ensure integration and consistency with the overall site, including any required modifications of the design.
- **Selected Architect – Portion 1 – Community Facility building**
 - Design and document the Portion 1 building through to completion.
 - Production of architectural drawings as required by the Executive Architect for the SSDA and Construction Certificate.
 - Collaborate with the Executive Architect and Executive Landscape Architect and incorporate design review and feedback throughout progression of project integration and consistency with the overall site, including any required modifications to the design.

The winning architects will also collaborate with the Executive Architect on elements such as bathroom pods and kitchen units which are to be fabricated as a common set of types across the development, as well as any common construction details to be agreed with the builder. This process will be collaborative to ensure design continuity and excellence of the entire scheme, while ensuring efficiencies in the construction delivery process can be achieved which are relevant to a project of this type.

2.9 Design Review Panel

To ensure site-wide design excellence can be achieved, a Design Review Panel will be formed, comprising the full Selection Panel (5 members). The Design Review Panel will be responsible for undertaking design reviews and providing feedback on the broader site development ahead of selection of the winning designers.

The Design Review Panel will review and provide feedback in relation to the Hayball and Aspect Studio designs for the site (including Portion 3-4, the basement and site-wide landscaping/public domain) prior to commencement of the competitive design alternatives process.

2.10 Design Integrity Panel

Following the completion of the competitive processes, the Design Integrity Panel (DIP) will be formed to provide design advice through to completion. The DIP will be associated with the delivery of the site in its entirety.

The DIP will comprise a quorum of the members from the Design Review Panel/Selection Panel. Should a member of the Selection Panel not be available to participate in future DIP reviews, the original agency who nominated them shall propose a replacement. Any replacement panellists must be approved by the consent authority. The DIP will be composed of design practitioners in the disciplines of architecture, urban design and landscape architecture.

The DIP will provide advice as to whether the integrity of the development's design (and design intent) has been maintained after the competitive processes have been completed. To ensure that design quality continues throughout the design development of the project, the DIP will 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 SSDA submission.
3. Review any proposed changes to the key measures after the SSDA is obtained.
4. In the event of any S4.55 modification, review the submission against the key measures to ensure design excellence is maintained.

Recently, the policy and legislative context surrounding delivery of affordable housing to alleviate the current housing crisis has started to evolve. Specifically, recently the NSW State Government announced incentives for the delivery of affordable homes and the potential for additional funding from the Federal Government, both which may cause the design solution to evolve post-competitive process to address opportunities and new requirements to maximise the delivery of affordable housing. The DIP may consider changes to, or developments of, the scheme in response to such policy changes that seek to optimise the delivery of affordable homes in an effective way.



30 June, 2023

Brandan Hoskins
Director, Planning
Ethos Urban

Via email:
bhoskins@ethosurban.com

CC:
Lindsey Gray
Project Director
Bridge Housing
L.Gray@bridgehousing.org.au

PROJECT: 600-660 Elizabeth Street, Redfern

RE: GANSW endorsement of Design Excellence Strategy

Dear Brendan,

I am writing regarding the design competition process and site wide approach to design excellence outlined in the Design Excellence Strategy for the above project.

We note that comments from GANSW and Department of Planning and Environment have been considered in the development of the Design Excellence Strategy. GANSW supports endorsement of the following document:

- 2210823_Design Excellence Strategy_Updated_30 June_Endorsed.pdf

Please accept this letter as confirmation of GANSW endorsement of the Design Excellence Strategy and feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

Endorsement of this Strategy does not fetter the consent authority in the assessment of any subsequent development application.

We look forward to receiving the draft Design Competition Brief for GANSW review and comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rory Toomey', is written over a faint, light blue watermark of the signature.

Rory Toomey
Principal Design Advisor
GANSW

Government Architect
New South Wales
L24, 320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect
@planning.nsw.gov.au
T +61 (02)9860 1464

governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au

