

# Bridging Design Excellence Strategy

Mixed use development with in-fill  
affordable housing

57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood

Prepared for  
Coronation Property Co. Pty Ltd

November 2024



Mecone acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the land on where this project is undertaken and across the Mecone offices that this report is prepared, paying respect to the Elders past and present. We recognise the ongoing connection of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to land, waters, and culture.

## Project director




Ian Cady

Amanda Harvey

## Contributors

Gemma Bassett

Stephanie Wu

Revision	Revision date	Status	Authorised: Name & Signature
V1	26 July 2024	DRAFT for GANSW review	Ian Cady 
V2	19 August 2024	DRAFT 2 for GANSW review	Ian Cady 
V3	6 November 2024	DIP Addendum draft	Amanda Harvey 

\* This document is for discussion purposes only unless signed and dated by the persons identified. This document has been reviewed by the Project Director.

## Contact

### MECONE

Suite 1204b, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street  
Sydney, New South Wales 2000

info@mecone.com.au  
mecone.com.au

© Mecone

All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language in any form by any means without the written permission of Mecone. All Rights Reserved. All methods, processes, commercial proposals and other contents described in this document are the confidential intellectual property of Mecone and may not be used or disclosed to any party without the written permission of Mecone.



# Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose of the Bridging Design Excellence Strategy	1
1.2	The Site	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Planning Background</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021	4
2.2	State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021	4
2.3	Chatswood CBD Planning and Urban Design Strategy 2036	4
2.4	Willoughby LEP Amendment No 34	4
2.5	Early Scoping Meeting	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Design Competition Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Participating Design Teams	5
3.2	Competition Jury	6
3.3	Key Dates	6
3.3.1	<i>Merits Identified by the Jury</i>	6
3.3.2	<i>Matters identified by to be reconsidered and refined</i>	7
<b>4</b>	<b>The Proposed Development</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	SSD Proposal	9
<b>5</b>	<b>Design Integrity Process</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1	Retention of the winning design team	11
5.2	Design Integrity Panel	11
5.3	Design Integrity Pathway	13
5.4	SSDA lodgement and Competitive Design Process Exemption Request	13
<b>1</b>	<b>Design Integrity Panel Meetings</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1	Introduction	15
1.2	Fundamental elements of design excellence	15
1.3	DIP review session 1	16
1.4	DIP review session 2	21
1.5	DIP review session 3	22
1.6	DIP endorsement	22

## Table of Figures

Figure 1	Site Location	2
Figure 2	Site Context	3
Figure 3	Competition Winning Scheme	5
Figure 4	Building envelope comparison	10
Figure 5	Design Integrity Pathway	13
Figure 6	Revised through site link	17
Figure 7	Comparison of roof design in competition and SSDA schemes	21

## Table of Tables

Table 1	– Proposed Development	9
---------	------------------------	---



## Table of Appendices

**Appendix 1** Design Competition Report

**Appendix 2** Design Competition Brief

**Appendix 3** DIP Meeting Notes



# 1 Introduction

This Bridging Design Excellence Strategy (the **Strategy**) has been prepared by Mecone Group Pty Limited on behalf of Coronation Property Co. Pty Ltd to support a State Significant Development Application (**SSDA**) to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (**DPHI**), pursuant to Chapter 2, Part 2, Division 1 of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 (Housing SEPP)* at 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood (the **site**).

This Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the *Design Competition Guidelines* published by Government Architect NSW (**GANSW**) (2023). It develops the Design Excellence Strategy dated 31 May 2023 which was endorsed by Willoughby City Council as part of a Local Design Excellence Competition for the site which concluded on 21 September 2023 and provides bridging documentation between Council-led Design Excellence Processes and State-led Design Excellence processes.

This Strategy has been developed in consultation with GANSW, DPHI and Council. The Strategy was endorsed by GANSW on 22 August 2024.

## 1.1 Purpose of the Bridging Design Excellence Strategy

The purpose of this Strategy is to establish the process that transitions a recently completed Local Design Competition to a revised scheme which seeks to pursue in-fill affordable housing (**IAH**) as part of an SSDA. By satisfying the requirements of this Strategy, there will be no requirement to run a new Design Competition for the site, and a separate design competition exemption will be granted by GANSW.

Specifically, this Strategy confirms the following:

- The outcomes of the original design competition.
- The engagement of the competition-winning design team through to completion of the project.
- The planning framework and any relevant outcomes of early scoping meetings with DPHI.
- How the revised proposal seeks to maintain the design intent and design quality of the competition winning scheme.
- Provision of a high-level comparison of the proposed development against the competition winning scheme.
- Details of how design integrity will be maintained throughout the SSDA process including reconvening the original competition jury as the 'Design Integrity Panel' (**DIP**) to review and comment on the revised proposal at key stages.
- Requirement to obtain DIP confirmation the SSD proposal has maintained the potential to exhibit 'design excellence' in accordance with Clause 6.23 of the *Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012 (WLEP 2012)*.

**Note – Nothing in this Strategy endorses a departure from the relevant planning controls, including any relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) and WLEP 2012. Where there is any inconsistency between this Strategy and the relevant planning controls, the relevant planning controls prevail. Endorsement of this Strategy does not fetter the consent authority in the assessment of any future development application for the subject site.**



## 1.2 The Site

The site is located at 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood, within the Willoughby LGA. The site has a total area of 2,644.7m<sup>2</sup> and consists of two lots which are legally identified as SP81015 and SP101358.

The site has a frontage to Albert Avenue to the north, Archer Street to the west, and Bertram Street to the east. Existing development on the site consists of a multi dwelling housing development comprising two two-storey buildings and basement carpark in the west, a single storey heritage listed (local) building currently being used as a boarding house and a two-storey dual occupancy.

Surrounding development is a diverse mix of land uses. To the north and west of the site is Chatswood CBD, which largely comprises commercial and retail land uses, shop top housing, and medium-high density residential development. To the east of the site are less intensive land uses, predominantly consisting of low-medium density residential development as part of the South Chatswood Heritage Conservation Area. To the south comprises existing low to medium residential development. Noting however future development to the south is envisaged to be medium to high density under the current LEP which prescribes a height limit of 11m to 90m and a floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.7 to 5:1 for the block.


The site is located within 250m of Chatswood Westfield and Chatswood Chase shopping centres, and approximately 600m walking distance from the Chatswood Transport Interchange, which provides rail, metro and bus connections. In 2024, the Sydney Metro City & Southwest line will open and connect Chatswood Station to Crows Nest, North Sydney, Barangaroo and Martin Place.

The location of the site and the broader local context is shown in **Figure 1** and **Figure 2**.



**Figure 1 Site Location**

Source: Mecone



### Legend

- Site outline
- Chatswood CBD boundary
- Railway line
- Train station



0 100 200 300 m



**Figure 2 Site Context**

Source: Mecone



## 2 Planning Background

### 2.1 State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021

The in-fill affordable housing provisions in Chapter 2 Part 2 Division 1 of the Housing SEPP aims to facilitate the delivery of new in-fill affordable housing to meet the needs of very low-, low- and moderate-income households.

The in-fill affordable housing provisions apply to the proposal in accordance with section 15C of the Housing SEPP because:

- The proposal involves shop top housing as a type of residential development as defined in section 15B and is permitted with consent within the MU1 Mixed Use zone under the LEP;
- The proposal will provide a state affordable housing component of at least 10%; and
- The proposal is located within an accessible area (within 800m of a railway and Metro station) as defined in Schedule 10.

### 2.2 State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021

Under the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021 (Planning Systems SEPP)*, if the residential component of the development has an Estimated Development Cost (**EDC**) of more than \$75 million, a State Significant Development Application (**SSDA**) is required to be lodged with the DPHI. The subject development has a CIV of more than \$75 million for the residential component and therefore a SSDA is being prepared.

### 2.3 Chatswood CBD Planning and Urban Design Strategy 2036

The Chatswood CBD Planning and Urban Design Strategy 2036 guides future private and public development as the Chatswood CBD grows over the next 20 years. It aims to provide capacity for future growth and employment, achieve exceptional design and a distinctive, resilient and vibrant CBD.

The Strategy informed changes to the Willoughby LEP (Amendment No. 34) and Willoughby Development Control Plan that directly affect the subject site.

### 2.4 Willoughby LEP Amendment No 34

On 30 June 2023, changes to Willoughby LEP (Amendment No 34) were gazetted. This amendment altered a number of planning controls and other provisions across the Chatswood CBD, giving effect to the recommendations of the Chatswood CBD strategy. The site was subject to these changes, resulting in significant uplift of planning controls. A summary of these controls is provided in **Section 4.2**.

### 2.5 Early Scoping Meeting

An early scoping meeting was held with DPHI and GANSW on 4 March 2024 to seek preliminary feedback on the proposal.

No formal minutes were issued from the early scoping meeting. Matters discussed include GFA calculations, building height, overshadowing, carparking and affordable housing components.

## 3 Design Competition Summary

A Design Competition was undertaken for the site between 10 July 2023 and 21 September 2023. The Design Competition was undertaken in accordance with Clause 6.23(6)(b) of the LEP.

A Design Excellence Strategy and an Architectural Design Competition Brief were prepared in consultation with Willoughby City Council and in accordance with Council's *Guidelines for Design Excellence Review and Competitions* (2019) as in effect at the time. The Competition Brief was endorsed by Council on 7 July 2023.

### 3.1 Participating Design Teams

The Design Competition was undertaken as an invited process where the proponent sought three design teams to respond to a Competitive Design Process. The three selected design teams were:

1. Fender Katsalidis
2. PBD Architects
3. Woods Bagot (Winning scheme)



**Figure 3 Competition Winning Scheme**

Source: Woods Bagot



## 3.2 Competition Jury

The Competition Jury (the Jury) incorporated one (1) representative nominated by GANSW, two (2) representatives nominated by Council, and two (2) representatives nominated by the Proponent.

The Jury comprised the following members:

- **Matthew Bennett (Chair)**  
Director – Bennett and Trimble
- **Laura Harding (Council nominated)**  
Senior Designer – Hill Thalys
- **Conard Johnston (Council nominated)**  
Director – Studio Johnston
- **Kim Crestani (Proponent nominated)**  
Director – Order Architects
- **Robert Nation (Proponent nominated)**  
Principal – Nation Architects

## 3.3 Key Dates

The key dates and processes are:

- Commencement date: 10 July 2023
- Final presentation date: 5 September 2023
- Jury Endorsement of Competition Report: 21 September 2023

**Appendix 1** provides the Architectural Design Competition Report which was prepared at the conclusion of the competition. The report outlines the Design Competition process, architectural submissions, and the competition jury's deliberations, decision, and recommendations. The Jury unanimously considered that the Woods Bagot scheme provided the best response to the Design Competition Brief and concluded it was capable of achieving design excellence.

Jury recommendations relating to design features to be retained and items for design development have been extracted from Section 4 of the Architectural Design Competition Report and provided below.

### 3.3.1 Merits Identified by the Jury

The Jury identified the following elements to be retained:

- *The shifting and variation of these horizontal bands to support larger residential and commercial floor plates at the base and to accommodate a landscaped communal roof terrace is essential to the concept. These shifts distinguish the tower within the emerging skyline of Chatswood and assist in mediating its scale within the surrounding streetscape.*
- *The clarity and material quality of the continuous concrete horizontal bands and the wrapping of this material to the balcony and terrace soffits to provide visual continuity when viewed from below*
- *The juxtaposition of these concrete bands with striated ceramic cladding with a colour, texture and a lustrous glazed finish that are integral to the material production process.*



- *The ratio of solid to glazed facade across the building to support the architectural concept and improve residential amenity and environmental performance.*
- *The extent of cantilevered terraces and balconies that bring formal variation and animating shadows to the facade composition and tower silhouette.*
- *The Jury supports the configuration of the communal open space as a roof terrace with a series of enclosed, semi-enclosed and outdoor spaces.*

### 3.3.2 Matters identified by to be reconsidered and refined

The Jury identified the following matters to be reconsidered and refined:

- *The Jury expects the quality and amenity of the apartments to be maintained and refined as the project develops.*
- *The Jury did not think the option for extended balconies to the sub-penthouse level was necessary to achieve Design Excellence. And would pose additional planning risk.*
- *The Jury is cognisant that the ceramic cladding may be considered costly however any substitution with another material would trigger a review by the Willoughby Council Design Excellence Design Integrity Process prior to the submission of the Development Application.*
- *The design team is encouraged to test and carefully calibrate the proposed balustrade heights (if required) to support improved views without significantly impacting the overall facade strategy and proposed solid to glazed façade ratios.*
- *The design team is encouraged to consider how the environmental responsiveness and performance of the building can be improved by an informed response to each solar aspect that supports the overall architectural facade strategy in a holistic and integrated manner. For example, can discrete sun horizontal or vertical shading elements be incorporated into the window reveals on the western and northern facades without increasing the depth of the facades to augment the use of double-glazing?*
- *Significant work will be required during the next phase to develop an open space strategy with a level of consideration, quality and amenity equivalent to the architectural proposal.*
- *The Jury encourages the design team to:*
  - *design the landscaped areas around the building as clear legible extensions of the public domain to be welcoming for both residents and visitors*
  - *increase tree canopy coverage across the site to meet or exceed the required targets (the rendered views appeared to include more trees than the plans presented)*
  - *extend the Connecting with Country strategy through detailed landscape design, species selection, naming and artwork strategies*
  - *configure the basement to protect the existing trees including the significant Fig Tree on Albert Avenue with input from an Arborist*
  - *consider how green infrastructure might be included for the management of stormwater, both for the purposes of retention and re-use on site, and for minimising downstream pollution of waterways.*



- *Ensure that planting areas are well provisioned with soil and water to allow planting to thrive and understand the impacts of wind on planting and the viability of the larger trees illustrated within the proposal (including upper levels) and determine whether additional screening will be required for wind control.*
- *Identify plant species best suited to each elevation and microclimate.*
- *The design team is encouraged to continue their investigations with specialist consultant input including planning, traffic, safety, structural, waste and acoustic advice to refine these options for further consideration.*
- *The Jury encourages the design team to obtain input from a specialist wind consultant to address and mitigate any adverse impacts on the amenity and use of these facilities. Consideration could be given to decanting some of the communal space to podium level, however the Jury strongly supports some communal space on the rooftop given the potential for excellent views for residents and guest and the silhouette off of the roof plane.*
- *The Jury supports the location and character of the Archer Street residential address but questioned the size and configuration of the ground floor residential lobby including the lack of BOH areas such as a mail/parcel delivery room. Members of the Jury also questioned whether the lobby should extend through the building as a link. The design team is encouraged to consider this as part of the wider consideration of the ground floor and basement access/servicing.*
- *Obtain specialist consultant advice to confirm lift requirements.*
- *Ensure there is sufficient rubbish chute provision on each level including recycling with a preference for a dedicated recycling chute rather than a diverter mechanism.*
- *The location of the commercial lobby could be reconsidered as part of the wider ground floor design review.*

The Design Competition Brief (**Appendix 2**) guided design teams to fully comply with LEP and DCP controls. However, it did not contemplate bonus floorspace or height that may be awarded to shop-top housing under the provisions of Chapter 2 Part 2 Division 1 of the Housing SEPP, as these provisions came into effect for the site on 30 June 2024.



# 4 The Proposed Development

## 4.1 SSD Proposal

The proposal relates to a shop top housing development which seeks 30% FSR and building height uplifts and to provide a 15% affordable housing component under the Housing SEPP.

The proposal involves the construction of a 32-storey mixed use shop top housing development and includes:

- A three-storey podium comprising non-residential uses between ground level and Level 2;
- A 29-storey residential tower comprising 151 units;
- Adaptive reuse of the heritage item as a restaurant/café and creation of a pocket park;
- Five-level basement providing a total of 169 parking spaces;
- Communal facilities on Level 1 and 2 including a swimming pool and a gym/yoga space;
- Associated landscaping; and
- Services and infrastructure improvements as required.


**Table 1 – Proposed Development**

Parameter	Winning Scheme	Envisaged SSDA Scheme
<b>Land use</b>	Shop top housing and commercial premises	No change
<b>Gross Floor Area (GFA)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential: 10,977m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Non-residential: 2,247m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Total GFA: 13,224m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Commercial use in heritage building: 121m<sup>2</sup> (not counted as GFA pursuant to clause 4.4(2A)(b) of the LEP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential: 14,940m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Non-residential: 2,248m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Total GFA: 17,188m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Commercial use in heritage building: 121m<sup>2</sup> (not counted as GFA pursuant to clause 4.4(2A)(b) of the LEP)</li> </ul>
<b>Floor Space Ratio (FSR)</b>	5:1	6.5:1
<b>Building Height</b>	90m (26 storeys)	117m (32 storeys)
<b>Setbacks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archer Street:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ground to roof: 6m</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Albert Avenue:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ground to Level 5: 3m</li> <li>○ Level 6 to roof: 6m</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bertram Street:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ground: 18.5m (open space provided in the south eastern corner of the site)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	No change
<b>Total number of units</b>	114	151
<b>Unit number and mix</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1-bed: 15 (13%)</li> <li>• 2-bed: 60 (53%)</li> <li>• 3-bed: 36 (32%)</li> <li>• Sub-penthouse: 3 (3%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studio: 6 (4%)</li> <li>• 1-bed: 58 (38.4%)</li> <li>• 2-bed: 43 (28.5%)</li> <li>• 3-bed: 32 (21.2%)</li> <li>• 4-bed: 12 (7.9%)</li> </ul>

Parameter	Winning Scheme	Envisaged SSSA Scheme
<b>Affordable housing</b>	To be developed during DA stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing SEPP: 41 units (2,608m<sup>2</sup>) to be 15.2% of total GFA (2,578.6m<sup>2</sup>) to be provided on Levels 3-7</li> <li>LEP: LEP: 10% of residential component – to be delivered via negotiation and agreement with Willoughby City Council</li> </ul>
Car Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential: 109 spaces</li> <li>Residential Visitors: 27 spaces</li> <li>Commercial (Office/business premises): 12 spaces</li> <li>Restaurants (retail): 12 spaces</li> <li><b>Total: 160 spaces</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing: 17 spaces</li> <li>Market housing: 120 spaces</li> <li>Retail: 32 spaces</li> <li><b>Total: 169 spaces</b></li> </ul>
Communal open space	785m <sup>2</sup> (29% of site area)	655m <sup>2</sup> (25% of site area)
Deep soil area	Approx. 245m <sup>2</sup> (9% of site area)	298m <sup>2</sup> (11% of site area)
Landscaped area	922m <sup>2</sup>	1,779m <sup>2</sup>

**Figure 4** below provides a comparison between the competition winning scheme and the proposed SSSA scheme.

**BUILDING ENVELOPE**  
Additional Affordable Housing



**Figure 4 Building envelope comparison**  
Source: Woods Bagot



## 5 Design Integrity Process

The Design Integrity Process is to be undertaken in accordance with Part 3.5 of the GANSW *Design Competition Guidelines 2023*. In the event of any inconsistency, the Design Competition Guidelines prevail.

### 5.1 Retention of the winning design team

This Strategy confirms that as the winning design team of the competition held in 2023, Woods Bagot has been appointed as the lead designer as selected by the Jury. Arcadia has been appointed by the Applicant as the landscape architect and forms part of the design team. The scope of design services provided by the lead designer should include:

- preparation of drawings for a development application
- preparation of drawings for a construction certificate
- preparation of drawings/material for contract documentation
- continuity of design leadership through construction to occupation certificate.
- Provide any documentation required by the Consent Authority verifying the design intent has been achieved at completion; and
- Attend all meetings that pertain to design issues with the community, authorities and other stakeholders, as required.

The SSDA shall maintain the design intent and design quality of the Jury selected Design Competition scheme and maintain the potential to exhibit 'design excellence' in accordance with Clause 6.23 of the Willoughby LEP.

### 5.2 Design Integrity Panel

In accordance with the Design Competition Guidelines, a quorum of the original competition jury will be appointed as the Design Integrity Panel (**DIP**) to review the proposed design and advise on the delivery of design excellence.

The original jury members comprised:

- **Matthew Bennett (GANSW nominated / Jury Chair)**  
Director – Bennett and Trimble
- **Laura Harding (Council nominated)**  
Senior Designer – Hill Thalys
- **Conard Johnston (Council nominated)**  
Director – Studio Johnston
- **Kim Crestani (Proponent nominated)**  
Director – Order Architects
- **Robert Nation (Proponent nominated)**  
Principal – Nation Architects



The DIP is to review the revised proposal against the merits and elements identified for refinement in the Design Competition Report. Where the DIP is satisfied that the scheme maintains the potential to achieve design excellence, DIP will confirm the in writing no later than 7 days after a DIP review.

Where a scheme requires further design development to deliver Design Excellence, the DIP may require more than one review, and shall make recommendation on a process to ensure that Design Excellence may be achieved.


The following operational parameters will apply to the proposed Design Integrity Process:

- The DIP is reconvened by the Applicant with assistance from the competition manager.
- Invited observers to all DIP meetings must be – DPHI (Assessments Staff), Council and GANSW.
- Prior to the first meeting, the DIP is to review and sign a ‘terms of reference’.
- Presentation material should provide a clear ‘compare and contrast’ between the proposed scheme and the developed scheme presented at follow-up DIP meeting. Any additional height or floorspace should be clearly annotated on all drawings.
- Each meeting of the DIP will be documented in a design integrity report. The report will include a statement confirming that the design retains or improves upon the design excellence qualities exhibited in the competition winning submission and retains the potential to achieve design excellence.
- The DIP report will:
  - make specific reference to advice and recommendations from the competition report and earlier DIP sessions.
  - specify if further DIP sessions are recommended.
  - be prepared by the competition manager and reviewed and endorsed by the DIP.
  - be submitted to the consent authority as part of the SSDA.



## 5.3 Design Integrity Pathway

The Design Integrity Process is summarised below:



**Figure 5 Design Integrity Pathway**  
Source: Mecone

## 5.4 SSDA lodgement and Competitive Design Process Exemption Request

Following DIP advice, certifying (in writing) that the proposal maintains the potential to achieve 'design excellence', the applicant may submit a formal exemption request to GANSW clearly explaining the relevant circumstances of the request. Following internal review and consultation with the Willoughby City Council, GANSW will advise the applicant in writing whether a new competitive design process is not required, and if not, how the design review panel will be conducted. GANSW will respond to the request in a timely and efficient manner.

The exemption request is to be made in accordance with Clause 6.23(8) of the LEP, which states:

*(8) Subclause (6)(b) does not apply if—*

- (a) the consent authority certifies in writing that a competitive design process is not required, and*
- (b) a design review panel reviews the development, and*
- (c) the consent authority takes into account the advice of the design review panel.*



# ADDENDUM – Design Integrity Report



# 1 Design Integrity Panel Meetings

This section describes the review sessions held with the DIP, the issues raised during the sessions, and how the proposal has addressed those issues.

## 1.1 Introduction

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the DIP includes a quorum of the original competition jury, including the Chair. Three jury members from the original competition jury were appointed as the DIP, including:

<b>Panel member</b>	<b>Role/Position</b>
Matthew Bennett (Chair)	Director – Bennett and Trimble
Conrad Johnston (Council nominee)	Director – Studio Johnston
Kim Crestani (Proponent nominee)	Director – Order Architects

Three review sessions were held with the DIP on 11 September 2024, 1 October 2024 and 15 October 2024 respectively. The first two sessions were attended by key members of Woods Bagot and Arcadia (the design team), Coronation (the Proponent) and Mecone (DIP Manager). Key stakeholders were also invited to attend the DIP sessions, including representatives from the DPHI, GANSW and Willoughby City Council). Mecone as the DIP manager were also attendance.

Supplementary materials prepared by Woods Bagot were emailed to the DIP for the second and third review session.

Following the three review sessions and the supplementary materials provided by the design team on 15 October 2024, the DIP confirmed support for the revised proposal as it closely aligns with the original competition scheme and has the potential to achieve design excellence. It is also confirmed that no further reviews are required by the DIP prior to lodgement of the proposal.

A copy of the meeting minutes for the three sessions are provided in **Appendix 3**.

## 1.2 Fundamental elements of design excellence

As outlined in **Section 3**, Woods Bagot were selected as the winning scheme to progress to the detailed Development Application. A series of matters were identified by the competition jury for retention and refinement in the Design Competition Report, which are required to be addressed as part of the design integrity process.

Since the design competition, the winning scheme has been further developed to capture the 30% FSR and building height uplifts under the Housing SEPP, while maintaining the design intent and design quality of the winning competition scheme.

As stated in the DIP meeting minutes, the focus of the DIP review sessions was on design and amenity impacts and merits of the 30% uplift proposal. The advice provided by the DIP does not fetter the discretion of the consent authority in assessing impacts of the development including but not confined to wind, overshadowing to public domain, shadow impacts on surrounding development, traffic, waste strategy and the capacity of utilities.



## 1.3 DIP review session 1

The first DIP review session was held online on 11 September 2024 and written DIP advice was subsequently received on 13 September. The DIP supported the following amendments to the scheme as they were consistent with the quality and strategies of the Design Excellence Competition proposal:


- *Increased tower height resulting in a slender tower form*
- *Revised apartment plans including the provision of affordable housing*
- *Inclusion of an additional lift to the central core*
- *Reconfigured ground floor lobby serving both market and affordable housing*
- *Refinement of the proposed balcony balustrades including the decrease in height of solid balustrades and the introduction of glazed panels as presented*
- *Improved passive shading to glazing with a solution that is integral to the overall architectural facade strategy*
- *Design resolution of the glazed ceramic, pigmented precast and brick facade elements*
- *Further details and resolution of the adaptive re-use strategy for the existing heritage building (subject to separate heritage advice)*
- *Design Resolution of the landscape proposal (subject to the following comments regarding the shared-way).*

The DIP identified further amendments requiring further consideration. The DIP comments and response provided by Mecone and the design team on 24 September are summarised below.

### ***New carpark entry and the shared-way***

- *The provision of a clear shared-way connection between Archer St and Bertram St along the south-eastern boundary of the site was a key strength of the Design Excellence Competition proposal and an important benefit in the consideration of a non-compliant servicing strategy.*
- *The introduction of a dedicated carpark entry from Bertram Street has significantly reduced the urban quality and amenity of the proposal including the legibility of the shared-way connection and wayfinding for pedestrians traversing the site.*
- *Furthermore, the current proposal risks converting this space to a service court for the building. The lack of deep soil provision, landscape and tree canopy compounds these concerns.*
- *The Panel recommends the design team:*
  - *reconsider the alignment, geometry (and width if possible) of the carpark entry to provide a visually clear, physically linear, and direct public connection between Archer Street and Bertram Street. This should be at least 2m in width to improve way-finding and CPTED outcomes for pedestrians using the shared-way.*
  - *explore opportunities to improve the amenity and character of the shared-way with:*
    - *the integration of landscape elements and lighting, and*
    - *the provision of deep soil to support increased planting and tree canopy coverage.*

**Response provided:** Woods Bagot and Arcadia have identified a number of design refinements to improve the visual and physical connectivity and landscape character of the through site link, as indicated in the following sketch.



**Figure 6 Revised through site link**  
 Source: Arcadia and Woods Bagot

The proposed car park entry ramp has been carefully positioned to:

- Minimise vehicle movements via the through site link.
- Separate service vehicles and cars.
- Allow for safe vehicular movements in and out of the basement carpark.
- Maintain sufficient headroom for cars at level B1 and B2.
- Maximise the deep soil provision for the pocket park.
- Provide for stormwater drainage from the site to the south.
- Provide level and equitable pedestrian access throughout the through site link.

Woods Bagot agree with the panel that a straight path of 2m width would benefit the through site link, but the maximum path width possible is only 1m and pedestrians would have to proceed over stormwater drains.

Therefore, the proposal is to:

1. Increase and extend landscaping into the through site link, working closely with the traffic consultant to ensure the on-grade space remaining will allow for the safe movement of service vehicles.



2. Provide additional deep soil along the Archer Street frontage.
3. Adjust the car park ramp as much as possible to widen the path above.
4. Increase the width of the link by adjusting the glazing line at the south-east corner of the ground floor commercial tenancy and hanging the planter box above the driveway.
5. Create an opportunity to shorten the path of travel via the park.
6. Minimise the height of the planter box to maximise visibility through the link.
7. Incorporate overhead lighting along the building face.

#### **Communal Open Space and Rooftop Terrace**

- *The relocation of the communal open space from the rooftop location to the podium has resulted in:*
  - *a significant loss of amenity for residents including a communal space with district views, solar amenity, a high level of architectural and landscape character, and a common space for all residents that is unambiguously communal.*
  - *a significant reduction in the architectural quality of the tower with the loss of the sculptural roof form massing to offset the repetition of the tower floor plates, and the provision of a distinctive architectural element within the skyline of Chatswood.*
- *To address both of these concerns, the Panel recommends the design team reinstate a majority of the communal open space to the rooftop, and reestablish a distinctive and sculptural rooftop massing for these facilities and spaces. The proposal should be refined to mitigate wind impacts.*

#### **Response provided:**

##### Communal Open Space to the Rooftop

Regarding the location of Communal Open Space (COS), the preamble to Part 3D of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) states that:

*“Communal open space (CoS) is an important environmental resource that provides outdoor recreation opportunities for residents, connection to the natural environment and valuable ‘breathing space’ between apartment buildings”.*

##### ADG Design Criteria

Minimum area equal to 25% of the site (see Figure 3D.3 below) with at least 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part for 2 hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.


##### Communal Open Space to the Rooftop

Regarding the location of Communal Open Space (COS), the preamble to Part 3D of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) states that:

*“Communal open space (CoS) is an important environmental resource that provides outdoor recreation opportunities for residents, connection to the natural environment and valuable ‘breathing space’ between apartment buildings”.*

##### ADG Design Criteria

Minimum area equal to **25% of the site** (see Figure 3D.3 below) with at least 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part for 2 hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.



## ADG Design Guidance

The ADG states that communal open space should be co-located with deep soil areas but can be provided on a podium or roof where this is not practicable. The location of CoS should:

- *respond to microclimate, including sun in winter, shade in summer and **shelter from strong winds**.*
- *be readily visible from habitable rooms and private open space areas.*

## Design Response

The proposed COS comprises 716 sqm (27% of site area), with:

- 234 sqm (9% of site area) as ground level deep soil that:
  - has access to northern and eastern sun,
  - is screened from strong southern and western winds,
  - is activated by retail/F&B uses on two sides,
  - is overlooked by commercial and residential above,
  - is capable of supporting large tree growth.
- 482 sqm (18% of site area) in two wide terraces to the first floor wellness facility, providing an alternative and more private space for residents – includes an all weather open space for residents forming an extension of the adjacent wellness centre and pool and surrounded by dense planting.

While a rooftop open space would enjoy high quality district views, at a height of almost 120 metres any such space would be highly exposed to wind and sun, with limited opportunity for reinstated planting



and is likely to experience uncomfortable high winds at time, making the space not as versatile or useable. It would also not be visible from the proposed apartments or balconies.

### Precedents in Chatswood

While some recently approved low to mid-rise buildings have rooftop COS (688 Pacific Highway and 58 Anderson Street) we have reviewed the designs for the following 90+ metre recent projects in the Chatswood CBD:

- 3 Ellis Street
- 5-9 Gordon Avenue
- 10-15 Gordon Avenue
- 9-11 Nelson Street
- 629 Pacific Highway
- 3-5 Help Street
- 38-42 Anderson
- 44-52 Anderson Street
- 54 Anderson Street

In all of these projects COS has been provided at ground and/or podium level, with no rooftop COS. For this reason, the proposed location of the COS for the subject proposal therefore is not out of character with other similar mixed use projects in Chatswood.

### **Sculptural Rooftop Massing**

In response to the request to reestablish ‘*a distinctive and sculptural rooftop massing for these facilities and spaces*’ the new proposed form at the top of the building is an elegant cap creating a distinctive outcome on the skyline – see **Figure 7** below comparing the previous and proposed roof designs.

More specifically this design response is appropriate on the basis that:

- The incorporation of three levels of penthouse apartments allows for the horizontal precast façade bands to dissolve towards the top of the building and for the terracotta façade to be prioritised, similar to the effect at the base of the building.
- With the topmost floor glazed all around, the topmost precast faced roof level appears to float above the rest of the building, lightening its appearance at the top.
- With a step at the centre of each face, this roof band is varied and creates a unique sculptural appearance which Woods Bagot believe is a high-quality design outcome for the precinct.
- The roof top no longer includes the COS, so has been designed for residential amenity of future residents at these levels but has still sought to incorporate high quality design outcomes.



**Figure 7 Comparison of roof design in competition and SSDA schemes**

Sources: Woods Bagot

## Conclusion

The attached sketch plan indicates numerous design refinements to improve the connectivity and landscape character of the through site link.

However, while the ADG allows rooftop COS, it encourages it to be at lower levels, which is the same for a number of other similar recently approved 90+ metre mixed use tower developments in Chatswood. We therefore submit that the proposed space fully satisfies the ADG, would provide superior amenity to the roof top location and is the strong preference of the proponent.

In terms of rooftop massing, the revised design of the top of the building provides a unique sculptural appearance which Woods Bagot believe is a high-quality design outcome for the precinct.

## 1.4 DIP review session 2

A second review session was held in person with the DIP on 1 October 2024 to review the updated materials provided by the design team. Further advice was received from the DIP on 2 October.

The DIP comments and response provided by Mecone and the design team on 11 October are summarised below.

### **Amendments Requiring Further Consideration**

- *The shared-way link and the roof terrace communal open space are two key strengths of the competition scheme, however the Panel understands need for schemes to be refined to respond to engineering constraints and market considerations.*
- *With any adjustment to the proposal, it will be critical to maintain an equivalent level of design quality and amenity for the revised scheme to have the potential to achieve Design Excellence.*

### **Communal Open Space and Rooftop Terrace**

- *The relocation of the communal open space from the rooftop location to the podium has resulted in:*
  - *a significant loss of amenity for residents including a communal space with district views, solar amenity, a high level of architectural and landscape character, and a common space for all residents that is unambiguously communal.*



- *a significant reduction in the architectural quality of the tower with the loss of the sculptural roof form massing to offset the repetition of the tower floor plates, and the provision of a distinctive architectural element within the skyline of Chatswood.*
- *To address both of these concerns, the Panel recommends the design team reinstate a majority of the communal open space to the rooftop, and reestablish a distinctive and sculptural rooftop massing for these facilities and spaces. The proposal should be refined to mitigate wind impacts.*

Additional drawings were provided by Woods Bagot and submitted to the DIP on 11 October 2024 to address the comments received from the DIP.

## 1.5 DIP review session 3

Further to the additional drawings submitted on 11 October, supplementary presentation materials prepared by Woods Bagot were emailed to DIP on 15 October for consideration (see **Appendix 4**).

Commentary was received from the DIP on 17 October, which confirmed the proposed amendments have satisfied outstanding concerns regarding:

- *the resolution and legibility of the shared-way link between Archer Avenue and Bertram Street*
- *the location and configuration of the communal open space on level 1 of the podium*
- *the architectural massing and expression of the penthouse level of the building.*

The DIP confirmed their support on the revised proposal “*as the design closely aligns with the original competition scheme and has the potential to achieve design excellence*”.


The DIP also confirmed that no further reviews are required by the DIP prior to submission of the proposal for assessment.

## 1.6 DIP endorsement

The DIP Chair confirms that this Addendum is an accurate record of the DIP feedback and that the DIP endorses the observations and clarifications by consensus.

The DIP endorses the progression of the proposal to lodgement, for the reasons outlined in this Addendum.

### Design Integrity Panel (DIP) Endorsement

Name	Signature	Date
Matthew Bennett (Chair) Director – Bennett and Trimble		11 November 2024



# Appendix 1

# Design Competition Report



# Architectural Design Competition Report

57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood

PREPARED FOR

Coronation Property Co. Pty Ltd

September 2023

MECONE.COM.AU

# Project Director

Ian Cady






## Contributors

Stephanie Wu

REVISION	REVISION DATE	STATUS	AUTHORISED: NAME & SIGNATURE
A	11 September 2023	Draft for jury review	Ian Cady
B	18 September 2023	Draft 2 for jury review	Ian Cady
C	19 September 2023	Final issue	Ian Cady

\* This document is for discussion purposes only unless signed and dated by the persons identified. This document has been reviewed by the Project Director.

## Juror Signatures

NAME	JUROR SIGNATURE	DATE
Matthew Bennett (Chair)		19 September 2023
Laura Harding		19 September 2023
Conrad Johnston	 Conrad Johnston	21 September 2023
Kim Crestani		19 September 2023
Robert Nation		21 September 2023



# Contact

## MECONE

Suite 1204b, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street  
Sydney, New South Wales 2000

[info@mecone.com.au](mailto:info@mecone.com.au)  
[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)

© Mecone

All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language in any form by any means without the written permission of Mecone. All Rights Reserved. All methods, processes, commercial proposals and other contents described in this document are the confidential intellectual property of Mecone and may not be used or disclosed to any party without the written permission of Mecone.



# Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	1
1.1	Overview .....	1
2	Architectural Design Competition .....	1
2.1	The Proponent .....	1
2.2	Participating Architectural Competitors .....	1
2.3	Technical Advisors .....	1
2.4	Competition Jury .....	2
2.5	Observers .....	2
2.5.1	From Willoughby City Council .....	2
2.5.2	From the Proponent .....	2
2.6	Competition Manager .....	3
2.7	Competitive Design Process Timeline .....	3
2.8	Competition Brief .....	4
3	Selection Panel Assessment of Each Original Scheme .....	5
3.1	Overview .....	5
3.2	Submitted Schemes and the Competition Jury's Assessment .....	5
3.2.1	Fender Katsalidis .....	5
3.2.2	PBD Architects .....	13
3.2.3	Woods Bagot .....	19
4	Competitive Process Winner .....	26
4.1	Architectural Concept .....	26
4.2	Apartment Design and Amenity .....	26
4.3	Facade and Material Strategy .....	26
4.4	Site and Landscape Strategy .....	27
4.5	Basement Entry and Servicing .....	28
4.6	Rooftop Communal Open Space .....	28
4.7	Lobby and Core Design .....	28
5	Summary and Conclusion .....	30

## Schedule of Figures & Tables

Figure 1	Photomontage .....	6
Figure 2	Ground Floor Plan .....	7
Figure 3	Level 1 Plan .....	8



Figure 4 Level 3 Plan .....	9
Figure 5 Level 14-21 Plan .....	10
Figure 6 Photomontage .....	13
Figure 7 Ground Floor Plan .....	14
Figure 8 Level 1 Plan .....	14
Figure 9 Level 8-14 Plan .....	15
Figure 10 Level 15-24 Plan .....	15
Figure 11 Option B Ground Floor Plan .....	16
Figure 12 Level 18-24 Plan (Option B).....	17
Figure 13 Photomontage .....	19
Figure 14 Ground Floor Plan – preferred option .....	20
Figure 15 Level 1-2 Plan .....	21
Figure 16 Typical Lowrise Plan - Level 3-5 .....	22
Figure 17 Typical Highrise Plan - Level 6-23 .....	23
Figure 18 Compliant Loading Option .....	24
Table 1 Key Dates .....	3

# Appendices

**Appendix 1 – Design Competition Brief**

**Appendix 2 – Competition Correspondence**

**Appendix 3 – Jury Letter**



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

This Architectural Design Competition Report outlines the process, architectural submissions and Competition Jury deliberations, decision and recommendations for the Architectural Design Competition (Design Competition) for the site known as 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood, in accordance with the Willoughby City Council Design Excellence Policy.

This Report should be read with reference to the Architectural Design Competition Brief (the Brief) (**Appendix 1**), relevant correspondence during the design competition (**Appendix 2**), and the Jury's commentary on the winning scheme (**Appendix 3**). The design competition was conducted in accordance with the Brief, which was endorsed by Willoughby City Council and issued to all competitors at the commencement of the competition.

## 2 Architectural Design Competition

### 2.1 The Proponent

The Proponent for the Architectural Design Competition is Coronation Property Co. Pty Ltd (Coronation). Three (3) competitors have been invited to prepare schemes for the site.

### 2.2 Participating Architectural Competitors

The following three architectural competitors participated in the Design Competition:

**1. Fender Katsalidis**

Rob Miram – Partners

**2. PBD Architects**

Paul Buljevic – Director

**3. Woods Bagot (Winner)**

Domenic Alvaro – Director

### 2.3 Technical Advisors

Input from Technical Advisors informed the design competition brief. The Technical Advisors appointed to assist during the competition process include:

Traffic Consultant	<b>Bayzid Khan</b> Principal Transportation Engineer – Stantec Australia
QS Consultant	<b>Brian O'Mahony</b> Associate – WT Partnership
ESD Consultant	<b>Behrooz Shojaei</b> Senior ESD Engineer – IGS
Heritage Consultant	<b>Daniel Nabb</b> Heritage Consultant – NBRS



Services Consultant	<b>Steven Cassells</b> Engineering Lead – Neuron
Planning Consultant	<b>Stephanie Wu</b> Senior Planner – Mecone

## 2.4 Competition Jury

The Competition Jury (the Jury) incorporated one (1) representative nominated by the Government Architect NSW (GANSW), two (2) representatives nominated by Willoughby City Council, and two (2) representatives nominated by the Proponent.

The Jury comprised the following members:

One nominated by GANSW:

- **Matthew Bennett (Chair)**  
Director – Bennett and Trimble

Two nominated by Willoughby City Council:

- **Laura Harding**  
Senior Designer – Hill Thalys
- **Conrad Johnston**  
Director – Studio Johnston

Two nominated by the Proponent:

- **Kim Crestani**  
Director – Order Architects
- **Robert Nation**  
Principal – Nation Architects

## 2.5 Observers

### 2.5.1 From Willoughby City Council

Two observers from Willoughby City Council attended the presentation day:

- **Wil Robertson**  
Urban Design Specialist
- **Jane Liang**  
Strategic Planner

### 2.5.2 From the Proponent

Three observers from the Proponent attended the briefing session, mid-point review and presentation:



- **Andrew Hall**  
Project Director
- **Chris Georgas**  
Head of Design Management
- **Aras Labutis**  
Head of Urban Transformations

## 2.6 Competition Manager

The Proponent appointed Mecone Group Pty Ltd (Mecone) to act as the Competition Manager. **Ian Cady** assisted by Stephanie Wu from Mecone served as the Competition Manager.

## 2.7 Competitive Design Process Timeline

An Architectural Design Competition Brief was prepared by Mecone in accordance with Willoughby City Council's (WCC) *Guidelines for Design Excellence Review and Competitions*. The Competition Brief was endorsed by Council on 7 July 2023.

Three architectural consortiums were invited to participate in the competitive process (refer to **Section 2.2**).

The key dates and processes for the competitive process are outlined in **Table 1** below.

**TABLE 1 KEY DATES**

WEEK	DATE	MILESTONE/COMPETITION PROCESS
Week 1	10 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 (Start date)	Commencement, Briefing Session and Site Visit
Week 1-3	10 <sup>th</sup> July – 28 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 (3 weeks)	Initial concept development
Week 3	28 <sup>th</sup> July 2023	<b>Midpoint Review</b> Competitors presented progress presentations including preliminary general arrangement floor plans, sections, elevations, façade description, retail concepts, materiality and yield and massing diagrams.
Week 4-5	28 <sup>th</sup> July – 11 <sup>th</sup> August 2023 (2 weeks)	<b>Proponent review of midpoint submissions</b> The proponent provided feedback to each competitor.
Week 6-7	14 <sup>th</sup> August – 25 <sup>th</sup> August 2023 (2 weeks)	Concept Finalisation



	<b>25<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b>	<p><b>Final Submission Lodgement Date</b></p> <p>Competitors submitted electronic copies of entries to the Competition Manager.</p>
	<b>28<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b>	<p><b>Presentation Material Lodgement Date</b></p> <p>Competitors submitted presentations to the Competition Manager for audit prior to Presentation Date.</p>
<b>Week 8</b>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> September 2023</b></p> <p>(5 working days)</p>	<p><b>Technical Assessment by Proponent’s Technical Advisors</b></p> <p>Technical reviews were submitted to the Jurors for consideration. Technical advisors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- QS</li> <li>- ESD</li> <li>- Traffic</li> <li>- Services</li> <li>- Heritage</li> <li>- Buildability</li> <li>- Planning</li> </ul>
<b>Week 9</b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup> September 2023</b>	<p><b>Presentation Date</b></p> <p>Competitors presented final submissions to the Jury at Mecone’s office. Woods Bagot were unanimously selected as the competition winner.</p>
		<b>Notification to Competitors</b>
<b>Week 10</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> September 2023</b>	<b>Submission of Design Competition Report</b>

## 2.8 Competition Brief

Competitors were sent a copy of the Architectural Design Competition Brief on 7 July 2023. The Architectural Design Competition Brief sent to competitors is included at **Appendix 1**.



## 3 Selection Panel Assessment of Each Original Scheme

### 3.1 Overview

Design Reports were submitted by each competitor and an internal review of each scheme was undertaken by the Competition Jury and technical advisors. On the Presentation Day (5 September 2023), each architectural competitor presented their scheme to the Jury and questions were asked in order to clarify any issues. The Jury then evaluated each scheme.

### 3.2 Submitted Schemes and the Competition Jury's Assessment

This section details the key components of each scheme as presented by the architectural competitors and the Competition Jury's assessment.

#### 3.2.1 Fender Katsalidis

The key features of the scheme prepared by Fender Katsalidis are illustrated in **Figures 1-5** below.





**FIGURE 1 PHOTOMONTAGE**  
*Source: Fender Katsalidis*



Flood levels dictate raising the building up to RL 88.97, which requires ramp and stair access from footpath levels. A plinth is formed behind a landscaped planter along the site boundary. The retail space is illustrated as a two level showroom but could be restaurant with mezzanine. Internal escalators take visitors to this level.

Residential and commercial lobbies sit at the same level activating the through site link towards the café retail. This has an 'il fresco' terrace before descending via stairs and a ramp towards the garden and heritage house terrace. This house accommodates exhibition, meeting, art studio and office spaces.

Residential and commercial bike storage with an EOT facility activate the pedestrian link but are separated to cater for weekday / weekend and day / night use.


Landscape and public art populates and animates the ground plane. It offers narrative and creates place. Art also permeates the architecture with a possible sculptural content in the rear extension of the 34 Albert Avenue heritage house.




**5.0 GROUND FLOOR PLAN**

**FIGURE 2 GROUND FLOOR PLAN**

Source: Fender Katsalidis






**FIGURE 3 LEVEL 1 PLAN**

Source: Fender Katsalidis







**FIGURE 5 LEVEL 14-21 PLAN**

Source: Fender Katsalidis

The following Statement of Intent is taken from the submission material prepared by Fender Katsalidis:

*“Redevelopment of this site offers a wonderful opportunity to contribute a meaningful and respectful amenity to the landscape and cityscape of Chatswood. It sits in a transitional zone between a dense mixed use urban core and a low density residential. Our approach has been to manifest this transition in a design for the public domain on and around the site and for the built form above.*

*We have responded to the objectives of the design brief by providing a mixed use precinctual solution including retail, commercial, residential and community use. Retail analysis showed a need for showroom at ground level with minimal commercial space above. A two-level showroom is designed with double height void space and interconnecting escalators. Boutique style office space compliments with separate lift access. The ground plane and public domain are active, open, and interconnected spaces. Landscape design by Arcadia adds hard and soft spaces, water, capturing sun and shade. The heritage house is converted to a community centre and public art piece directed by Cultural Capital. A café and terrace is included at ground level to compliment the retail and community centre. Lobbies to both commercial and residential with bike parking and EOT facility activate a through site pedestrian link. Residential apartments are provided at the size and mix desired and are designed to optimise views and solar access. Loading and waste collection is facilitated, and all car and motor bike parking requirements accommodated in basements.*

*Design excellence is achieved with thorough analysis of ground plane and massing options to uncover an optimum solution. Coronation advised preference for an efficient and sustainable option, well within the allowable height limit. This option Improves the quality of the public domain from its current state of private and inaccessible. The public domain is now fully accessible through landscape and pedestrian friendly active space.*



*High quality design, materials and detailing are proposed for the built form. A palette of natural materials is selected to humanise the architecture and represent the site' location as a transition between city and suburb. Concrete, bronze compliment tower glazing while brick responds to local context on the podium.*

*This site is highly suitable for mixed use development. As a transitional site, it is not zoned for either residential or commercial but for both. The proposed uses complement each other and ensure activity throughout the day and night.*

*The heritage house is honoured and enhanced by returning it to its original brick façade, painted timber, and terra cotta roof. It is revived through use as a community centre and art piece.*

*Careful consideration has been given to the relationship with the neighbouring site to the south. ADG setbacks are applied to massing and built form proposed only to one level of the boundary. Setbacks above this contain landscape to soften outlook back to the site. Overlooking is mitigated at lower levels through commercial use and obscured glazing. Modulation of the built form is achieved through recessed articulation between ground floor and podium, podium, and tower and to the massing of the tower itself.*

*A high level of sustainability can be achieved for this development by virtue of its dense population, where more people share common resources and reduce their urban footprint. A number of ESD initiatives are designed to optimise energy use through passive solar design, minimise water use through rainwater harvesting and flow limiters, optimise use of resources and embodied energies.*

*The impact on the adjacent conservation area to the east is minimised through relevant use of materials on the building and terraced built form, which steps away from the conservation area.*

*Landscape is integrated into the design both at ground plane and vertically through podium and tower levels. A high level of hard and soft landscaped space is included at ground level and through communal levels. The most important element of the design is the interface at ground level of buildings and the public domain. Active spaces, diverse uses, articulated entries, easy transition of levels through landscape and architecture drive this proposal towards a design of excellence."*

#### Merits identified by the Jury

The Jury identified the following merits within the proposal:

- the east-west permeability of the ground plane provided by the arcade connection through the building and the activation of this connection with retail, food/beverage, and the lobbies for residential and commercial accommodation;
- the reduction in the podium height relative to the planning controls to provide a better relationship with the existing streetscape and heritage cottage;
- the positive contribution of the proposed landscape design and art strategy to the site and wider precinct;
- the potential use of the heritage cottage for community and cultural functions; and
- the research undertaken into the original materiality of the cottage to inform the selection of brick for the podium facades.

#### Concerns identified by the Jury

The Jury also raised a number of concerns including:

- the overall visual complexity of the tower and podium facades;
- the introduction of a mid-tower recess/break on level 13 which interrupts the vertical proportions of the tower massing and its perceived slenderness;



- the environmental performance of the facade including the depth, alignment and spacing of the vertical blades and the lack of aspect-specific consideration in their configuration;
- the amenity and comfort of the exposed corner balconies;
- the design and distribution of apartments does not appear to respond adequately to prospect or amenity;
- the number and proportion and of living spaces in three bedroom apartments;
- the relationship between the communal pool and the adjacent apartments results in acoustic and privacy concerns;
- the comparatively low performance of cross ventilation;
- potential complexities regarding fire egress within the arcade link;
- the functionality of the loading dock / turntable; and
- the intention to add a contemporary addition to the heritage building given the extent of new building form on the site.



### 3.2.2 PBD Architects


The key features of the scheme prepared by PBD Architects are illustrated in **Figures 6-10** below.




**FIGURE 6 PHOTOMONTAGE**

Source: *PBD Architects*





**FIGURE 7 GROUND FLOOR PLAN**  
 Source: PBD Architects



**FIGURE 8 LEVEL 1 PLAN**  
 Source: PBD Architects





**FIGURE 9 LEVEL 8-14 PLAN**  
 Source: PBD Architects




**FIGURE 10 LEVEL 15-24 PLAN**  
 Source: PBD Architects



Alternative option

PBD Architects presented an alternative option (Option B) which provided an alternative ground floor commercial layout, an alternative unit mix and typical floor plate for Level 18-24 with a yield of 112 units. The alternative option is illustrated in **Figures 11-12** below.



**FIGURE 11 OPTION B GROUND FLOOR PLAN**

Source: PBD Architects





**FIGURE 12 LEVEL 18-24 PLAN (OPTION B)**

Source: PBD Architects

The following Statement of Intent is taken from the submission material prepared by PBD Architects:

*“Context analysis*

*Located approximately 533m east of the Chatswood Transport Interchange with access to Metro, train and bus services, the site at 57-61 Archer Street presents an exciting opportunity to create a civic place that positively contributes to the surrounding context, enhances the overall urban experience that promotes community engagement and cultural activities.*

*Level 1*

*Flexible commercial offering integrated in the landscaped podium. The reduced depth of the floorplate allows better amenity, such as solar access, natural ventilation and visual interest, which stimulates productivity. Furthermore, due to the stepping of the built form, breakout spaces and green outlook is provided for each tenancy. The floor plan can accommodate smaller tenancies or greater floor space, depending on the needs of the users.*

*Communal open space*

*The communal open space on the podium is a generous private retreat for residents of the development. It is characterised by numerous breakout spaces, both passive and active, and encourages different activities through zoning. Users of the space also benefit from solar access throughout the day. In addition, the podium deck is an expansive private open space for all podium level units.*

*Material finishes*

*The proposal contains a clear approach to materiality and construction. The towers comprise a straightforward stack of apartments, transitioning in planning to the upper levels to provide additional 3 bedroom stock to the upper levels. Structural transfers are generally avoided and podium columns extend*



*through the tower structure. The tower contains a continuous façade, absorbing all required performance aspects into a regular expression, subtly modulating to accommodate specific acoustic, privacy and shading requirements. Mullion and top rail extensions provide visual depth and a degree of sunshading.*

*Acoustic plenums are recessed within the façade grid. Privacy screening is integrated where necessary to address visual privacy requirements. The façade comprises natural toned anodized framing, with light hue aluminium mullions to the window system throughout. The tiered landscape comprises a series of concrete slabs with timber soffits. The distinctive stepped planter upstand can be constructed from insitu concrete or readily substituted with pre-cast. The tiered levels contain light colour tones, providing contrast to the planting and increasing the visual presence of the landscape elements.*

#### *Public art*

*Public art presents a significant opportunity for the project, enhancing the architectural and landscape design and providing opportunities for interpretation. The public art opportunities are focused on the communal level which is also visible from the heritage building*

*We are confident that artists will creatively interpret the opportunities of the project, interpreting the site history and present, identifying surprising opportunities for integrated public art. The public art approach will be developed in collaboration with a public art consultant, further increasing the sophistication of the approach.*

*Public art opportunities are concentrated to the parts of the building that are visible from the public domain.”*

#### Merits identified by the Jury

The Jury identified the following merits within the proposal:

- the location of the building core and the potential to provide good apartments;
- the reduction in the podium height relative to the planning controls to provide a better relationship with the existing streetscape and heritage cottage;
- the potential amenity and sunlight to communal open space on the podium;
- the proportions, materiality and proposed detailing of the podium;
- the intent for a well-mannered and rational façade; and
- the configuration of the basement to reduce impact on the existing Fig tree on Albert Avenue.

#### Concerns identified by the Jury

The Jury also raised a number of concerns including:

- the design and configuration of apartments e.g. high proportion of inboard living areas that do not take full advantage of the relative slenderness of the building to be located on the corners of the tower;
- the effectiveness of natural ventilation with flow paths through ensuites and walk-in wardrobes;
- the resolution of fire egress in the options presented;
- the architectural expression of the annex building;
- the lack of consideration of the southern podium and tower façade; and
- the disconnect between the rendered views and the tower plans regarding blade walls and columns raising questions about what the resulting expression, materiality and detailing.



### 3.2.3 Woods Bagot


The key features of the scheme prepared by Woods Bagot are illustrated in **Figures 13-17**.



**FIGURE 13 PHOTOMONTAGE**


*Source: Woods Bagot*






**FIGURE 14 GROUND FLOOR PLAN – PREFERRED OPTION**  
 Source: Woods Bagot






**FIGURE 15 LEVEL 1-2 PLAN**  
 Source: Woods Bagot





**FIGURE 16 TYPICAL LOWRISE PLAN - LEVEL 3-5**  
 Source: Woods Bagot





**FIGURE 17 TYPICAL HIGHRISE PLAN - LEVEL 6-23**

Source: Woods Bagot

Compliant Loading Option

Further to the preferred option involving at-grade loading, a Compliant Option was included to provide basement loading with an access ramp with 4.5m clearance for Council's 10.5m MRV waste truck. The proposed Compliant Loading Option is illustrated in **Figure 18**.





**FIGURE 18 COMPLIANT LOADING OPTION**

Source: Woods Bagot

Merits identified by the Jury

The Jury identified the following merits within the proposal including:

- the clarity and quality of the architectural concept of a free-standing tower formed through the stacking of repetitive horizontal bands providing continuous spandrel panels and balustrades;
- the shifting and variation of these horizontal bands to support larger residential and commercial floor plates at the base and to accommodate a landscaped communal roof terrace;
- the configuration of the communal open space as a roof terrace with a series of enclosed, semi-enclosed and outdoor spaces;
- the thorough analysis of prospect, views and amenity in determining the configuration of the residential tower floorplate;
- the consistent quality, functionality and amenity of the proposed apartments regardless of their size or location within the tower;
- the proposed architectural language and materiality is robust, legible and well integrated with the building's program;
- the overall intent of the site strategy including the introduction of a pocket park/lawn to the southeast corner of the site; and
- the potential establishment of a shared way along the southern edge of the site to increase urban connectivity, porosity and potential tree canopy coverage.

Concerns identified by the Jury

The Jury also raised a number of elements for further consideration including:



- the resolution of the waste/loading strategy with specialist consultant input for the compliant and non-compliant options to test the urban, construction and cost benefits of each proposal;
- improvements to the environmental performance of the apartment glazing through an informed response to each solar aspect that supports the overall architectural facade strategy in a holistic and integrated manner;
- further refinement of the open space strategy including tree canopy provision;
- the size, configuration and locations of the residential and commercial lobbies with the wider consideration of the ground floor; and
- the provision of two lifts in tower with this number of apartments.



## 4 Competitive Process Winner

Of the three schemes assessed by the Jury, the Jury unanimously agreed that the Woods Bagot scheme was most capable of achieving design excellence.

The Jury members agreed that the Woods Bagot scheme is capable of achieving Design Excellence subject to further design development prior to the lodgement of a Development Application. The Jury have identified a series of issues that require further consideration, as well as elements that should be retained in order for the scheme to achieve Design Excellence.

The below commentary has been extracted from the Jury Letter at **Appendix 3**.

For reference, elements to be retained are underlined and issues requiring further consideration are in **bold**.

### 4.1 Architectural Concept

- The Jury strongly supports the clarity and quality of the architectural concept of a free-standing tower formed through the stacking of repetitive horizontal bands providing continuous spandrel panels and balustrades.
- The shifting and variation of these horizontal bands to support larger residential and commercial floor plates at the base and to accommodate a landscaped communal roof terrace is essential to the concept. These shifts distinguish the tower within the emerging skyline of Chatswood and assist in mediating its scale within the surrounding streetscape.

### 4.2 Apartment Design and Amenity

- The Jury were impressed by the consistent quality, functionality and amenity of the proposed apartments regardless of their size or location within the tower. The scheme represents an excellent understanding of apartment design that has been tested and refined through successive projects by the design team. The Jury strongly supports the initiative to translate this knowledge from the urban infill typology precedent the team presented to this mixed-use tower project.
- **The Jury expects the quality and amenity of the apartments to be maintained and refined as the project develops.**
- **The Jury did not think the option for extended balconies to the sub-penthouse level was necessary to achieve Design Excellence. And would pose additional planning risk.**

### 4.3 Facade and Material Strategy

- The proposed architectural language and materiality is robust, legible and well integrated with the building's program. In order for the scheme to achieve Design Excellence it will be critical to maintain:
  - the clarity and material quality of the continuous concrete horizontal bands and the wrapping of this material to the balcony and terrace soffits to provide visual continuity when viewed from below
  - the juxtaposition of these concrete bands with striated ceramic cladding with a colour, texture and a lustrous glazed finish that are integral to the material production process (the ceramic cladding provides a material contrast and quality that is necessary to offset and enrich the robustness of the concrete elements and the repetitious language of the tower when viewed in the immediate and wider urban context). **The Jury is cognisant that the ceramic cladding may be considered costly however any substitution with another material would trigger a review by the Willoughby Council Design Excellence Design Integrity Process prior to the submission of the Development Application.**



- the ratio of solid to glazed facade across the building to support the architectural concept and improve residential amenity and environmental performance
- the extent of cantilevered terraces and balconies that bring formal variation and animating shadows to the facade composition and tower silhouette.
- Members of the Jury questioned the finished height of the solid balustrades for the upper level apartments. As part of the design development process, **the design team is encouraged to test and carefully calibrate the proposed balustrade heights (if required) to support improved views without significantly impacting the overall facade strategy and proposed solid to glazed facade ratios.**
- **The design team is encouraged to consider how the environmental responsiveness and performance of the building can be improved by an informed response to each solar aspect that supports the overall architectural facade strategy in a holistic and integrated manner. For example, can discrete sun horizontal or vertical shading elements be incorporated into the window reveals on the western and northern facades without increasing the depth of the facades to augment the use of double-glazing?**

## 4.4 Site and Landscape Strategy

- The Jury commended the overall intent of the site strategy but notes that **significant work will be required during the next phase to develop an open space strategy with a level of consideration, quality and amenity equivalent to the architectural proposal.**
- The Jury supports:
  - the strategy to remove unsympathetic additions to the existing heritage building (subject to separate Heritage advice) and the insertion of a contemporary horizontal canopy that supports the adaptive re-use of the heritage building and assists in mediating between the scale of the house and the tower podium
  - the introduction of a pocket park / landscaped lawn to the southeast corner of the site to increase the overall landscape provision
  - the intention for a refined and simple palette of materials to create a refined and uncluttered urban environment.
  - the potential establishment of a shared way along the southern edge of the site to increase urban connectivity, porosity and potential tree canopy coverage (see notes below regarding Basement Access and Servicing).
- **The Jury encourages the design team to:**
  - **design the landscaped areas around the building as clear legible extensions of the public domain to be welcoming for both residents and visitors**
  - **increase tree canopy coverage across the site to meet or exceed the required targets (the rendered views appeared to include more trees than the plans presented)**
  - **extend the Connecting with Country strategy through detailed landscape design, species selection, naming and artwork strategies**
  - **configure the basement to protect the existing trees including the significant Fig Tree on Albert Avenue with input from an Arborist**
  - **consider how green infrastructure might be included for the management of stormwater, both for the purposes of retention and re-use on site, and for minimising downstream pollution of waterways.**



- **Ensure that planting areas are well provisioned with soil and water to allow planting to thrive and understand the impacts of wind on planting and the viability of the larger trees illustrated within the proposal (including upper levels) and determine whether additional screening will be required for wind control.**
- **Identify plant species best suited to each elevation and microclimate.**

## 4.5 Basement Entry and Servicing

- Two options were presented by the design team:
  - a compliant option with loading and servicing functions located in the basement;
  - a non-compliant option where loading and servicing functions are accommodated on the ground level with access via a shared way to the south of the tower; and
  - The Jury notes that issues had been identified in both options as part of the Technical Review.
- While acknowledging the misalignment with Willoughby Council requirements of the non-compliant option, the Jury identified urban benefits in the establishment of a shared way to the south of the building including:
  - improved urban connectivity and porosity in an area where significant residential density is proposed and the site having three street frontages is considered unique in this aspect;
  - greater opportunities for fine-grain commercial tenancies around the base of the building to support site and precinct activation;
  - potential for greater tree canopy and landscape provision to combat urban heat;
  - the reduction of built form massing adjacent to the existing heritage building resulting in a more sympathetic outcome;
  - reinforcement of the architectural concept of a free-standing tower in a landscaped setting; and
  - greater potential to integrate the site with the landscaped character of the adjacent heritage conservation area.
- **The design team is encouraged to continue their investigations with specialist consultant input including planning, traffic, safety, structural, waste and acoustic advice to refine these options for further consideration.**

## 4.6 Rooftop Communal Open Space

- The Jury supports the configuration of the communal open space as a roof terrace with a series of enclosed, semi-enclosed and outdoor spaces and **encourages the design team to obtain input from a specialist wind consultant to address and mitigate any adverse impacts on the amenity and use of these facilities. Consideration could be given to decanting some of the communal space to podium level, however the Jury strongly supports some communal space on the rooftop given the potential for excellent views for residents and guest and the silhouette off of the roof plane.**

## 4.7 Lobby and Core Design

- The Jury supports the location and character of the Archer Street residential address but questioned the size and configuration of the ground floor residential lobby including the lack of BOH areas such as a mail/parcel delivery room. Members of the Jury also questioned whether the lobby should extend through the building as a link. **The design team is encouraged to consider this as part of the wider consideration of the ground floor and basement access/servicing.**



- The Jury questioned the provision of two residential lifts and whether a third lift may be required given the number and size of apartments to be serviced? **Obtain specialist consultant advice to confirm lift requirements.**
- **Ensure there is sufficient rubbish chute provision on each level including recycling with a preference for a dedicated recycling chute rather than a diverter mechanism.**
- The Jury supports the provision of a dedicated commercial lift, stair and lobby and consider them important elements to be retained. **The location of this lobby could be reconsidered as part of the wider ground floor design review.**



## 5 Summary and Conclusion

The purpose of this Design Competition Report is to inform Willoughby City Council on the process and outcomes for the Architectural Design Competition process for 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood.

The Architectural Design Competition process has been undertaken in accordance with the endorsed Design Competition Brief and relevant planning provisions, including Clause 6.23 of the LEP, DCP Controls and Willoughby City Council Guidelines for Design Excellence Review and Competitions 2019.

Of the three architectural competitors invited to compete in the process, the **Woods Bagot** submission was unanimously judged to be the most capable of exhibiting design excellence with regard to matters at Clause 6.23(4) of the LEP. The merits identified by the Jury that are critical for the scheme to achieve Design Excellence are detailed at **Section 3.2.3** and **4**. Matters identified by the Jury for further exploration are identified at the end of **Section 4**.

The Jury confirms that this Design Competition Report is an accurate record of the Architectural Design Competition process and endorses the assessment and recommendations.



# Appendices

# Design Competition Brief

# Competition Correspondence

## 57-61 Archer Street, Chatswood

11 July 2023

---

### 1. SUPPORTING IMAGERY/CGI'S

No more than 3 unique, photomontage rendered CGI's should be included in submissions. Specific CGI views will not be prescribed.

Portions of CGI images may be reproduced (ie zoomed-in on) throughout submissions but should not present any views or angles which differ from the 3 CGI's.

Revit model extracts will not be counted, provided they are not montaged onto photographs.

---

### 2. GROSS FLOOR AREA

There several are GFA matters which require clarification by Council:

- Former road reserve  
Whilst this matter is being resolved by Council, submissions should design to a target GFA of 13,225m<sup>2</sup>.
  - Non-residential GFA  
For abundance of caution, the GFA of the heritage item **should not** be included in the calculation of 17% non-residential floorspace. We consider that the heritage item presents as a separate building and cannot be relied upon for the 17% non-residential GFA.
  - Exclusion of heritage item from total GFA  
For the purpose of the design competition, the GFA of the heritage item **should not** be included in the calculation of the total GFA. We are currently seeking clarification from Council and will provide an update once confirmed.
- 

### 3. SITE SURVEY

A full site survey is underway and is anticipated to be circulated within 2 weeks, it will be provided as a PDF and .DWG.

---

### 4. UNIT SIZES

The proponent is **no longer seeking a single penthouse** to the top floor, it is preferred that sub-penthouses of approximately 140-170m<sup>2</sup> are provided in accordance with **Table 4 at Section 4.1.2** of the brief.

---

### 5. POST-COMPETITION FEES

Fee proposals for post-competition fees should be submitted separately from the design competition documentation and should be discussed separately with Coronation.

## 57-61 Archer Street, Chatswood

28 July 2023

---

### 1. STREET WALL HEIGHT

Street wall height is a **maximum** requirement under the Draft DCP, which states street wall heights lower than the maximum are encouraged at the interface with low density residential conservation area.

Note: On corner sites where different setbacks and street frontage height precincts meet, the greater setback and lower street wall height required on the primary frontage is to continue around the corner for a minimum distance of 6m. This is to provide a satisfactory transition between the setbacks and wall heights.

---

### 2. LOADING

**A winning scheme must demonstrate compliance in accordance with Council's waste and loading requirements.** This involves:

- A compliant basement loading dock accommodating Council's 10.5m MRV waste vehicle and residential removal trucks with a height clearance of 4.5m.
- Adequate onsite maneuverability is to be provided to ensure vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward direction without reliance on a turntable
- Only one entry area into and exiting the site is permitted

Notwithstanding, **competitors are encouraged to explore an alternative option** involving:

- At-grade loading and waste collection
  - Separate residential and loading / waste access
- 

### 3. NON-RESIDENTIAL GROSS FLOOR AREA

The LEP requirement for 17% of the building's GFA to be used for non-residential purposes is a minimum requirement.

Ground level loading and vehicle manoeuvring is not GFA but might compromise the ability to provide the required 17% non-residential GFA.

## Stephanie Wu

---

**From:** Stephanie Wu  
**Sent:** Monday, 14 August 2023 3:39 PM  
**To:** Rob Mirams; Rod Uriarte; Keith Lam; Tomy@pbdarchitects.com.au; Paul Brace; Glenn O'Loughlin; Domenic Alvaro; Kate Dickinson; Hugh Thomson  
**Cc:** Andrew Hall; Aras Labutis; Chris Georgas; Ian Cady  
**Subject:** Archer Street - Survey Plan  
**Attachments:** 203689\_DTL.zip; 203689\_DTL.pdf

Hi All,

Please find attached detailed site survey.

We note the total site area shown on the survey plan is 2,644.7m<sup>2</sup>, which is slightly less than the site area nominated in the brief (0.41m<sup>2</sup> difference). For the purpose of GFA calculation, please refer to the GFA figures issued Friday afternoon. The discrepancy will be resolved at DA stage.

Also just noting that the presentation lodgement date is now 28 August 2023. In summary, the revised dates are as follows:

- **25 August** – Final Submission Lodgement Date
- **28 August** – Presentation Material Lodgement Date
- **5 September** – Presentation Date
- **19 September** – Decision Date
- **26 September** – Notification to competitors

If you have any questions please let me know. Thanks.

Kind regards,

**STEPHANIE WU**

Senior Planner

---

02 8667 8668  
Level 12, 179 Elizabeth St, Sydney NSW 2000  
[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)

---






Based in Sydney CBD, Western Sydney,  
Melbourne, Perth, Brisbane & Regional Australia

Start planning  
with  **MOSAIC**

THE PLATFORM FOR URBAN ANALYTICS



This e-mail is confidential to the named recipient. If you received a copy in error, please destroy it. You may not use or disclose the contents of this e-mail to anyone., nor take copies of it. The only copies permitted are (1) by the named recipient and (2) for the purposes of completing successful electronic transmission to the named recipient and then only on the condition that these copies, with this notice attached, are kept confidential until destruction.

## Stephanie Wu

---

**From:** Stephanie Wu  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 16 August 2023 1:34 PM  
**To:** Rob Mirams; Rod Uriarte; Keith Lam; Tomy@pbdarchitects.com.au; Paul Brace; Glenn O'Loughlin; Domenic Alvaro; Kate Dickinson; Hugh Thomson  
**Cc:** Andrew Hall; Chris Georgas; Ian Cady; Robertson, Wil  
**Subject:** 57-61 Archer Street Planning clarifications

Dear Competitors,

A competitor has asked:

1. Can architectural features such as solar shading overhang the setback line and if so by how much?
2. Can the building be built to the south boundary over four levels including ground? If not is a 3m setback justifiable above ground?
3. Can a vehicle turntable be used for waste collection vehicle in basement 1?

These questions are answered below:

### 1. Overhang of architectural features to the setback lines

The DCP does not allow for any protrusion into the setback area. Any protrusion beyond the required setback in the DCP will be identified as a non-compliance. This also applies to the southern boundary which is subject to the ADG separation requirements.

A winning scheme is required to be compliant with the relevant development controls. If protrusion into the setback area is deemed warranted, this will need to be in an alternative option with justification provided for its design merits.

### 2. Provision of commercial spaces

There are no specific DCP setback requirements to the common boundary for 55 Archer Street.

However, the interface to future development immediately to the south will be an important design consideration. In this regard, the site immediately to the south is subject to a 90m height and 5:1 FSR control with a 17% non-residential floor space requirement and assumed ADG compliant separation to the residential above. It would be reasonable to assume the adjoining property would only have two full width non-residential podium levels.

It is reiterated that Coronation's preference is to limit non-residential spaces to two (if necessary three) levels.

### 3. Use of turntable

Section 4.4 of the Willoughby DCP states:

*Willoughby City Council **does not generally support** mechanical car parking systems or **turntables**, and under no circumstances will they be allowed for accessible or visitor car parking.*

*An applicant must show there is no other reasonable car parking arrangement available. They must ensure that safety, emergency and noise issues relating to the ongoing operation of a mechanical car parking system and/or turntable have been addressed to Willoughby City Council's satisfaction.*

*Mechanical systems and turntables must satisfy all of these requirements:*

- a. the site is constrained by existing conditions*
- b. they are only used to access spaces assigned to a particular dwelling/unit/tenant/business*
- c. there is adequate standing space within the site for vehicles waiting to use the system*
- d. turntables may be used to ease turn paths but must not be the sole means to allow vehicles to turn around within the site; vehicles must be able to turn around using multipoint turns without using the turntable*

Note:

- The purpose of item (d) is to ensure vehicles can enter and leave the site if there is a malfunction with the turntable.

Turntables can be used, however vehicles must be able to turn around using multipoint turns without the turntable.

Any further questions please feel free to contact me.

Kind regards,

**STEPHANIE WU**

Senior Planner

---

02 8667 8668


Level 12, 179 Elizabeth St, Sydney NSW 2000

[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)

---



 **Mecone** Based in Sydney CBD, Western Sydney,  
Melbourne, Perth, Brisbane & Regional Australia



This e-mail is confidential to the named recipient. If you received a copy in error, please destroy it. You may not use or disclose the contents of this e-mail to anyone., nor take copies of it. The only copies permitted are (1) by the named recipient and (2) for the purposes of completing successful electronic transmission to the named recipient and then only on the condition that these copies, with this notice attached, are kept confidential until destruction.

## Stephanie Wu

---

**From:** Stephanie Wu  
**Sent:** Thursday, 24 August 2023 5:54 PM  
**To:** Rob Mirams; Rod Uriarte; 'david.robinson@fkaustralia.com'; Domenic Alvaro; Glenn O'Loughlin; Kate Dickinson; Hugh Thomson; Paul Brace; Tomy@pbdarchitects.com.au; Keith Lam  
**Cc:** Ian Cady; Andrew Hall; Chris Georgas  
**Subject:** Archer Street Clarification - Presentation Material Lodgement

Dear Competitors,

We received a query in relation to the due date and time of the presentation material, limit to the number of slides and time allowed for the presentation.

Please see below response:

- **Presentation Material Lodgement Date and Time:** 28 August 2023 (Monday) by 5pm
- **Limit to number of slides and presentation time:** There is no limit on the number of slides. However, presentations should be no longer than 25 minutes and will be followed by a 20-minute Q&A session with the jurors.

Please note that the presentation slides are not to provide any new materials that are not contained in the submissions. This also relates to the limit of 3 x CGIs.

Any additional content beyond what is provided in the submissions will be redacted from the presentation slides.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

Kind regards,

**STEPHANIE WU**  
Senior Planner

---

02 8667 8668  
Level 12, 179 Elizabeth St, Sydney NSW 2000  
[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)

---






Based in Sydney CBD, Western Sydney,  
Melbourne, Perth, Brisbane & Regional Australia

Start planning  
with  **MOSAIC**

THE PLATFORM FOR URBAN ANALYTICS



This e-mail is confidential to the named recipient. If you received a copy in error, please destroy it. You may not use or disclose the contents of this e-mail to anyone., nor take copies of it. The only copies permitted are (1) by the named recipient and (2) for the purposes of completing successful electronic transmission to the named recipient and then only on the condition that these copies, with this notice attached, are kept confidential until destruction.

# Jury Letter

## **57-61 Archer St and 34 Albert Avenue Chatswood**

### **Design Excellence Competition Jury**

Matthew Bennett (GANSW nominee and Chair)

Kim Crestani (Proponent nominee)

Bob Nation (Proponent nominee)

Laura Harding (Willoughby Council nominee)

Conrad Johnston (Willoughby Council nominee)

Domenic Alvaro  
Woods Bagot  
2/60 Carrington Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

13th September 2023

Dear Domenic,

### **Re: Design Excellence Competition**

Thank you for participating in Willoughby Council's Design Excellence Competition process and your presentation to the Jury on the 5th of September. The Jury has assessed the design proposals and has unanimously agreed to proceed with Woods Bagot as the preferred scheme.

The Jury members agreed that your scheme is capable of achieving Design Excellence subject to further design development prior to the lodgement of a Development Application. This letter sets out the items the Jury have identified that require further consideration, as well as elements that should be retained to achieve Design Excellence.

### **Architectural Concept**

- The Jury strongly supports the clarity and quality of the architectural concept of a free-standing tower formed through the stacking of repetitive horizontal bands providing continuous spandrel panels and balustrades.
- The shifting and variation of these horizontal bands to support larger residential and commercial floor plates at the base and to accommodate a landscaped communal roof terrace is essential to the concept. These shifts and variations distinguish the tower within the emerging skyline of Chatswood and assist in mediating its scale within the surrounding streetscape.

### **Apartment Design and Amenity**

- The Jury were impressed by the consistent quality, functionality and amenity of the proposed apartments regardless of their size or location within the tower. The scheme represents an excellent understanding of apartment design that has been tested and refined through successive projects by the design team. The Jury strongly supports the initiative to translate this knowledge from the urban infill typology precedent the team presented to this mixed-use tower project.
- The Jury expects the quality and amenity of the apartments to be maintained and refined as the project develops.
- The Jury did not consider the option for extended balconies to the sub-penthouses necessary to achieve Design Excellence and could pose additional planning risk.

### **Facade and Material Strategy**

- The proposed architectural language and materiality is robust, legible and well integrated with the building's program. In order for the scheme to achieve Design Excellence it will be critical to maintain:
  - the ratio of solid to glazed facade across the building to support the architectural concept and improve residential amenity and environmental performance
  - the extent of cantilevered terraces and balconies that bring formal variation and animating shadows to the facade composition and tower silhouette
  - the clarity and material quality of the continuous horizontal concrete bands and the wrapping of this material to the balcony and terrace soffits to provide visual continuity when viewed from below
  - the juxtaposition of these concrete bands with striated ceramic cladding with a colour, texture and a lustrous glazed finish that are integral to the material production process. The ceramic cladding provides a material contrast and quality that is necessary to offset and enrich the robustness of the concrete elements and the repetitious language of the tower when viewed in the immediate and wider urban context. The Jury is cognisant that the ceramic cladding may be considered costly, however any substitution with another material would trigger a rigorous review by the Willoughby Council Design Excellence Design Integrity Process prior to the submission of the Development Application.
- Members of the Jury questioned the finished height of the solid balustrades for the upper level apartments. As part of the design development process, the design team is encouraged to test and subtly calibrate the proposed balustrade heights (if required) to support improved views without significantly impacting the overall facade strategy and proposed solid to glazed facade ratios.

- The design team is encouraged to consider how the environmental responsiveness and performance of the building can be improved by an informed response to each solar aspect that supports the overall architectural facade strategy in a holistic and integrated manner. For example, can discrete horizontal or vertical sun shading elements be incorporated into the window reveals and framing on the western and northern facades without increasing the depth of the facades to augment the use of double-glazing?

### **Site and Landscape Strategy**

- The Jury commended the overall intent of the site strategy but notes that significant work will be required during the next phase to develop an open space strategy with a level of consideration, quality and amenity equivalent to the architectural proposal.
- The Jury supports:
  - the strategy to remove unsympathetic additions to the existing heritage building (subject to separate Heritage review and advice) and the insertion of a contemporary horizontal canopy that supports the adaptive re-use of the heritage building and assists in mediating between the scale of the house and the tower podium
  - the introduction of a pocket park / lawn area to the southeast corner of the site to increase the overall landscape provision
  - the intention for a refined and simple palette of materials to create a refined and uncluttered urban environment
  - the potential establishment of a shared way along the southern edge of the site to increase urban connectivity, porosity and potential tree canopy coverage (see notes below regarding Basement Access and Servicing).
- The Jury encourages the design team to:
  - design the landscaped areas around the building as clear legible extensions of the public domain to be welcoming for both residents, workers and visitors
  - increase tree canopy coverage across the site to meet or exceed the required targets (the rendered views appeared to include more trees than the plans)
  - extend the Connecting with Country strategy through detailed landscape design, species selection, naming and artwork strategies
  - configure the basement to protect the existing trees including the significant Fig tree on Albert Avenue with input from an Arborist
  - consider how green infrastructure might be included for the management of stormwater, both for the purposes of retention and re-use on site, and for minimising downstream pollution of waterways
  - ensure that planting areas are well provisioned with soil and water to allow planting to thrive and understand the impacts of wind on planting and the

viability of the larger trees illustrated within the proposal (including upper levels) and determine whether additional screening will be required for wind control

- identify plant species best suited to each elevation and microclimate.

### **Basement Entry and Servicing**

- Two options were presented by the design team:
  - a compliant option with loading and servicing functions located in the basement
  - a non-compliant option where loading and servicing functions are accommodated on the ground level with access via a shared way to the south of the tower
  - the Jury notes that issues had been identified in both options as part of the Technical Review requiring further attention.
- While acknowledging the misalignment of the non-compliant option with Willoughby Council requirements, the Jury identified a series of urban benefits in the establishment of a shared way to the south of the building including:
  - improved urban connectivity, porosity and walkability in an area where significant residential density is proposed
  - greater opportunities for fine-grain commercial tenancies around the base of the building to support site and precinct activation
  - potential for greater tree canopy and landscape to combat urban heat
  - the reduction of built form massing adjacent to the existing heritage building resulting in a more sympathetic outcome
  - reinforcement of the architectural concept of a free-standing tower in a landscaped setting on a site with three existing street frontages
  - greater potential to integrate the site with the landscaped character of the adjacent heritage conservation area.
- The design team is encouraged to continue their investigations with specialist consultant input including planning, traffic, safety, structural, waste and acoustic advice to refine these options for further consideration.

### **Rooftop Communal Open Space**

- The Jury supports the configuration of the communal open space as a roof terrace with a series of enclosed, semi-enclosed and outdoor spaces and encourages the design team to obtain input from a specialist wind consultant to address and mitigate any adverse impacts on the amenity and use of these facilities.
- Consideration could be given to decanting some of the communal space to the podium, however the Jury strongly supports communal space on the rooftop given the potential for excellent district views for residents and their guests, and the contribution of these facilities and spaces to the roofscape silhouette.

## **Address, Lobby and Core Design**

- The Jury supports the location and character of the Archer Street residential address but questioned the size and configuration of the ground floor residential lobby including the lack of BOH areas such as a mail/parcel delivery room. Members of the Jury also questioned whether the lobby should extend through the building as a link? The design team is encouraged to consider this as part of the wider consideration of the ground floor and basement access/servicing.
- The Jury questioned the provision of two residential lifts and whether a third lift may be required given the number and size of apartments to be serviced? Obtain specialist consultant advice to confirm lift requirements.
- Ensure there is sufficient rubbish chute provision on each level including recycling with a preference for a dedicated recycling chute rather than a diverter mechanism.
- The Jury supports the provision of a dedicated commercial lift, stair and lobby and considers them important elements to be retained. The location of this lobby could be reconsidered as part of the wider ground floor design review.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this proposal. Please contact Mecone directly if you require any additional information.

Yours sincerely,



Matthew Bennett  
GANSW Nominee and Jury Chair  
Director, Bennett and Trimble, Architect #8538  
BSc (Arch) BArch Medal (Usyd), M.Arch (Harvard)  
NSW State Design Review Panel





# Appendix 2

# Design Competition Brief

# 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood

Architectural Design Competition Brief

PREPARED FOR

Coronation Property Co. Pty Ltd

July 2023

MECONE.COM.AU



# Project Director

Ian Cady

## Contributors

Stephanie Wu

Michael Buckton

REVISION	REVISION DATE	STATUS	AUTHORISED: NAME & SIGNATURE
A	30 June 2023	Draft 1	Ian Cady 
B	7 July 2023	Final	Ian Cady 

\* This document is for discussion purposes only unless signed and dated by the persons identified. This document has been reviewed by the Project Director.

## Contact

### MECONE

Suite 1204b, Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street

Sydney, New South Wales 2000

[info@mecone.com.au](mailto:info@mecone.com.au)

[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)

© Mecone

All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, transmitted, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language in any form by any means without the written permission of Mecone. All Rights Reserved. All methods, processes, commercial proposals and other contents described in this document are the confidential intellectual property of Mecone and may not be used or disclosed to any party without the written permission of Mecone.



# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>General Information</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1	Overview, Purpose of the Competitive Design Process	8
1.2	Planning Background	8
1.3	The Proponent	9
1.4	The Consent Authority	9
1.5	The Architectural Design Competition Brief	9
1.6	Competition Management	10
1.7	Key Dates	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Site Description &amp; Context</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1	Site & Context Overview	14
2.2	Site & Context Photographs	15
2.3	Potential View Opportunities	16
2.4	Subject Site Ground Conditions	17
2.4.1	Topography	17
2.4.2	Ground Conditions	17
2.4.3	Utilities	17
2.5	Heritage	17
<b>3</b>	<b>Planning Context</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1	Willoughby LEP and Draft DCP	19
<b>4</b>	<b>Project Objectives</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Residential Tower Considerations	23
4.1.1	Product Positioning & Customer Orientation	23
4.1.2	Unit Mix	23
4.1.3	Apartment Design	23
4.2	Retail/Commercial Podium Considerations	25
4.2.1	Rationale for Retail/Commercial Podium	25
4.2.2	Floor Space Allocation and Functions	25
4.3	Heritage	26
4.4	Façade	27
4.5	Facilities	27
4.6	Traffic access and loading	27



4.6.1	Vehicular access.....	27
4.6.1.1	Compliant option .....	27
4.6.1.2	Alternative option .....	28
4.6.2	Loading requirements .....	28
4.6.2.1	Compliant option .....	28
4.6.2.2	Alternative option .....	28
4.7	Flooding.....	28
4.8	Structural Design .....	29
4.8.1	Basement Structure .....	29
4.8.2	Foundations.....	29
4.8.3	Roof Structure .....	29
4.9	Building Services & Plant.....	29
4.10	Tree Retention.....	29
4.11	Environmentally Sustainable Design.....	30
4.12	Public Art .....	31
<b>5</b>	<b>Competition Procedures.....</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Design Excellence .....	32
5.2	Architectural Design Competition Entry.....	33
5.3	Competition Manager.....	33
5.4	Impartial Observers.....	33
5.5	The Competition Jury.....	33
5.6	Jury Chair .....	34
5.7	Jurors Obligations.....	34
5.8	Proponents Obligations.....	34
5.9	Technical Assistance to the Jury .....	35
5.10	Technical Assistance to Competitors.....	35
5.11	Technical Advisor Obligations .....	35
5.12	Communication and Questions .....	35
5.13	Closing Date for Final Submissions .....	35
5.14	Lodgement of Submissions.....	35
5.15	Late Submissions .....	36
5.16	Presentation Date – Presentation Material.....	36
5.17	Disqualification.....	36
5.18	Jury Assessment and Decision .....	36



5.19 Appointment of the Architect of the Winning Scheme ..... 37

5.20 Architectural Design Competition Report ..... 37

5.21 Announcement..... 37

5.22 Competition Fee ..... 37

5.23 Copyright ..... 38

**6 Submission Requirements..... 39**

6.1 Submission Format..... 39

6.2 Documentation Requirements..... 39

6.3 Statement of Intent ..... 40

6.4 Statement of Compliance..... 40

6.5 Yield Analysis and Area Schedule ..... 40

6.6 Construction Cost ..... 40

6.7 ESD and Innovation ..... 40



# Schedule of Figures & Tables

Figure 1 – Subject site – 57-61 Archer Street & 34 Albert Avenue .....	8
Figure 2 – Site Context .....	15
Figure 3 – Site viewed from Archer Street looking east .....	15
Figure 4 – Site viewed from Albert Avenue looking South .....	16
Figure 5 – Site Viewed From Bertram Street Looking South West .....	16
Figure 6 – Site viewed from Bertram street looking west.....	16
Figure 7 – Heritage Map .....	18
Figure 8 – Road Widening .....	22
Figure 9 – Trees on Albert Avenue viewed from opposite footpath .....	30
Figure 10 – Trees on Albert Avenue viewed from crossover at 57-61 Archer Street .....	30
TABLE 1 – TABLE OF APPENDICES .....	7
TABLE 2 – DESIGN COMPETITION DATES .....	10
TABLE 3 – PLANNING CONTROL OVERVIEW.....	20
TABLE 4 – DESIRED UNIT MIX.....	23



**TABLE 1 – TABLE OF APPENDICES**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>PREPARED BY</b>
1	Site Survey	Stuart De Nett Land Surveyors
2	Heritage Brief	NBRS
	Building Services Requirements	
3	3a. Engineering Design Guide 3b. Engineering Options Analysis 3c. Services Infrastructure Report	Neuron
4	Traffic Brief	Stantec
5	Flood Impact Statement	IGS
6	ESD Brief	IGS
7	Structural Engineering Brief	Coronation
8	Retail Analysis	Coronation
9	Yield Analysis and Area Schedule Template	Mecone
10	Summary of Key Statutory Planning Controls	Mecone
11	Design Competition Assessment Criteria	Mecone
12	Photomontages (to follow)	Sky monkey

*With the exception of appendices containing planning controls:*

- *Where there is any inconsistency between the Brief and appendices, the Brief prevails.*
- *Where there is any inconsistency between the Appendices and the planning controls, the planning controls prevail.*
- *Information and assumptions contained within appendices.*
  - *May not be wholly current at the time this Brief was endorsed.*
  - *Are for the purpose of this Competitive Design Process only and may be preliminary in status.*
  - *Are not to infer or to be taken as an approval, agreement or endorsement by Council.*
- *In no way fetter the Council's determination in regard to compliance with the relevant planning controls and General Information.*



# 1 General Information

## 1.1 Overview, Purpose of the Competitive Design Process

The purpose of the Invited Architectural Design Competition (Design Competition) is to select the highest quality architectural, landscape and urban design solution with the objective of exhibiting design excellence for the development of 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood (the site) in accordance with the Willoughby City Council Design Excellence Policy.

The redevelopment of the site represents opportunity to develop a new, significant, environmentally innovative and elegant building within the Chatswood CBD.



FIGURE 1 – SUBJECT SITE – 57-61 ARCHER STREET & 34 ALBERT AVENUE  
Source: Mecone Mosaic

## 1.2 Planning Background

A Planning Proposal (PP-2021-6242) has been prepared by Council to undertake a comprehensive review of *Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012* (LEP 2012) and Willoughby Development Control Plan (DCP) to establish planning controls to deliver the vision and objectives of Council's Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS), implement recommendations of strategic planning studies and updated the provisions in LEP 2012 and DCP. The Planning Proposal was exhibited from 15 March 2022 to 8 July 2022. The amended Willoughby LEP was gazetted on 30 June 2023, with the DCP anticipated to be finalised by end of July.



The amended LEP provides the site with:

- Rezoning the site from R3 Medium Density Residential to B4 Mixed Use
- Increasing the maximum permitted building height from 9m to 23m for 34 Albert Avenue and 90m for 57-61 Archer Street
- Increasing the floor space ratio (FSR) from 0.7:1 to 5:1
- Introducing a 10% affordable housing contribution
- Identifying the site as part of a Special Provisions Area to implement controls relating to affordable housing, design excellence, minimum commercial GFA, and minimum lot size.

## 1.3 The Proponent

The Proponent for the Project is Coronation Property Co Pty Ltd. Three (3) Competitors have been invited to prepare schemes for the site:

- Woods Bagot
- Fender Katsalidis
- PBD Architects

## 1.4 The Consent Authority

The site is located within the Willoughby Local Government Area (LGA). Willoughby City Council (WCC) will assess the Development Application (DA) and either the Willoughby Local Planning Panel or the Sydney North Planning Panel will likely determine the Development Application.

## 1.5 The Architectural Design Competition Brief

This brief sets out the objectives of the proposal, the basis for participation and the responsibilities of the Proponents and Jury, the role of WCC together with, the Competition procedures.

As required by WCC Design Excellence Policy, WCC has reviewed this brief and has endorsed this invited Architectural Design Competition.

The outcome of this invited Architectural Design Competition does not alter the decision of the Consent Authority in the determination of any subsequent Development Applications for this project. The Consent Authority will not form part of the Jury although representatives from Council will act as impartial observers to the Architectural Design Competition.

NOTE: Nothing in this Brief approves a departure from the relevant planning controls including any relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), the LEP 2012, DCP, or the Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA), in the event of any inconsistency between this brief and the relevant planning controls, the relevant planning controls and the VPA prevail.



## 1.6 Competition Management

Mecone have been appointed as the competition manager. All communications with the Competition Manager are to comply with the communication protocols set out in this brief.

Competition Manager  
Ian Cady  
Director  
Mecone  
E [icady@mecone.com.au](mailto:icady@mecone.com.au)  
T 0411 957 292

## 1.7 Key Dates

The Design Competition will run over an approximate 10-week period from the Commencement Date to the Final Submissions Lodgement Date with an additional week for Competitors to prepare presentation material. Key dates for the Design Competition are as follows:

**TABLE 2 – DESIGN COMPETITION DATES**

WEEK	DATE	MILESTONE/COMPETITION PROCESS
Week 1	10 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 (Start date)	<b>Commencement, Briefing Session and Site Visit</b> The Invited Competitive Design Process begins. Brief issued to the invited Competitors. A Briefing Session to all Competitors will be conducted at 11.00am (AEST) by Mecone and the proponent at Mecone's offices: Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000 <b>Competitors to agree submission documentation</b> (Number of CGI's, page limit etc. noting information submitted in addition to that agreed will be redacted from final submissions) An opportunity will be offered to conduct a site visit immediately following the briefing.
Week 1-3	10 <sup>th</sup> July – 28 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 (3 weeks)	<b>Initial concept development</b> Competitors may seek feedback from the competition manager on matters arising from design progression. The competition manager will coordinate responses from technical consultants and Council as required and issue advice to all competitors.
Week 3	28 <sup>th</sup> July 2023	<b>Midpoint Review</b>



	<p>Competitors are encouraged to prepare a progress package including plans, sections, elevations, façade details in CAD, indicative finishes, project data.</p> <p>The following documentation is recommended to be available for the preliminary concept presentation at the Mid- Point Progress Session to assist. The list below is not mandatory but recommended to allow meaningful discuss and feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site plan including public realm layouts; including indicative concept landscape locations</li> <li>• Basement, Ground Floor, typical and atypical upper and lower-level plans</li> <li>• Plant level (if applicable) and roof plan</li> <li>• Section and elevations showing RLs</li> <li>• Typical layouts for each apartment type (1:50)</li> <li>• Area Schedule as per standard template</li> <li>• Description of the façade</li> <li>• Descriptions/concepts for the retail precinct</li> <li>• Material use schedule</li> <li>• Axonometric plans</li> <li>• Discussion on pedestrian comfort and wind impacts associated with the podium</li> </ul> <p>Competitors are advised to outline the draft yields within the spreadsheet provided in <b>Appendix 9</b>.</p> <p>Competitors are allocated 20 minutes to present the package, followed by 20 minutes for feedback. Presentations will be scheduled as follows:</p> <p><b>Presentation 1:</b> 13.00</p> <p><b>Presentation 2:</b> 14.00</p> <p><b>Presentation 3:</b> 15.00</p> <p>The midpoint review will be held at Mecone’s Office at Level 12, 179 Elizabeth Street, Sydney.</p>
<p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p><b>28<sup>th</sup> July – 4<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b></p> <p>(1 week)</p>	<p><b>Proponent review of midpoint submissions</b></p> <p>Competitors may seek feedback from the competition manager on matters arising from design progression. The competition manager will coordinate responses from technical consultants and Council as required and issue advice to all competitors.</p>
<p><b>Week 5-6</b></p> <p><b>7<sup>th</sup> August – 18<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b></p> <p>(2 weeks)</p>	<p><b>Concept Finalisation</b></p> <p>Competitors to prepare final package in accordance with the documentation requirements in <b>Section 6.2</b> for submission.</p>



<p><b>Week 6</b></p>	<p><b>18<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b></p>	<p><b>Final Submission Lodgement Date</b></p> <p>Competitors are to submit electronic copies of all relevant documentation <b>to the Competition Manager by 5.30pm (AEST) 18<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b>. Competition Manager is to issue electronic copy of Final submissions to the Jury &amp; Willoughby City Council by 12noon (AEST) the following Friday.</p>
<p><b>21<sup>st</sup> August 2023</b></p>		<p><b>Presentation Material Lodgement Date</b></p> <p>Competitors submit PowerPoint presentation to the Competition Manager by 5.00pm (AEST) 21<sup>st</sup> August 2023 for audit prior to Presentation Date. The Competition Manager will redact any additional content beyond the agreed scope at the competition briefing. Competitors will be notified of any redactions.</p>
<p><b>23<sup>rd</sup> August 2023</b></p> <p>(3 working days)</p>		<p><b>Technical Assessment by Proponent's Technical Advisors</b></p> <p>Proponent's technical advisors to submit reports reviewing each of the Competitors submissions to the Competition Manager by 5.30pm (AEST) for distribution to the Jury &amp; Willoughby City Council. Technical advisors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- QS</li> <li>- Structural</li> <li>- Heritage (by Council's heritage advisor)</li> <li>- Planning compliance</li> </ul>
<p><b>Week 7</b></p>	<p><b>25<sup>th</sup> August 2023</b></p> <p>(1 week)</p>	<p><b>Presentation Date</b></p> <p>Competitors to present Final Submissions to the Jury. Presentations to be held at Mecone's office at Suite 1204, 179 Elizabeth Street, Sydney NSW 2000.</p> <p>The schedule of the presentations will be as follows:</p> <p><b>Presentation 1:</b> 9.00-10.00</p> <p><b>Presentation 2:</b> 10.15-11.15</p> <p><b>Presentation 3:</b> 11.30 – 12.30</p> <p><b>Jury Deliberation:</b> 12.30-2.30</p> <p>Presentations should be no longer than 25 minutes and will be followed by 20 minutes for questions.</p> <p>Time will be allocated after the 3<sup>rd</sup> presentation for Jury deliberation. The Jury may advise of a winner on the presentation date.</p>



<b>Week 9</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> September 2023</b> (2 weeks)	<b>Decision Date</b> Submissions will be evaluated by the Jury with a recommendation made for the formal appointment of a successful Competitor within 14 days of the Presentation Date.
<b>Week 10</b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup> September 2023</b> (5 working days)	<b>Notification to Competitors</b> Date by which all Competitors are notified in writing of the Decision.  <b>Design Competition Report</b> Date by which the Design Competition Report prepared by the Proponent is submitted to the Willoughby City Council.



## 2 Site Description & Context

### 2.1 Site & Context Overview

The subject site is known as 57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue, Chatswood and legally described as SP81015 and SP101358 (**Figure 1**). The site has an area of approximately 2,645.11m<sup>2</sup> and is a regular shape.

The Competitive Design Process is intended to apply to the whole of the site.

The site has frontages to Archer Street to the west, Albert Avenue to the north and Bertram Street to the east. The site currently comprises a multi dwelling housing at 57-61 Archer Street in the west and a local heritage item being 152 – *House (including original interiors)* at 34 Albert Avenue in the east.

The site is located approximately 533m east of the Chatswood Transport Interchange with access to Metro, train and bus services. It is also approximately 300m from the central retail / civic precinct of Chatswood, which includes large scale shopping centres (Westfield, Mandarin Centre and Chatswood Chase) and cultural facilities at The Concourse.

Existing development in the immediate vicinity include:

- North: Chatswood Police Station and commercial development, including allied health services, office buildings and local businesses
- South: Low to medium density residential dwellings
- East: Early learning centre and childcare facility, and low-density residential dwellings
- West: 10-storey hotel development, Chatswood Private Hospital and high-density residential development





**FIGURE 2 – SITE CONTEXT**  
 Source: Mecone Mosaic

## 2.2 Site & Context Photographs



**FIGURE 3 – SITE VIEWED FROM ARCHER STREET LOOKING EAST**  
 Source: Google Street View





**FIGURE 4 – SITE VIEWED FROM ALBERT AVENUE LOOKING SOUTH**  
*Source: Google Street View*



**FIGURE 5 – SITE VIEWED FROM BERTRAM STREET LOOKING SOUTH WEST**  
*Source: Google Street View*



**FIGURE 6 – SITE VIEWED FROM BERTRAM STREET LOOKING WEST**  
*Source: Google Street View*

## 2.3 Potential View Opportunities

Potential view opportunities were explored by Skymonkey. Existing ground level views are dominated by the existing commercial and residential development to the north, south, east and west.



Potential elevated panoramic views include:

- City views to the south-east and south-west.
- Bushland views to the north and north-west.

Design should be optimised to take advantage of these views but should also consider the future development of neighbouring sites, and how these may limit the expanse of such views. In particular, developments at:

- Directly to the south, which are also subject to Council's Planning Proposal with increased height limits to:
  - 90m at 51-55 Archer Street
  - 68m at 37-49 Archer Street
  - 41m at 29-35 Archer Street

## 2.4 Subject Site Ground Conditions

### 2.4.1 Topography

The site has a gradual slope falling approximately 1-2m across the length of the site from south to north. A detailed survey of the site is provided in **Appendix 1**.

### 2.4.2 Ground Conditions

Based on known geotechnical data in the Chatswood area, the subsurface profile potentially comprises fill overlying stiff clay, then weathered low strength shale bedrock encountered at between 8m to 17m deep below the Natural Ground Level (NGL). The water table is likely to be approximately 5-11m deep below NGL subject to detailed geotechnical investigation.

### 2.4.3 Utilities

There is an existing sewer pipe along the eastern and southern boundaries of 57-61 Archer Street. A minimum 1.5m from the centreline of the sewer to the edge of the shoring zone is to be provided.

## 2.5 Heritage

The eastern portion of the site (34 Albert Avenue) is identified to contain a local heritage item under the LEP, being I52 – *House (including original interiors)*.

To the east, the site is adjacent to the South Chatswood Heritage Conservation Area of local significance and a local heritage item being I51 – *House (including original interiors)* at 28 Albert Avenue to the east across Bertram Street. To the south east, a local heritage item being I103 – *House (including original interiors)* is located at 34 Neridah Street.


To the north, a heritage tree being I237 – *Angophora costata* (tree) is located at 63 Archer Street.

Specifically, the NSW State Heritage Inventory identifies the significance of the heritage item within the site as:



34 Albert Avenue has historic local significance as a relatively intact house in the late Victorian Italianate style. It is representative of the modest cottage scale of residential development that was constructed in Chatswood following the arrival of the railway in 1890.

Further details of the significance and history of the site are provided in the Heritage Brief at **Appendix 2**.



**FIGURE 7 – HERITAGE MAP**  
Source: NSW Government



## 3 Planning Context

A summary of the key statutory planning controls is provided in **Appendix 12**. Competitors are responsible for ensuring that relevant planning controls are addressed in their design submissions.

All schemes must be fully compliant with the recently gazetted Willoughby LEP. Non-compliances with the Draft DCP are discouraged by the Proponent and the Consent Authority. However, if Competitors feel there are significant design or environmental benefits through minor non-compliances, details should be included within their submission as an “Option”. In every submission, there should be a fully compliant option.

The Draft DCP controls applicable to the site are set out in Part L Section 4 and provide a building envelope on the site which is defined by street, podium and tower setbacks. Each competitor’s submission is required to respond to these. Any instance of non-compliance in the submissions must be justified against the objectives of the applicable planning controls. This justification must be included in the Statement of Compliance as part of the Competitors final submission. Refer to the summary of the key statutory planning controls in **Appendix 10** for more information.

In addition to the Draft DCP, the following other key planning instruments must be carefully considered through the Architectural Design Competition process:

- *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Apartment Development* (SEPP 65) and the Apartment Design Guide (ADG)
- Willoughby LEP
- Current DCP
- Chatswood CBD Planning & Urban Design Strategy 2036
- Other relevant Willoughby City Council and applicable State plans and policies

### 3.1 Willoughby LEP and Draft DCP

The site is zoned MU1 Mixed Use under the amended Willoughby LEP. The new LEP provides the following controls:

- Maximum building height of 23m for 34 Albert Avenue and 90m for 57-61 Archer Street
- Maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of to 5:1
- A 10% affordable housing contribution
- Identifies the site as part of a Special Provisions Area to implement controls relating to affordable housing, design excellence, minimum non-residential floor space and minimum lot size.

The objectives of Part L of the Draft DCP are as follows:

- Establish a strong framework to guide development in Chatswood CBD and the local retail/commercial centres
- Provide capacity for growth by increasing residential densities and create job opportunities by making provision for more commercial floor space
- Achieve exceptional design, and distinctive, resilient and vibrant centres
- Create attractive and thriving local retail/commercial centres



- Protect the heritage values of heritage listed items and ensure any new development integrates with the character of heritage conservation areas
- Provide greening on and around buildings, and improve pedestrian and cycle links

An overview of the planning controls in accordance with new Willoughby LEP and Draft DCP is provided below. These should be adhered to for the Architectural Design Competition.

**TABLE 3 – PLANNING CONTROL OVERVIEW**

ITEM	CONTROL
Site Area	2,645.11m <sup>2</sup> Note: The site area will be confirmed upon receipt of final survey
Maximum FSR	5:1
Height Limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90m at 57-61 Archer Street</li> <li>• 23m at 34 Albert Avenue</li> </ul>
Non-residential floor space	17% of the building's gross floor area (GFA)
Maximum GFA at each level for residential towers above the podium level	700m <sup>2</sup>
Street Wall Height	<p>Albert Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maximum 24m street wall height</li> </ul> <p>Bertram Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maximum 7m street wall height</li> </ul> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On corner sites where different setbacks and street frontage height precincts meet, the greater setback and lower street wall height required on the primary frontage is to continue around the corner for a minimum distance of 6m. This is to provide a satisfactory transition between the setbacks and wall heights.</li> <li>• Street wall heights lower than the maximum are encouraged at the interface with low density residential conservation area.</li> </ul>
Minimum Podium Setback	<p>Albert Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum 3m setback at ground level from front boundary, with intermitted wider open space (note consideration to be given to required retention of trees on Albert Avenue footpath)</li> </ul> <p>Archer Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maximum 6m setback at ground level from front boundary</li> </ul> <p>Bertram Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum 6m setback at ground level from front boundary</li> </ul> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On corner sites where different setbacks and street frontage height precincts meet, the greater setback and lower street wall height required on the primary frontage is to continue</li> </ul>



	<p>around the corner for a minimum distance of 6m. This is to provide a satisfactory transition between the setbacks and wall heights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With setbacks of 3m or more, deep soil planting for street trees is to be provided</li> <li>• Setbacks greater than the minimum are encouraged, particularly at the interface with low density residential conservation areas.</li> </ul>
Minimum setback above street wall	<p>Albert Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3m setback above street wall to tower</li> </ul> <p>Archer Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no setback from podium to tower</li> </ul> <p>Bertram Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum 3m setback above street wall to tower</li> </ul>
Through-site links	All proposals must consider the potential for through links to public places. (Note no apparent links are evident.)
Active Street Frontages	All premises on the ground floor of the building facing the street are to be used for the purposes of commercial premises.
Traffic and Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one entry into and existing a site is permitted</li> <li>• All loading docks, including provision for garbage trucks and residential removal trucks are to be within basement areas with adequate onsite manoeuvrability. This is to ensure vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward direction.</li> <li>• Note: Willoughby City Council does not generally support mechanical systems, such as turntables to facilitate vehicles entering and leaving the site in a forward direction.</li> </ul>
Parking (Current DCP)	<p>Shop top housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studio - 0.5 space</li> <li>• 1 space / dwelling (other than studios)</li> <li>• Visitor spaces - 1 per 4 dwellings</li> </ul> <p>Office/business premises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 / 110m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul> <p>Shop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 space / 25m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul> <p>Restaurants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 space / 75m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All roofs up to 30m from the ground are to be green roofs (in particular podium roofs)</li> <li>• Minimum 20% of the site area is to be soft landscaping, which may be on the ground, podium, and roof top levels of buildings</li> <li>• Soft landscaping must be a minimum depth of 600mm</li> </ul>
Substation	Substations are to be within buildings, not within a street, open space or setback. They must not face key active street frontages.



Road widening	<p>A 3m wide strip of land at 34 Albert Avenue (corner of Bertram Street) is to be required for road widening (see <b>Figure 8</b> below). The 3m strip of land will be dedicated to Council as part of future development.</p> <p>FSR is to be calculated based on the site area before dedication to Council. However, physical building works is to be excluded within the land to be dedicated to Council.</p>
Public Art	<p>Provision is to be made for Public Art in accordance with Council's Public Art Policy.</p>
Building Sustainability	<p>Minimum 4-star rating and aspire to achieve a 5-star rating using the most recent and relevant Green Star rating tool (or equivalent)</p>



**FIGURE 8 – ROAD WIDENING**  
 Source: Willoughby City Council



## 4 Project Objectives

Design considerations for the residential component are outlined in the following sections.

### 4.1 Residential Tower Considerations

#### 4.1.1 Product Positioning & Customer Orientation

The site is in a prime location and will have wide appeal, more so to owner-occupiers rather than investors. The development needs to be targeted towards this market. A higher number of three-bedroom apartments in line with market demand, is the preference. Flexible and modular floorplates are favoured such that the floorplate is capable of accommodating a variety of unit mix.

#### 4.1.2 Unit Mix

Preliminary market research undertaken by the proponent indicates a yield of approximately 109 units you are encouraged to explore this further. The desired unit mix is as follows:

**TABLE 4 – DESIRED UNIT MIX**

Unit Type	1 Bed	1 Bed + Study	2 Beds	3 Beds	3 Beds + Study	Sub Penthouse	Penthouse	Total
Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	50-52m <sup>2</sup>	57-58m <sup>2</sup>	80-85m <sup>2</sup>	110m <sup>2</sup>	125m <sup>2</sup> +	140-170m <sup>2</sup>	120m <sup>2</sup>	
Ratio	9%		53%		34%	4%		100%

Larger apartments are to be located higher in the building relative to smaller units, and north-east corner position to be occupied by larger apartments.

#### 4.1.3 Apartment Design

Apartments are to comply with *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development* and the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). Apartment planning is to use spaces efficiently and be planned to enhance the premium quality standard of the residential component. The following should be considered in the detailed planning of all apartments:

##### General Requirements

- Orientation of balconies, main living spaces and master bedrooms should aim to be towards the key views where possible, noting neighbouring development opportunities which may limit existing views.
- The entry foyer to the residential apartments needs to be separate from the commercial foyer and for the exclusive use of the residential owners.
- Room designs with angled walls should be avoided.
- Subject to meeting ADG requirements, larger apartments should be positioned in the best locations. Ideally, all three-bedroom apartments should be in corner positions.
- Amenities provided should be family-friendly, including a gym and a swimming pool (desirable, but not essential).



- To meet the design brief regarding the depth of living rooms and comply with ADG, living rooms will likely need to be on the facade of the building with an offset balcony beside same
- Avoid positioning three-bedroom apartment next to a one-bedroom on the same floor and ideally one-bedroom apartment be located on lower floors in the building.

#### **One-bedroom design requirements**

- These units should be designed to the minimum size, ideally with an island kitchen and a living room that is 4m x 5.5m in size.
- The balcony should be designed to meet the ADG minimum size requirements.
- The entry to the bedroom should be positioned to allow for 3m of robe area, in line with the width of the bedroom.

#### **Two-bedroom design requirements**

- Living rooms should have a minimum size of 4m x 6m, and where larger in area, the living room can be up to 6.5m to 7m in depth.
- Each unit should include an ensuite and a main bathroom, with no need for a bath.
- Cupboard laundries are sufficient, but they should not be positioned in the living room.
- If the area allows, the inclusion of a media desk is of value.
- Kitchens should include an island bench that allows for seating.
- Preferably, balconies should be slightly larger than the ADG minimum, i.e., 12m<sup>2</sup> to 14m<sup>2</sup>.

#### **Three-bedroom design requirements**

- Living areas should have a minimum depth of 7m, and where the apartment is 120m<sup>2</sup> to 125m<sup>2</sup> in area, a living room width of 4.5m and depth of 7.5m.
- Further, small three-bedroom apartment kitchens need to be a minimum width of 3m and have an island bench. Where the living room is wider, the kitchen should also be increased in size, ideally with an L-shaped return providing additional storage.
- Smaller designs should provide a minimum of 3m of robe area to the main bedroom, and where larger three-bedroom apartments provide a minimum of 4m of robe, ideally walking through to an ensuite. Ensuites should allow space for double basins.
- One of the bathrooms should include a bath, and where included in the ensuite, it should be separate from the shower.
- Cupboard laundries should be avoided, i.e., laundries should be walk-in rooms.
- In the larger design, the addition of a study room is preferable.
- Ideally, balconies should be larger than ADG minimum, i.e., 14m<sup>2</sup> to 16m<sup>2</sup>.



### **Sub Penthouse design requirements**

- Preferably, one of these designs should be around 160m<sup>2</sup> to 170m<sup>2</sup> and designed to provide four bedrooms, while the other two should be three-bedroom plus study designs. There should be additional area allocated to the living room, kitchen, and master bedrooms.

### **Penthouse design requirements**

- The apartment should be palatial in area with a view towards the city and ideally opening to the landscaped area as shown on the current plans. It should be a four-bedroom design, including a second bedroom with an ensuite and a guest WC. The design should allow for two separate living rooms: a combined living and dining area adjoining the kitchen, and a separate family or TV room. Additionally, if sufficient area should include a butler's kitchen.

## **4.2 Retail/Commercial Podium Considerations**

Design considerations for the retail/commercial and podium component are outlined in the following sections.

### **4.2.1 Rationale for Retail/Commercial Podium**

Competitors are encouraged to maximise activation of the ground floor and to considering the location and structure of the commercial scheme. Competitors shall balance site gradients with the need for accessibility, and a high-quality entry experience.

### **4.2.2 Floor Space Allocation and Functions**

The following design guidelines should be considered in the design development of the non-residential component of the podium. Regardless of the guidelines below, competitors are encouraged to think outside the box regarding the ground plane and broader development integrate with one another and the surrounding urban fabric to activate and support the local community.

The following desired floor space allocation and functions are to be considered:

- The non-residential component should seek to provide contiguous and flexible configuration of spaces suited to a diverse range of potential uses, including retail, café, co-working space, childcare centre, office and showroom space. Preference for any hospitality uses to benefit from street frontages.
- A residential lobby should be separated from the non-residential floor space.
- Careful consideration should be given to the relationship between the non-residential component and residential apartments immediately above regarding acoustic and visual privacy etc.
- Serviceability will be key for the non-residential component, ensuring future flexibility of tenancy types etc. Key items such as loading, waste and services should be considered including the provision for grease arrestors and storage for hospitality etc.



## 4.3 Heritage

NBRS has prepared a heritage brief to inform and guide design proposals for the site, with a view of conserving the significance of the heritage item located within the site and the heritage items in the vicinity. In particular, the principles include:

### 1. Sensitive interface

- a) *Ensure the visual curtilage of the heritage item is retained through careful design considerations that do not result in detracting from an understanding of the significance of the place.*
- b) *The built form and fenestration pattern is to be designed in a manner that is sympathetic to the heritage item.*
- c) *Consider a stepped transitional form adjacent the heritage item and towards the existing high-density developments located to the west of the subject site.*
- d) *The built form of any proposal is to avoid any new development from overpowering or looming in the vicinity of the heritage item.*
- e) *Select appropriate materials that are sympathetic to the heritage item and the surrounding context.*
- f) *Incorporate a clear setback between the heritage item and new development to preserve the visual and physical curtilage of the item.*

### 2. View lines and curtilage

- a) *Protect existing view lines to and from the heritage item from the public domain.*
- b) *Incorporate a setback between the heritage item and the new development to create a view line towards the western façade of the heritage item and to clearly articulate the curtilage of the heritage item.*
- c) *Retain the existing curtilage around the heritage item to preserve its visual and physical spatial integrity.*

### 3. Garden setting

- a) *Reinstate a period appropriate garden setting, including removing the existing hardstand carparking spots in front of the heritage item.*
- b) *Incorporate landscaping improvements to enhance the overall setting and create a visually appealing environment that complements the significance of the heritage item.*
- c) *Landscaping should optimise visual exposure of the heritage building to the street.*
- d) *Provide car parking spaces for the tenant of the heritage item within the proposed basement.*

### 4. Conservation works

- a) *As part of any design, conservation works on the heritage item to preserve its historical fabric, architectural elements, and significant features are to be acknowledged as part of any proposal.*

Further details of heritage principles are provided in the Heritage Brief at **Appendix 2**.



## 4.4 Façade

Façade design considerations include:

- The facade must provide visual and aesthetic performance, weather proofing, thermal insulation, acoustic insulation and resist structural forces. All nominated facade materials must comply with the relevant fire safety requirements - noting materials are not to include any PE or other flammable claddings.
- Careful consideration should be given to the thermal performance of the facades, with particular attention to the placement of windows and balconies.
- Facades should integrate greening to reflect the local context.
- Integrate building service elements, such as drainage pipes, grilles, screens, ventilation louvres and car park entry doors and substation into the overall facade design.
- Use of reflective materials should be carefully considered to avoid any undesirable glare for pedestrians, occupants, and other neighbouring buildings.
- The façade is to minimise wind impacts associated with the building, particularly with the podium roof.
- The façade is to be designed to mitigate heat load with consideration given to building sustainability requirements, in particular with Section J requirements (refer to ESD Brief at **Appendix 6**).

Further, the façade design costs allowances are:

- Assumed façade total area: 7,800m<sup>2</sup>
- Solid façade assumption: 60% total area \$580/m<sup>2</sup>
- Glass façade assumption: 40% total area \$750/m<sup>2</sup>
- Blended rate for façade: \$650/m<sup>2</sup>

## 4.5 Facilities

Communal facilities such as swimming pool and gym are encouraged, but not essential.

## 4.6 Traffic access and loading

A Traffic Briefing Note has been prepared by Stantec to provide high-level transport advice relating to vehicular access and loading requirements.

### 4.6.1 Vehicular access

#### 4.6.1.1 Compliant option

In accordance with Part L of the Draft DCP, only one entry area into and exiting a site is permitted. A winning scheme must have a design in accordance with this requirement. Archer Street should be used as the vehicular access point.



#### 4.6.1.2 Alternative option

Notwithstanding the above, competitors are encouraged to explore an alternative option involving residential access via Bertram Street and waste collection and loading access via Archer Street. This option will allow for separate access for residents and loading/waste collection activities and provide opportunities for the non-residential podium to address Albert Avenue and Archer Street and the residential tower to address Bertram Street. Consideration should also be given to an increased residential setback/entry to Bertram Street.

### 4.6.2 Loading requirements

#### 4.6.2.1 Compliant option

The Draft DCP requires all loading docks, including provision for garbage trucks and residential removal trucks to be within basement areas with adequate onsite manoeuvrability. This is to ensure vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward direction. It is noted that Council's garbage truck is a 10.5m MRV truck with a height clearance requirement of 4.5m. Compliance with Council's loading requirements is required to be demonstrated in the Compliant Option.

#### 4.6.2.2 Alternative option

Nonetheless, competitors are encouraged to explore an alternative option involving ground level loading and waste collection to minimise the spatial requirements for accommodating Council's waste truck in the basement levels. This option is required to provide forward ingress and egress without reliance on a turntable.

Further details of design specifications and traffic advice are provided in the Traffic Briefing Note at **Appendix 4**.

## 4.7 Flooding

A preliminary site-specific overland flow assessment (**Appendix 5**) has been prepared by IGS to identify approximate flood levels, depth and extent during 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) and Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) storm events.

The site is susceptible to overland flows from the upstream catchment. These flows progress along Archer and Bertram Streets in a northward direction. Within the site, the overland flows traverse from the southern boundary and exit through the northern boundary.

During flood events, the site experiences varying flood levels and depths. The south western corner of the site has a flood level of RL 88.67m AHD and the north eastern corner has a flood level of RL 86.90m AHD. Council's flood planning controls applicable to the site are:

- Minimum Required Habitable Flood Level = 1% AEP Flood Level + 0.5m Freeboard
- Minimum Required Non-Habitable Flood Level = 1% AEP Flood Level + 0.3m Freeboard
- Sensitive Use Developments / Basement and Entry to Basements = 1% AEP Flood Level + 0.5m Freeboard or PMF, whichever is greater



## 4.8 Structural Design

### 4.8.1 Basement Structure

The Structural Engineering Brief identifies that the provision of four basement levels will lead to approximately 12-13m excavation. The basement will be excavated through fill and stiff clay and shale bedrock encountering shallow water table. The basement will possibly be designed as drained basement.

The design architect should take the consideration of minimizing the basement depth to save cost of basement excavation, dewatering, and environmental protection work, etc.

There are several earth retention systems that could be adopted subject to detailed geotechnical investigation and report. A soldier piled wall retention system could potentially be adopted for this project. Competitors are to allow a minimum of 900mm structural zone for the construction of the retention system.

### 4.8.2 Foundations

The building structure will be supported on pad footings on shale (bedrock). The depth of the bedrock is approximately 8-17m below ground subject to detailed geotechnical engineering investigation.

### 4.8.3 Roof Structure

A flat plate concrete roof slab would be an economical solution that will provide the necessary fire rating and be suitable for building services plant.

Further details of the structural design requirements are provided at **Appendix 9**.

## 4.9 Building Services & Plant

The indicative Services requirements at **Appendix 3** provides preliminary spatial assumption for the purpose of the competitive process only and does not preclude alternative design strategies. These requirements are only intended to provide high level assumptions to cover off any significant spatial requirements. Competitors are not required to provide detailed building services designs.

Competitors should seek to provide sufficient space within the design to accommodate building plant and services. Plant must be fully concealed and located on the roof behind parapets not by screens or fences. Treatment/finishes to service and plant areas should be designed to conceal equipment and integrate seamlessly with the primary facade. Careful attention should be provided to the minimise rooftop mechanical plant, large discharge/intake louver panels, and fan units etc. away from view to reduce any visual and acoustic impacts.

Services at ground level shall be concealed from view where possible. Exposed pipework, ductwork and the like will not be supported.

Services rooms with fixed constraints such as Sprinkler Booster Valves, Fire Control Room, and Substation must be specifically identified in compliant locations.

## 4.10 Tree Retention

Significant trees (fig trees) along the Albert Avenue footpath are to be retained (refer to **Figures 9-10**). Removal of street trees on Archer Street may be required to facilitate site access.





**FIGURE 9 TREES ON ALBERT AVENUE VIEWED FROM OPPOSITE FOOTPATH**  
 Source: Coronation



**FIGURE 10 TREES ON ALBERT AVENUE VIEWED FROM CROSSOVER AT 57-61 ARCHER STREET**  
 Source: Coronation

## 4.11 Environmentally Sustainable Design

The Proponent is committed to ensuring this development exceeds all standard environmentally sustainable design standards including targeting 5 Star Greenstar Certification. All competitors should seek to provide best practice performance considering both sustainability and the evolving conditions of urban life including as a response to COVID-19.

The ESD Brief at **Appendix 6** identifies sustainable design initiatives to be considered that have the potential to reduce the environmental impact of the proposed development.

Of particular note, the ESD Brief outlines the following objectives:

- *Objective 1: improve the design to achieve sustainable and energy efficient buildings with low greenhouse gas emissions*
- *Objective 2: reduce waste and promote the adaptable re-use of existing buildings and encourage durable design and construction which is adaptable and low maintenance*
- *Objective 3: encourage the use of renewable energy and alternative water supply*
- *Objective 4: improve resident and employee comfort, health and wellbeing*
- *Objective 5: reduce natural resource consumption and source materials responsibly*
- *Objective 6: encourage sustainable water management*
- *Objective 7: consider climate adaptation and resilience*



- *Objective 8: promote sustainable transport management*

For developments that exceed at an estimated cost of \$30 million, the design of the proposed development is required to achieve a minimum 4-star Green Star rating or a 'Best Practice' standard using a similar rating tool. However, Council expects developments to achieve a minimum 5-star ('Australian excellence') rating or similar rating tool.

## 4.12 Public Art

The proponent is committed to the delivery of public art as part of the proposed development which should seek to emerge from the architectural design qualities of each competitor's proposal reflective of both the immediate and broader context. The public art objectives of the competition are to create opportunities for innovative artistic responses that:

- Respond the site's contextual location including proposed use and the constraints and opportunities of the site.
- Align with Willoughby City Council's Public Art Policy 2020.

It is expected that competitors' responses will include a preliminary public art strategy for the location, character and conceptual approach to the proposed development. However, the full public art strategy will accompany the future DA and the detailed planning and procurement of public art will occur following DA approval.



# 5 Competition Procedures

This brief has been prepared in accordance with the Willoughby Council Guidelines for Design Excellence Review and Competitions. The architectural design competition will be conducted in accordance with these guidelines. A copy of the guidelines can be found at the following link: <https://www.willoughby.nsw.gov.au/Council/Policies-Publications/Policies/Design-Excellence-Guidelines>

## 5.1 Design Excellence

Pursuant to clause 6.23(4) and (5) of the Willoughby LEP, in considering whether the development exhibits design excellence, regard must be had to the following matters –

- (a) whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved,***
- (b) whether the form, arrangement and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,***
- (c) whether the development detrimentally impacts on view corridors.***

Furthermore, regard must also be had to how the development addresses the following matters –

- (a) the suitability of the land for development,*
- (b) existing and proposed uses and use mix,*
- (c) heritage and streetscape constraints,*
- (d) the relationship of the development with other development (existing or proposed) on the same site or on neighbouring sites in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form,*
- (e) bulk, massing and modulation of buildings,*
- (f) street frontage heights,*
- (g) environmental impacts such as sustainable design, overshadowing, wind and reflectivity,*
- (h) achieving the principles of ecologically sustainable development,*
- (i) pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirements,*
- (j) the impact on, and proposed improvements to, the public domain,*
- (k) the impact on special character areas,*
- (l) achieving appropriate interfaces at ground level between the building and the public domain,*
- (m) excellence and integration of landscape design.*



## 5.2 Architectural Design Competition Entry

This architectural design competition is by invitation only and will include a total of three (3) competitors. Each competitor in this competition must be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with the *NSW Architects Act 2003*, or in the case of interstate or overseas competitors, eligible for registration. Each competitor shall be prepared to submit a design proposal that satisfies this brief.

## 5.3 Competition Manager

The competition will be overseen by Ian Cady, Competition Manager from Mecone whose role will be to manage the organisation and administration of the competition. The role of the Competition Manager will include:

1. Ensuring the competition is undertaken in accordance with Willoughby City Council Design Excellence Policy and this brief.
2. Acting as the first point of contact for the proponent, the competitors, Willoughby City Council and the Jury during the competition.
3. Facilitation of briefing, presentation and evaluation meetings.
4. Receiving of competitors questions during the competition and coordination of responses.
5. Ensuring the architectural submissions meet the requirements of the brief.
6. Assist in drafting of the competition design report.

**Note:** All communications with the Competition Manager are to comply with the communication protocols set out within this brief.

## 5.4 Impartial Observers

The competition will be overseen by an impartial observer appointed by Willoughby City Council. The observer will be present during all briefings and jury sessions. All information and responses issued to and received from Competitors and the Jury are to be copied to the observer.

## 5.5 The Competition Jury

The competition jury will comprise of five (5) jurors, two (2) of which will be nominated by Willoughby City Council who are to have no pecuniary interests in the development proposal. Two (2) of the members are to be nominated by the Proponent with the remaining juror to be from the NSW Government Architect's Office. If any of the jurors have to withdraw prior to the completion of the Competition, another juror of equivalent credentials will be appointed by whoever originally appointed that Juror member. Jury members are to:

- Represent the public interest.
- Be appropriate to the type of the development proposed.
- Include persons who have expertise in the design, development and construction professions and the property related industries.
- Include a majority of registered architects with urban design expertise



## 5.6 Jury Chair

The Jury is to agree on the selection of the Chairperson, the primary function of which will be to ensure the jury deliberations proceed in a fair and orderly manner. In coordination with the Competition Manager, the chair shall at conclusion of Jury deliberations, supervise the letter of notification to the winning and unsuccessful competitors; writing of the jury comments to be included in the Architectural Design Competition Report; and review the endorsement of the final Architectural Design Competition Report as prepared by the Proponent.

## 5.7 Jurors Obligations

The jury accepts and agrees in accepting the position that:

- Have no contact with any of the Competitors in relation to the subject site and the competition from their time of appointment until the completion of the process, other than during presentation of the submissions.
- Evaluate submissions promptly in accordance with the Competition timetable.
- Abide by the requirements of the Competition Brief.
- Follow complete confidentiality regarding the competition from time of appointment.
- Consider planning or other technical advice provided by Willoughby City Council.
- Retain from introducing irrelevant considerations in addition to or contrary to those described in the Competition Brief or contrary to the statutory framework relevant to the site.
- Make every effort to arrive at a consensus in the selection of a winner.
- Where possible, to defer non-essential detailed design matters to resolution as part of a development application.
- Prepare an Architectural Design Competition report explaining their decisions.

In accordance with the *Willoughby Design Excellence Guidelines*:

*'The panel members and chair are to complete their deliberations at the review session. However, if subsequent meetings are required, these must take place within 14 working days. **Requests for additional information should be avoided wherever possible**'.*

[our emphasis]

## 5.8 Proponents Obligations

- The proponent agrees to have no contact with the Jury members, competitors and/or elected Councillors in relation to the site and the Competition from their time of appointment until the completion of the process other than what is set out in this Brief.
- If Willoughby City Council is informed by a Jury member that they have been contacted by the Proponent or a Competitor in relation to the site or the Competition, then their involvement may be terminated.



## 5.9 Technical Assistance to the Jury

The proponent shall engage technical advisors to review each Competitors' submissions. They jury may seek independent technical assistance if required. The technical advisors will be strictly limited to technical and compliance matters pertaining to their professional discipline only. Technical Advisors shall refrain from providing advice on matters outside of their area of expertise.

## 5.10 Technical Assistance to Competitors

Competitors are encouraged to seek advice to achieve the best possible architectural outcome for their proposed scheme. All Competition and Technical Advisor communications must be submitted in writing to the Competition Manager in accordance with the communication protocols of this brief. Competitors may elect to appoint their own technical consultants as needed, all of which are keep the information confidential.

Note. All communications must be strictly confidential in accordance with the communication protocols set out within this brief.

## 5.11 Technical Advisor Obligations

The Proponent shall engage Technical Advisors to review each Competitor's submission and provide assistance to the Jury. Advice provided by Technical Advisors to Competitors and the Jury will be strictly limited to independent technical and compliance matters pertaining to their professional discipline only. Technical Advisors shall refrain from providing advice on matters outside of their remit.

## 5.12 Communication and Questions

Competitors should direct all communication regarding any clarifications on the Competition details in writing to the Competition Manager. All communication must be addressed to the Competition Manager directly. Except where specified otherwise in this brief, Competitors should not communicate verbally with Proponent, jury members, technical advisors, Willoughby City Council, consent authority or other competitors.

## 5.13 Closing Date for Final Submissions

Final submissions must be lodged no later than 5.30pm (AEST) on the Final Submission Lodgement Date. It is the sole responsibility of the competitor to ensure the actual delivery to the Competition Manager by the specified deadline.

## 5.14 Lodgement of Submissions

Competitors shall submit digital entries to the Competition Manager at the following address:

Competition Manager  
Ian Cady  
Director, Mecone  
E [icady@mecone.com.au](mailto:icady@mecone.com.au)  
T 0411 957 292



## 5.15 Late Submissions

Unless formally requested by the Proponent for the sole purpose of clarification, the Jury will not take into consideration any new materials submitted by Competitors following lodgement of Final Submissions.

## 5.16 Presentation Date – Presentation Material

On the Final Presentation Date, Competitors present their Final Submissions to the Jury. Competitors are to provide an electronic version of their presentation submission material to the competition manager by the start of the following week, in accordance with the Key Dates nominated in this brief. The competition manager will then audit the presentations. Note, new material is not to be included in the presentation which does not form part of the final submission. The competition manager will notify competitors if content is required to be redacted. On the final presentation date, the Jury may disqualify a competitor that presents new material that has not been submitted by the final submission due date.

## 5.17 Disqualification

Submissions that fail to meet the competition requirements may be disqualified, in particular where the submission is received after the final submissions lodgement time and date, contrary to the objectives of the Willoughby City Council planning controls, not submitted in accordance with the submission requirements as stated in the brief, or where the competitor attempts to influence the deliberations of any juror outside the final presentation date. All disqualifications will be determined by the jury.

## 5.18 Jury Assessment and Decision

A minimum of three (3) competitive submissions must be considered as part of this competition. The competition manager shall provide a digital copy of the Final Submissions to all jury members and Willoughby City Council. The competitors must present their final submissions to the Jury in person on the specified presentation date. The presentation must be no longer than 25min followed by 20min for questions from the jury. Each competitor's submission will be graded by the jury according to the assessment criteria provided in the **Appendix 11**.

The Jury is expected to reach a decision on the winner on the day of the final presentation. In exceptional circumstances, the jury may request a revision to submissions within 14 days of Final Presentations. For these submissions, the Jury will list the specific design issues that should be addressed and request the respective Competitors to amend their submission within a defined period of time (having regard to the extent of the requested amendments). Competitors must re-present their submission within 14 days of the initial presentation.

The Jury's decision will not fetter the discretion of the Consent Authority in its determination of any subsequent development application associated with the development site that is the subject of this competition.

The Jury may grade the designs in order of merit. The jury may decline to declare a winner of the Competition if none of the submissions exhibit design excellence. If the jury declines to declare a winner, the jury may recommend that none of the submissions in their opinion have the potential to exhibit design excellence and thus end the Competition.



## 5.19 Appointment of the Architect of the Winning Scheme

The Proponent shall appoint the Architect (winning Architect) of the winning submission as selected by the Jury. Full design and documentation of the winning scheme should then occur. To ensure that design quality continues through design development, construction drawings and into physical completion of the project, the designer of the winning scheme is to be nominated as design architect for the duration of the project which includes as a minimum:

1. Preparation of a DA.
2. Control over design decisions for a construction certificate and through to completion of a project.
3. Represent the project in meetings with the community, authorities, and stakeholders, as required.

The Winning Architect may work in conjunction with other architectural practices to meet the project documentation obligations but must retain control and leadership role over design decisions. In the event that the Proponent decides not to proceed with the Winning Architect, or the Proponent limits the architectural commission outlined above, the Proponent will:

1. Provide the Willoughby City Council with written reasons for this decision; and
2. Restart the Architectural Design Competition.

## 5.20 Architectural Design Competition Report

When the competition submissions have been assessed, the proponent is required to submit to Willoughby City Council a Competition Report. The report shall detail the competition process including a copy of the brief, the jury's assessment of the design and merits of each submission, the rationale for the choice of the preferred design and clearly demonstrate how this is the best exhibition of design excellence including finally any recommended design amendments. The proponent is to submit the Competition Report to Willoughby City Council as outlined in the key dates section of this brief.

## 5.21 Announcement

The winning architect will be notified of the jury's decision as per the date set out in the key dates section of this brief. The architectural design competition process results will be made public within 21 days of the decision date.

## 5.22 Competition Fee

A competition fee of \$75,000 AUD (plus GST) shall be paid to each competitor for participating in this invited architectural design competition. Each competitor can submit their competition fee invoice once the final submission has been received to the following:

Attention: Andrew Hall  
Coronation Property Co. Pty Ltd  
[a.hall@coronation.com.au](mailto:a.hall@coronation.com.au)

The proponent agrees to pay the competition fee to each competitor within 28 business days.



## 5.23 Copyright

Copyright for each submission shall remain in the ownership of the original authors unless separately agreed between the proponent and the architect. The proponent shall have the right to develop, rely on, display, photograph, publish or distribute the brief, submissions, presentation and reports for the purpose of publication, publicity or other such purposes which will acknowledge the copyright of the owners.



## 6 Submission Requirements

Competitors are encouraged to focus their submissions, only including the most pertinent information required to describe their proposals. This should include a weighted focus to graphical information including the use of diagrams, sketches and renderings etc. to inform the proposal. Competitors are advised that all presentation material should clearly identify the Competitors identity and be of suitable quality for public exhibition. A cover letter is recommended outlining the content submitted.

### 6.1 Submission Format

The final submission is to be submitted to the Competition Manager as a single digital folder transfer with no password.

### 6.2 Documentation Requirements

Submission documentation is to be limited of a **maximum of 40 x A3 pages**.

No appendices or supplementary information will be accepted (other than planning compliance assessment which may be an appendix).

The submission should include:

- **Aerial Photograph** identifying site within context.
- **Context Plan** – noting key contextual considerations.
- **Existing Site Plan** – per survey provided.
- **Site Analysis Plan** – noting key site considerations.
- **Concept Plan** – locating key public domain improvements, building form and massing relative to context.
- **Site Study** – including view analysis, overshadowing and solar access analysis, and consideration of subject site within broader framework of the Chatswood CBD Strategy.
- **Typical Plans** – including all key levels including basement levels, apartment layouts, lift core design, elevations and sections, showing levels for both schemes.
- **Area Schedule** – coordinated with typical plans including GBA, GFA, NSA and GLAR/NLA in addition to apartment mix and parking numbers/allocation etc.
- **Roof Plan** – providing RLs of all roof items including architectural roof features and cores etc.
- **Elevation Drawings** – showing and describing the various façade elements.
- **Typical Facade Detail** – including of different facade typologies pending the design, i.e. podium and tower.
- **Shadow Impact Diagrams** – demonstrating compliance with planning controls.
- **SEPP65 / ADG Diagrams** – demonstrating compliance including minimum solar gain and cross ventilation etc.
- **GFA Plan** – demonstrating calculation of GFA, coordinated with area schedule.
- **Ground and Level 1 Public Domain Plan** – demonstrating relationship with podium commercial/retail with the surrounding context including activation.
- **Streetscape Context Elevation** – demonstrating development within local context (i.e. to Albert Avenue, Archer Street and Bertram Street).
- **Concept Landscape Plan** – demonstrating vision for incorporation of landscaping both on public domain and communal roof garden including alignment with architectural vision.
- **Digital Material Board** – outlining indicative finishes and mood images for development.



- **3D Massing** – outlining the proposed form of the building including specific details not captured otherwise in 2D documentation.
- **Process Diagrams** – demonstrating the design process taken to reach the proposed outcome including form articulation etc.
- **3 x CGIs** – capturing proposed development within context including proposed materiality and landscaping.
- **Planning Diagrams and Drawings** – outlining compliance with Planning Proposal and Draft DCP.
- **Completion of the project data document** – provided to competitors in the form of a returnable schedule

**Note.** Competitors are to collectively agree to any variation to the above at the competition briefing. For the purpose of planning coordination, the winning Competitor may be required to submit to the Consent Authority DWG files of the ground floor, geo-spatially referenced with MGA coordinates.

## 6.3 Statement of Intent

Competitors are to provide a design statement of intent, outlining the proposals approach and the response to the brief's objectives including specifically, the manner in which Design Excellence and sustainability has been achieved.

## 6.4 Statement of Compliance

Competitors are to provide a Statement of Compliance prepared by a suitably qualified person indicating the proposals compliance with the relevant planning controls. This is to further outline any non-compliances with the site specific DCP including appropriate justifications. LEP non-compliances will not be accepted.

## 6.5 Yield Analysis and Area Schedule

Competitors are to submit a yield schedule that is floor by floor per the Yield Analysis and Area Schedule in **Appendix 8**. The schedule is to include Gross Floor Area (GFA) as per the LEP definition, Gross Building Area (GBA) measured from outside face of the external facade, Net Sellable Area (NSA) and Gross Lettable Area (GLAR), apartment mix and number including allocation of parking spaces. Competitors are to provide both PDF and Excel versions of the spreadsheet.

## 6.6 Construction Cost

All competitors' submissions will be costed and assessed by the proponent's appointed quantity surveyor. The maximum construction value is to be \$55 million (excl GST).

## 6.7 ESD and Innovation

As per the objectives of the development, ESD and innovation should be key considerations in all competitors' proposals, and therefore competitors should provide a statement summarising all proposed alternate initiatives including exceeding the minimum BASIX requirements, and targeted Greenstar Points in accordance with the ESD Brief. This statement should further seek to provide a cost benefit analysis for deviations to the Annexure documents in this brief.







# Appendix 3

## DIP Meeting Notes

## **57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue Chatswood NSW**

### **Design Integrity Panel**

**Matthew Bennett (Chair), Kim Crestani, Conrad Johnston**

13th September 2024

#### **Foreword**

The focus of this commentary will be on design and amenity impacts and merits of the 30% uplift proposal. The advice provided below does not fetter the discretion of the assessment authority in assessing impacts including but not confined to wind, overshadowing to public domain, shadow impacts on surrounding development, traffic, waste strategy, and the capacity of utilities.

#### **1. Amendments Supported by the Panel**

The Panel supports the following amendments to the scheme as they are consistent with the quality and strategies of the Design Excellence Competition proposal:

- Increased tower height resulting in a slender tower form
- Revised apartment plans including the provision of affordable housing
- Inclusion of an additional lift to the central core
- Reconfigured ground floor lobby serving both market and affordable housing
- Refinement of the proposed balcony balustrades including the decrease in height of solid balustrades and the introduction of glazed panels as presented
- Improved passive shading to glazing with a solution that is integral to the overall architectural facade strategy
- Design resolution of the glazed ceramic, pigmented precast and brick facade elements
- Further details and resolution of the adaptive re-use strategy for the existing heritage building (subject to separate heritage advice)
- Design Resolution of the landscape proposal (subject to the following comments regarding the shared-way).

#### **2. Amendments Requiring Further Consideration**

The Panel does not support the following amendments as they are substantial departures from the Design Excellence Competition proposal, have resulted in a scheme that does not exhibit an

equivalent level of architectural and urban quality, and will significantly impact the potential of the proposal to achieve Design Excellence.

## **2A) New Carpark Entry and the Shared-Way**

- The provision of a clear shared-way connection between Archer St and Bertram St along the south-eastern boundary of the site was a key strength of the Design Excellence Competition proposal and an important benefit in the consideration of a non-compliant servicing strategy.
- The introduction of a dedicated carpark entry from Bertram Street has significantly reduced the urban quality and amenity of the proposal including the legibility of the shared-way connection and wayfinding for pedestrians traversing the site.
- Furthermore, the current proposal risks converting this space to a service court for the building. The lack of deep soil provision, landscape and tree canopy compounds these concerns.
- The Panel recommends the design team:
  - reconsider the alignment, geometry (and width if possible) of the carpark entry to provide a visually clear, physically linear, and direct public connection between Archer Street and Bertram Street. This should be at least 2m in width to improve way-finding and CPTED outcomes for pedestrians using the shared-way.
  - explore opportunities to improve the amenity and character of the shared-way with:
    - the integration of landscape elements and lighting, and
    - the provision of deep soil to support increased planting and tree canopy coverage.

## **2B) Communal Open Space and Rooftop Terrace**

- The relocation of the communal open space from the rooftop location to the podium has resulted in:
  - a significant loss of amenity for residents including a communal space with district views, solar amenity, a high level of architectural and landscape character, and a common space for all residents that is unambiguously communal.
  - a significant reduction in the architectural quality of the tower with the loss of the sculptural roof form massing to offset the repetition of the tower floor plates, and the provision of a distinctive architectural element within the skyline of Chatswood.
- To address both of these concerns, the Panel recommends the design team reinstate a majority of the communal open space to the rooftop, and reestablish a distinctive and

sculptural rooftop massing for these facilities and spaces. The proposal should be refined to mitigate wind impacts.

## **Conclusion**

The Design Integrity Panel recommends:

- further design development is undertaken for the revised proposal to achieve Design Excellence in accordance with the Willoughby LEP
- the revised proposal is presented to the DIP for review prior to submission.

## **57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue Chatswood NSW**

### **Design Integrity Panel**

**Matthew Bennett (Chair), Kim Crestani, Conrad Johnston**

1st October 2024 - DIP Comments #2

#### **Foreword**

The focus of this commentary will be on design and amenity impacts and merits of the 30% uplift proposal. The advice provided below does not fetter the discretion of the assessment authority in assessing impacts including but not confined to wind, overshadowing to public domain, shadow impacts on surrounding development, traffic, waste strategy, and the capacity of utilities.

#### **1. Amendments Supported by the Panel**

Please refer to the previous DIP commentary (13.9.24) for the list of supported amendments.

#### **2. Amendments Requiring Further Consideration**

- The shared-way link and the roof terrace communal open space are two key strengths of the competition scheme, however the Panel understands need for schemes to be refined to respond to engineering constraints and market considerations.
- With any adjustment to the proposal, it will be critical to maintain an equivalent level of design quality and amenity for the revised scheme to have the potential to achieve Design Excellence.

#### **2A) New Carpark Entry and the Shared-Way**

- The Panel acknowledges the substantial constraints for the carport entry and supports the intent of the revised sketch but is keen to see the proposal refined by:
  - Removing the pedestrian shortcut through the pocket park lawn as it may undermine the passive use of this space
  - Increasing the clarity and generosity of the connection past the building by:
    - Indenting the glazed corner of the building to increase the physical width of the connection and to improve view lines for pedestrians
    - Extending the angular geometry of the carpark entry wall to create a more direct pedestrian pathway between the shared-way and the Bertram St

- Continuing to develop the deep soil/landscaped areas and the character of the shared-way link.
- Please provide a section through the carport entry illustrating sufficient clearance and verification from the Traffic Consultant.

## **B) Communal Open Space and Rooftop Massing**

- The Panel reiterates its previous comments and remains concerned by:
  - The current architectural quality of the rooftop massing and its similarity to the repetitive tower levels
  - The quality and amenity of the communal open space within the podium including its fragmentation over two levels, the dimensions of the spaces, and its provision within and alongside commercial spaces.

### **I. Rooftop Massing**

- If the penthouse level is to be converted to penthouse apartments, refine the architectural massing to establish a distinct contrast between the penthouses and the repetitive tower levels that is equivalent to the competition scheme. This could include varying the heights of volumes, introducing indented courtyards to separate and articulate penthouse volumes, and other design strategies to improve the contrast between the building's roofline and the body of the tower.

### **II. Communal Open Space**

- The Panel does not support the current proposal for the reasons noted above.
- To address these concerns, consider combining the proposed spaces within the podium to create a purposefully designed and contiguous space with high levels of amenity, outlook, solar access and a clear delineation between commercial and communal facilities (residents should not need to pass through the commercial spaces to use the communal facilities and they should be available to market and affordable housing residents). Consider a combination of internal and external spaces, double-height spaces where possible, and outdoor terraces with views over the heritage building and pocket park.
- If possible, the Panel would like the design team to consider a small rooftop meeting room that could be accessed by residents to view the surrounding area, strata meetings etc. This could be a bookable space.

## **Conclusion**

The Design Integrity Panel recommends:

- Further design development is undertaken for the revised proposal to achieve Design Excellence in accordance with the Willoughby LEP
- The revised proposal is presented to the DIP for desktop review prior to submission with hardline architectural drawings and engineering confirmation where requested.

## **57-61 Archer Street and 34 Albert Avenue Chatswood NSW**

### **Design Integrity Panel**

**Matthew Bennett (Chair), Kim Crestani, Conrad Johnston**

17th October 2024 - DIP Comments #3

#### **Foreword**

The focus of this commentary will be on design and amenity impacts and merits of the 30% uplift proposal. The advice provided below does not fetter the discretion of the assessment authority in assessing impacts including but not confined to wind, overshadowing to public domain, shadow impacts on surrounding development, traffic, waste strategy, and the capacity of utilities.

#### **Summary of Comments**

The Panel has reviewed the supplementary presentation material emailed to the panel on the 15th of October 2024 and confirms the proposed amendments have satisfied outstanding concerns regarding:

- the resolution and legibility of the shared-way link between Archer Avenue and Bertram Street
- the location and configuration of the communal open space on level 1 of the podium
- the architectural massing and expression of the penthouse level of the building.

#### **Conclusion**


- The Design Integrity Panel supports the revised proposal as the design closely aligns with the original competition scheme and has the potential to achieve design excellence.
- No further reviews are required by the Design Integrity Panel prior to submission of the proposal for assessment.



Appendix 4

Supplementary materials

issued on 15 September 2024



#	Status	Description	Date
1	ISSUE FOR DA	PRELIMINARY - FOR SUBMISSION TO OBTAIN SEALS ONLY	19/12/23
2	FOR SSDA	FOR JURY UPDATE	25/09/24
3	FOR JURY UPDATE		14/10/24

Notes  
 Copyright © Woods Bagot 2018  
 All Rights Reserved  
 No material may be reproduced without prior permission  
 Contractor must verify all dimensions on site before commencing work or preparing shop drawings.  
 Do not scale drawings.

**LEGEND**

**BASEMENT**

- DP Drainage Pipe
- LD Linear Drain
- SD Spoon Drain

**GROUND**

- ADL Adaptable Loading Area
- ADP Adaptable Parking Space
- EOT End-of-Trip Facility
- MP Motorcycle Parking Space
- VP Visitor Parking Space

**TOWER**

- C Comms. Cupboard
- E Electrical Cupboard
- F High Pressure Fire Pipes Riser
- GT Gate
- GTL Louvred Gate
- H Hydraulic Riser
- LR Stair Relief
- M Meter Room
- PB Planter Box
- PCN Privacy Screen with Dense Planting
- SCR Screen
- SK Skylight
- SP Stair Press
- SPS Precast Spandrel Shading Device
- VRV Centralised VRF Plant Room
- FE Fire Extinguisher
- RF Refrigerant Riser

**NOTE**

- The final facade profile of the proposed design may be subjected to change based on the client's inputs or the availability of facade modules by the supplier.
- Dense landscape as wind buffer - treatment subject to wind tunnel test

Project  
**ARCHER & ALBERT**

Client  
**CORONATION PROPERTY**

Issuer  
**W-B**  
**WOODS BAGOT**

Project number 121876	Size check 25mm
Checked	Approved
Sheet size A1	Scale 1:100

Sheet title  
**GROUND FLOOR PLAN**

Sheet number  
**DA-2210**

Revision  
**4**

Status  
**FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**

#	Status	Description	Date
1		ISSUE FOR DA	19/12/23
2		PRELIMINARY - FOR SUBMISSION TO OBTAIN SCARS ONLY	02/07/24
3		FOR SSDA	25/09/24
4		FOR JURY UPDATE	14/10/24

Notes  
 Copyright © Woods Bagot 2018  
 All Rights Reserved  
 No material may be reproduced without prior permission  
 Contractor must verify all dimensions on site before commencing work or preparing shop drawings.  
 Do not scale drawings.

**LEGEND**

**BASEMENT**

DP	Drainage Pipe
LD	Linear Drain
SD	Spoon Drain
ADL	Adaptable Loading Area
ADP	Adaptable Parking Space
EOT	End-of-Trip Facility
MP	Motorcycle Parking Space
VP	Visitor Parking Space

**GROUND**

CO	Crossover
EP	Electric Pole
FS	Furniture - Seat
HB	Hydrant Booster
LP	Power and Light Pole
LR	Lobby Relief
TCR	Traffic Control Pole
ZGR	Zone for Gas Regulator
MH	Sewer Manhole
PT	PIT

**TOWER**

C	Comms. Cupboard
E	Electrical Cupboard
F	High Pressure Fire Pipes Riser
GT	Gate
GTL	Louvre Gate
H	Hydraulic Riser
LR	Stair Relief
M	Meter Room
PB	Planter Box
SCN	Privacy Screen with Dense Planting
SCR	Screen
SK	Skylight
SP	Stair Press
SPS	Precast Spandrel Shading Device
VRV	Centralised VRV Plant Room
FE	Fire Extinguisher
RF	Refrigerant Riser

**BL** Balustrade  
**CL** Commercial Lift  
**FCR** Fire Control Room  
**GBC** Garbage Chute  
**LTR** Lockable Storage  
**RI-R3** Residential Lift  
**STR** Storage

**STP** Stone Paving  
**SIT** Stone Tile Paving  
**TD** Timber Deck  
**TL** Tile

**NOTE**

1. The final facade profile of the proposed design may be subjected to change based on the client's inputs or the availability of facade modules by the supplier.

2. Dense landscape as wind buffer - treatment subject to wind tunnel test

Project  
**ARCHER & ALBERT**

Client  
**CORONATION PROPERTY**

Issuer  
**W-B**  
**WOODS BAGOT**

Project number  
**121876**

Size check  
 25mm


Checked - Approved - Sheet size A1 Scale 1:100

Sheet title  
**LEVEL 1**

Sheet number  
**DA-2211**

Revision  
**4**

Status  
**FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**





#	Status	Description	Date
1	ISSUE FOR DA		19/12/23
2	PRELIMINARY - FOR SUBMISSION TO OBTAIN SCARS ONLY		02/07/24
3	FOR SSDA		25/09/24
4	FOR JURY UPDATE		14/10/24

Notes  
 Copyright © Woods Bagot 2018  
 All Rights Reserved  
 No material may be reproduced without prior permission  
 Contractor must verify all dimensions on site before commencing work or preparing shop drawings.  
 Do not scale drawings.

**LEGEND**

**BASEMENT**

DP	Drainage Pipe
LD	Linear Drain
SD	Spoon Drain
ADL	Adaptable Loading Area
ADP	Adaptable Parking Space
EOT	End-of-Trip Facility
MP	Motorcycle Parking Space
VP	Visitor Parking Space

**GROUND**

CO	Crossover
EP	Electric Pole
FS	Furniture - Seat
HB	Hydrant Booster
LP	Power and Light Pole
LR	Lobby Relief
TCR	Traffic Control Pole
ZGR	Zone for Gas Regulator
MH	Sewer Manhole
PT	PIT

**TOWER**

C	Comms. Cupboard
E	Electrical Cupboard
F	High Pressure Fire Pipes Riser
GT	Gate
GTL	Louvred Gate
H	Hydraulic Riser
LR	Stair Relief
M	Meter Room
PB	Planter Box
SCN	Privacy Screen with Dense Planting
SCR	Screen
SK	Skylight
SP	Stair Press
SPS	Precast Spandrel Shading Device
VRV	Centralised VRV Plant Room
FE	Fire Extinguisher
RF	Refrigerant Riser
BL	Balustrade
CL	Commercial Lift
FCR	Fire Control Room
GBC	Garbage Chute
LTR	Lockable Storage
RL-R3	Residential Lift
STR	Storage
STP	Stone Paving
STT	Stone Tile Paving
TD	Timber Deck
TL	Tile

**NOTE**

- The final facade profile of the proposed design may be subjected to change based on the client's inputs or the availability of facade modules by the supplier.
- Dense landscape as wind buffer - treatment subject to wind tunnel test

Project  
**ARCHER & ALBERT**


Client  
**CORONATION PROPERTY**


Issuer  
**W-B**  
**WOODS BAGOT**

Project number	Size check
121876	25mm
Checked	Approved
-	-
Sheet size	Scale
A1	1:100

Sheet title  
**PENTHOUSE LEVEL 31**

Sheet number  
**DA-2223**  
 Status  
**FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**





#	Status	Description	Date
1		ISSUE FOR DA	19/12/23
2		PRELIMINARY - FOR SUBMISSION TO OBTAIN SCRS ONLY	02/07/24
3		FOR SSDA	25/09/24
4		FOR JURY UPDATE	14/10/24

Notes  
 Copyright © Woods Bagot 2018  
 All Rights Reserved  
 No material may be reproduced without prior permission  
 Contractor must verify all dimensions on site before commencing work or preparing shop drawings.  
 Do not scale drawings.

**LEGEND**

**BASEMENT**

DP	Drainage Pipe
LD	Linear Drain
SD	Spoon Drain
ADL	Adaptable Loading Area
ADP	Adaptable Parking Space
EOT	End-of-Trip Facility
MP	Motorcycle Parking Space
VP	Visitor Parking Space

**GROUND**

CO	Crossover
EP	Electric Pole
FS	Furniture - Seat
HB	Hydrant Booster
LP	Power and Light Pole
LR	Lobby Relief
TCR	Traffic Control Pole
ZGR	Zone for Gas Regulator
MH	Sewer Manhole
PT	PIT

**TOWER**

C	Comms. Cupboard
E	Electrical Cupboard
F	High Pressure Fire Pipes Riser
GT	Gate
GTL	Louvred Gate
H	Hydraulic Riser
LR	Stair Relief
M	Meter Room
PB	Planter Box
SCN	Privacy Screen with Dense Planting
SCR	Screen
SK	Skylight
SP	Stair Press
SPS	Precast Spandrel Shading Device
VRV	Centralised VRV Plant Room
FE	Fire Extinguisher
RF	Refrigerant Riser

BL Balustrade  
 CL Commercial Lift  
 FCR Fire Control Room  
 GBC Garbage Chute  
 LTR Lockable Storage  
 RI-R3 Residential Lift  
 STR Storage  
 STP Stone Paving  
 SIT Stone Tile Paving  
 TD Timber Deck  
 TL Tile

**NOTE**

1. The final facade profile of the proposed design may be subjected to change based on the client's inputs or the availability of facade modules by the supplier.

2. Dense landscape as wind buffer - treatment subject to wind tunnel test

Project  
**ARCHER & ALBERT**

Client  
**CORONATION PROPERTY**

Issuer  
**W-B**  
**WOODS BAGOT**

Project number	Size check		
121876	25mm		
Checked	Approved	Sheet size	Scale
-	-	A1	1:100

Sheet title

**ROOF PLAN**

Sheet number	Revision
DA-2224	4


Status  
**FOR DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**

**Communal open space**

- Ground Floor (including the pocket park and the landscaped plaza between the heritage building and the new building)

**Ground**


Ground Hard Surface CoS:	232 sqm
Ground Deep Soil CoS:	140 sqm
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>372 sqm</b>



- Terraces (including both the useable portion of the terraces and their associated landscaped area)

**Level 1**


Terrace:	311 sqm
----------	---------



**Total CoS: 683 sqm (26%)**

Deep Soil

Ground Deep Soil: 216 sqm (8.2%)  
Deep Soil (Less than min. Width): 99 sqm (3.7%)



GROUND FLOOR

DEEP SOIL ZONE	216m <sup>2</sup> (8.2%)	
DEEP SOIL (LESS THAN MIN. WIDTH)	99m <sup>2</sup> (3.7%)	









[mecone.com.au](http://mecone.com.au)  
[info@mecone.com.au](mailto:info@mecone.com.au)  
02 8667 8668