

Attachment D

Competitive Design Alternatives Report

811 Elizabeth Street, Zetland

Competitive Design Alternatives Report

811 Elizabeth Street, Zetland

8 November 2018

PREPARED BY

Meriton Property Services Pty Ltd
ABN 69 115 511 281

Karimbla Constructions Services (NSW) Pty Ltd
ABN 67 152 212 809

Level 11 Meriton Tower
528 Kent Street, Sydney NSW 2000

Tel (02) 9287 2888
Fax (02) 9287 2835

meriton.com.au

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Competitive Design Alternatives Process	1
2	Competitive Design Process Timeline	3
3	Review of Submissions	4
3.1	Turner	4
3.2	SJB	7
3.3	PTW	10
3.4	DKO	13
4	Recommendations	16
4.1	Selection Panel Resolution	16
4.2	Selection Panel Reconvened Meeting	16
4.3	Selection Panel Final Resolution and Recommendation	18
5	Conclusion	19

Annexure

- 1. Competitive Design Brief**
- 2. Design Excellence Strategy**
- 3. Turner Submission**
- 4. SJB Submission**
- 5. PTW Submission**
- 6. DKO Submission**
- 7. Panel Directed Design Changes**
- 8. Design Changes Presented by DKO**

1 Introduction

This Competitive Design Alternatives Report (the Report) has been prepared by Meriton Property Services for the Competitive Design Alternatives Process undertaken for 811 Elizabeth Street, Zetland. The Report outlines the Competitive Design Alternatives Process (Competitive Process), providing a summary of each competition entry and the Selection Panel's recommendations. It should be read in conjunction with the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief and Brief Supplement for Childcare Option (the Brief), prepared by Meriton (refer **Annexure 1**) and the approved Design Excellence Strategy (refer **Annexure 2**).

The Competitive Process was conducted in accordance with the Brief, which was developed in consultation with the City of Sydney Council and endorsed by the City of Sydney Council on 15 August 2018. The Brief was issued to all invited entrants on 16 August 2018 and the Competitive Process was also notified to Australian Institute of Architects on 15 August 2018 for information purposes.

The process was undertaken pursuant to *Sydney Local Environmental Plan (Green Square Town Centre—Stage 2) 2013*, *Sydney Local Environmental Plan (Green Square Town Centre—Stage 2) 2013* and the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2013* (as amended).

1.1 Competitive Design Alternatives Process

The competition comprises an 'invited' Competitive Design Alternatives Process. Meriton, as the proponent of the Competitive Process, invited four (4) architects to participate. In accordance with the protocols for the Invited Competitive Design Alternatives Process, each entrant was supplied with the Brief endorsed by the City of Sydney.

1.1.1 Entrants

The entrants who were invited to participate in the process were selected based on their reputation for high quality and sustainable architecture and urban design. The four (4) selected architectural firms were:

1. Turner;
2. SJB;
3. PTW; and
4. DKO.

1.1.2 Selection Panel

The Selection Panel as appointed by that proponent and was decided in consultation with Council and comprised of two nominees from City of Sydney Council and two from the proponent:

Proponent's nominees on Panel

1. Peter Spira; and
2. Robert Nation (Panel Chair).

City of Sydney Council nominees on Panel

1. Richard Johnson; and
2. Tony Caro.

1.1.3 Observers

The following City of Sydney Council observers were present at the presentations to the Selection Panel and during their deliberations.

1. Anita Morandini
2. Ben Chamie
3. Nicola Reeve

1.1.4 Recommendation Process

The selection process was based on the written material supplied, as well as the presentations given by each architect to the Selection Panel. Competitors were allocated 30 minute presentations and 30 minutes of questions and discussion by the Selection Panel on 15 October 2018.

The Selection Panel reconvened on 29 October 2018 to consider design changes it instructed DKO to make in order to potentially achieve design excellence.

Consideration was given to the planning, design, commercial and buildability objectives of the brief.

An overview of each scheme against the objectives of the brief, and the recommendations of the Selection Panel, is outlined in the following sections of this report.

2 Competitive Design Process Timeline

The competitive process has involved a series of briefings, meetings and presentations, which have helped Meriton in its review and assessment of the five schemes. The chronology of the key events is outlined below:

DATE	TASK/EVENT
Wednesday 22 August	Commencement Date Competitive Design Alternatives Process begins, brief issued to competitors
Wednesday 22 August	On-Site Briefing Session Briefing to all Competitors to answer questions or queries. Held on site at 811 Elizabeth Street, Zetland.
Tuesday 18 September	Progress Session Submission Date Competitors submit preliminary concepts to the Competitive Process Manager.
Wednesday 19 September	Progress Session Date Competitors attended individual session for technical and planning compliance review with questions answered. Held at Meriton head office.
Monday 8 October	Final Submission Lodgement Date Competitors lodge final submissions.
Friday 12 October	Lodgement of Presentation Date Material Competitors submit via email Final Presentation Date material.
Monday 15 October	Presentation Date Competitors present proposed designs to the Selection Panel Presentations held at Meriton head office.
Monday 29 October	Design Decision Date Panel reconvenes to consider design amendments by DKO and recommends formal appointment of successful Competitor.
Friday 9 November	Notification to Competitors Date all Competitors are notified in writing of the decision.
No later than 19 November	Competitive Design Alternatives Report Proponent issues the Competitive Design Alternatives Report to the City of Sydney.

3 Review of Submissions

This Section provides an overview of each design, as well as an assessment of each submission against the key objectives of the brief.

3.1 Turner

3.1.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design put forward by Turner is shown in **Figures 1 to 3** and contains the following:

Element	Proposal
Unit Mix	Studio 0 1 Bed 118 (46%) 2 Bed 114 (44%) 3 Bed 25 (10%) Total 257
Childcare	75 kids
Retail	Retail shops 597 sqm Supermarket 1,000 sqm box Total 1,597 sqm
Gross Floor Area	24,371 sqm
Car Parking	255 spaces

The submission prepared by Turner is included at **Annexure 3**.



Figure 1: Turner scheme looking southeast along Portman Street towards the subject site



Figure 2: Turner scheme looking west from the eastern side of Joynton Avenue



Figure 3: Turner scheme looking southwest from the corner of Elizabeth Street and Joynton Avenue

3.1.2 Assessment of Submission

The panel provided the following assessment on the scheme and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief:

- Overall urban design approach is generally well considered. The “water narrative” as a strategy to inform architectural and landscape aesthetics was notional and would require substantial development.
- Building B and particularly Building C were well resolved, however Building A (tower element) was less so.
- As presented Building A is extensively clad in unprotected glazing: the architects acknowledged that external solar protection would be required in any development of the scheme and this would substantially alter the buildings expression and character.
- Further development of the interface to Zetland Avenue (activation and level transitions) would be required to ensure the success of this important interface.
- The typical floor plans were well resolved with a spot-core/cross-through apartment strategy ensuring corridor lengths were not excessive. Connection of lift cores at upper levels to ensure continuous access for residents would be required.
- Apartment planning was efficient and resolved to a high design standard.
- Dedicated drop off and access arrangements would be required, and the multiple level layout for the child care centre would present operational inefficiencies.
- The Panel was concerned that all schemes fell well short of NCV compliance, based on City of Sydney ADG interpretation.

The Proponent thanks Turner for its submission and recognises the efforts made in their scheme. However, having regard to the above and the strengths of the other shortlisted schemes, it was decided not to proceed further with this proposal.

3.2 SJB

3.2.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design put forward by SJB is shown in **Figures 4 to 6** and contains the following:

Element	Proposal
Unit Mix	Studio 0 1 Bed 92 (37%) 2 Bed 119 (48%) 3 Bed 39 (16%) Total 250
Childcare	75 kids
Retail	Retail shops 615 sqm Supermarket 1,000 sqm box Total 1,615 sqm
Gross Floor Area	24,808 sqm
Car Parking	266 spaces

SJB's submission is included at **Annexure 4**.



Figure 4: SJB scheme looking southeast along Portman Street towards the subject site



Figure 5: SJB scheme looking west from the eastern side of Joynton Avenue



Figure 6: SJB scheme looking southwest from the corner of Elizabeth Street and Joynton Avenue

3.2.2 Assessment of Submission

The panel provided the following assessment on the scheme and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief:

- The general presentation and feel of this scheme is positive: the built form and architectural strategies result in a calm understated presentation to the surrounding public domain. The fluid forms of the architecture can relate well to the water narrative of the sites natural historical context.
- Whilst this scheme suggested many nascent design qualities, it was not sufficiently resolved in some key areas, including:
 - lack of development of the communal areas, particularly the podium open space
 - way-finding/access to lift cores and convoluted circulation for residents to common facilities
 - (pool/gym)
 - internal bedrooms in Building C (as submitted)
 - adequacy of lift provision, particularly in event of service/breakdown/furniture removal
 - excessively long corridors in Building A (Zetland Boulevard) and lack of clarity in relation to indoor/outdoor access areas on typical floors
 - planning and buildability resolution of the orthogonal floor plans and curvilinear edge profiles
 - deep soil fragmented and not providing sufficient consolidated area to support large plantings
 - rationale for precast profiles and horizontal blade element at window head
- The large supermarket footprint was well integrated into the built form, and the childcare centre appears to be well located and laid out for security and operational efficiency
- The cross-site link is not sufficiently activated, with only four units addressing the street level interface
- The Panel was concerned that all schemes fell well short of NCV compliance, based on City of Sydney ADG interpretation

The Proponent thanks SJB for its submission and recognises the efforts made in their scheme. The scheme was shortlisted by the Panel. However, having regard to the above and the strengths of the other shortlisted scheme, it was decided not to proceed further with the design.

3.3 PTW

3.3.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design put forward by PTW is shown in **Figures 7 to 9** and contains the following:

Element	Proposal
Unit Mix	Studio 0 1 Bed 98 (39%) 2 Bed 130 (51%) 3 Bed 26 (10%) Total 254
Childcare	75 kids
Retail	Retail shops 653 sqm Supermarket 1,000 sqm box Total 1,653 sqm
Gross Floor Area	25,002 sqm
Car Parking	226 spaces

The submission put forward to PTW is included at **Annexure 5**.



Figure 7: PTW scheme looking southeast along Portman Street towards the subject site



Figure 8: PTW scheme looking west from the eastern side of Joynton Avenue



Figure 9: PTW scheme looking southwest from the corner of Elizabeth Street and Joynton Avenue

3.3.2 Assessment of Submission

The panel provided the following assessment on the scheme and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief:

- This scheme has been well resolved for the purposes of the design competitive process, and generally appears to comply with the Stage 1 DA provisions and overall built form envisaged for the site.
- Access to lift lobbies and the podium is well defined.
- The key urban design strategies as presented were less resolved however, and would require further development.
- Areas where the panel suggested further design study and resolution included:
 - a more robust and integrated/contextual approach to the built form and interface to Zetland Avenue
 - access arrangements, security and location of the child care centre
 - adequacy of lift provision, particularly in event of service/breakdown/furniture removal
 - excessively long access corridors
 - rationale for Building A façade fenestration
 - equity of access to swimming pool
- The Panel was concerned that all schemes fell well short of NCV compliance, based on City of Sydney ADG interpretation.

The Proponent thanks PTW for their submission and recognises the efforts made in their scheme. However, having regard to the above and the strengths of the other shortlisted schemes, it was decided not to proceed further with the design.

3.4 DKO

3.4.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design put forward by DKO is shown in **Figures 10 to 12** and contains the following:

Element	Proposal
Unit Mix	Studio 0 1 Bed 87 (36%) 2 Bed 125 (52%) 3 Bed 27 (11%) Total 239
Childcare	75 kids
Retail	Retail shops 374 sqm Supermarket 1,000 sqm box Total 1,374 sqm
Gross Floor Area	24,752 sqm
Car Parking	184 spaces

DKO's submission is included at **Annexure 6**.



Figure 10: DKO scheme looking southeast along Portman Street towards the subject site



Figure 11: DKO scheme looking west from the eastern side of Joynton Avenue



Figure 12: DKO scheme looking southeast towards the corner of Elizabeth Street and Joynton Avenue

3.4.2 Assessment of Submission

The panel provided the following assessment on the scheme and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief:

- This scheme provided a strong analysis based on the disparate site contexts, and the architectural approach to built form is well considered as a result of this.
- This was particularly evident in the urban design approach, built form, scale and character of the new pedestrian cross link adjacent to the heritage precinct directly to the north of the site.
- The reduction of built form in Building C, whilst positive from an urban design perspective, has resulted in a lower commercial yield that would need to be addressed.
- Access to Buildings A and B, pool and communal courtyard is gathered at the south-eastern corner of the site, and this strategy and the sequence of entry spaces leading up to the courtyard is particularly successful.
- Frontage to Zetland Avenue is dominated by the proposed supermarket. The layout of the retail would need to be reconsidered to provide a finer grain of active frontages.
- Level transitions to address flood constraints along this frontage would require further design resolution.
- The Zetland Avenue façade and overall form of Building A would require further development of its composition and scale.
- The proposed child care centre location is challenged by poor access to sun and exposure to overlooking.
- The Panel was concerned that all schemes fell well short of NCV compliance, based on City of Sydney ADG interpretation.
- The overall parti, urban character and detail of this scheme has been well considered and is appropriate to its setting.

The Proponent thanks DKO for its submission and recognises the efforts made in their scheme.

4 Recommendations

4.1 Selection Panel Resolution

At the conclusion of the Presentation Day (15 October 2018), the Selection Panel unanimously resolved that DKO submitted the scheme that best demonstrates potential for design excellence. The Selection Panel further resolved that DKO address specific design details to be presented to a reconvened meeting of the Selection Panel on 29 October, 2018. A copy of the Panel resolution and the instructed design changes are at **Annexure 7**.

4.2 Selection Panel Reconvened Meeting

A reconvened meeting of the Selection Panel was held on 29 October, 2018, to consider the design changes prepared by DKO. The design changes tabled by DKO at the meeting, and considered by the Selection Panel, are included at **Annexure 8**.

The table below provides the Panel comments to the DKO response to each of the instructed design changes.

Selection Panel Design Instruction	Selection Panel Response to DKO amendments
<p>a) <u>General</u></p> <p>The scheme must more closely align with the target unit yield of 253 dwellings.</p> <p>The scheme should be revised to demonstrate ability to achieve ADG compliance for natural cross ventilation, as interpreted and required by City of Sydney. It is noted that all submitted schemes exhibited a significant compliance shortfall in this area.</p>	<p><i>The revised dwelling yield is acceptable (minimum 253 units).</i></p> <p><i>The revised scheme has increased the number of naturally cross-ventilated units, claiming 59%.</i></p> <p><i>There appears to be potential to achieve full compliance based on the City of Sydney interpretation of ADG, however this should be resolved to Council's satisfaction prior to lodgment of Stage 2 DA. The Panel notes that location of windows for natural cross ventilation between adjacent units must also take cross visual and aural privacy into consideration.</i></p>
<p>b) <u>Building C</u></p> <p>Whilst the Selection Panel supports the 'mews' design concept for Building C, the building must be revised to better satisfy the commercial aspects of the brief. The following key points should be addressed:</p> <p>The urban form and terrace typology of the building is supported, but the design needs to be revised to obtain a higher yield.</p> <p>For commercial reasons the three storey terraces should be replaced by a higher yield of more compact, preferably single level units.</p> <p>It is likely that the height and bulk of the building will need to be increased to meet the objective of achieving greater yield, and solar access impacts on the courtyard are to be considered in such revision.</p> <p>The setback to the proposed Frog Lane pocket park could also be reduced to meet the objective of achieving greater yield. It is noted this may result in the park becoming a landscaped widening of the Lane.</p>	<p><i>The design of Building C has been amended to substantially address the Panels comments. The bulk of the building has been increased to assist in delivering the required commercial yield, and this has been achieved whilst remaining well within the prescribed building envelope.</i></p> <p><i>The building layout and unit configuration has been revised to generally meet the noted commercial considerations.</i></p> <p><i>The Panel supports the lane being widened from 9m to 11m, and its design being further developed as an activated green public space responsive to the scale and character of the adjacent heritage area.</i></p> <p><i>To achieve this, the Panel considers there is scope to refine the built form by some adjustments to the prescribed envelope for Building C. The lane setback above L2 could be reduced in preference to increasing height along the southern edge of the building.</i></p> <p><i>The building indent on the alignment of the lane to the north could be occupied by a large tree, requiring deletion of a small number of car-parking spaces below for deep soil.</i></p>
<p>c) <u>Childcare Centre</u></p> <p>The Selection Panel has concerns about the proposed location of the childcare centre. An alternative location for the centre is to be explored with respect to the following key points:</p> <p>The current location impacts upon the quantum and quality of the residential communal courtyard.</p> <p>The current location creates safety concerns in that items can be dropped from apartment balconies above.</p> <p>The centre has a subterranean feel that would need to be further considered if it remains in this location. Furthermore the location of the centre must not result in the need for an extra basement.</p> <p>Access strategy and dedicated, safe car-parking for short term drop off and collection to be provided.</p>	<p><i>The Panel supports the proposed relocation of the Child Care Centre to the NW corner of the site.</i></p> <p><i>The required outdoor space will be partially shaded by Building C, and compliant solar access should be provided.</i></p> <p><i>To mediate overlooking from surrounding buildings, to protect the outdoor space from objects that may be dropped from units directly above, and to provide protection in poor weather, a substantial protected and shaded area adjacent to building C is recommended.</i></p> <p><i>The revised location appears to offer a better strategy for short-term drop-off and collection needs.</i></p>

Selection Panel Design Instruction	Selection Panel Response to DKO amendments
<p>d) <u>Supermarket</u></p> <p>The Selection Panel has concerns about the extent of prime frontage that the supermarket enjoys to Zetland Avenue and Portman Street. The design of the supermarket should be modified with respect to the following key points:</p> <p>The current design restricts opportunities for the supermarket tenant to use wall space by utilising 50% of its perimeter as glazing to the street frontages.</p> <p>The current location of the supermarket denies opportunities for smaller individual retail tenancies to occupy the street front, in order to better activate Zetland Avenue. The supermarket would benefit from redesign in conjunction with more economical planning or re-allocation of other ground floor level components proposed below Building A. The Selection Panel supports the configuration and generous common access to the development and common facilities (pool/gym) at the Joynton/Zetland corner, and these qualities should be retained in any revisions.</p>	<p><i>The Panel generally supports the revised planning of the ground level in the southern portion of the site, noting that the key positive attributes of the original submission have been retained.</i></p> <p><i>There is further design work to be carried out in relation to the street level interface of the built form and use with Zetland Avenue. The prescribed flood levels mean that the transitions to footpath levels will need to be carefully designed to ensure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a seamless and inviting sense of universal access</i> • <i>good sight lines into the retail terraces and spaces</i> • <i>an appropriate landscape setting for this south facing frontage.</i> <p><i>The integrated access from the Zetland/Joynton Ave. corner to Building A and Building B lobbies together with the pool and communal courtyard is a key feature of the proposal, and this has been retained. The detailed planning should be refined to ensure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>natural light to main lobbies and lift core areas</i> • <i>rationalisation of awkward triangular spaces flanking courtyard stair</i> • <i>provision of natural top light to swimming pool</i> • <i>ensure that units facing Joynton Ave and Elizabeth St address DCP setback objectives of a green and active street frontage with retention of existing trees and capacity for new large street tree plantings.</i>
<p>e) <u>Building A</u></p> <p>Whilst the Selection Panel supports in principle the design proposal for Building A, further consideration of the resolution of its urban form and detail with context, is recommended, as follows:</p> <p>The building form and articulation should align more rigorously with the broader envelopes and setbacks proposed for Zetland Avenue, and particularly to the west. The current proposal for large, shallow bay elements applied onto the primary building mass is not successful.</p> <p>The ten-storey street parapet datum should be stronger and more cohesive in its expression of this as a primary building form, by extension around the southwest corner into Portman St as far as the vehicular driveway. The facades of this element should respond to the park setting and south/west orientations, and be clearly distinguishable in their character from the upper setback element (L.10-14).</p> <p>The upper element could retain the proposed closely spaced fins on its western and eastern elevations to achieve this.</p> <p>The western end of the typical floor common corridor would benefit from access to natural light. This could be achieved by shifting the western unit (up to L.10) southwards to occupy the complying envelope corner, thereby opening the internal corridor to western natural light.</p>	<p><i>The Panel generally supports the proposed adjustments to the built form and architectural expression of Building A.</i></p> <p><i>It is noted however that western end of the typical floor plans retains the indented 1-bedroom unit that blocks the capacity for the common corridor to obtain natural light. The Panel's recommendation as noted in letter of 17 October remains, and this will impact upon the formal massing of this end of the building.</i></p>
<p>f) <u>Building B</u></p> <p>The urban form of the building is well considered, however the 'elbow' area of the building could be redesigned in order to assist in achieving the target unit yield (as noted by DKO at the presentation).</p>	<p><i>The Panel supports the revised floor plan, which now provides a pair of "cross-through" naturally ventilated units at the corner elbow. The architectural resolution of this transition can be resolved in design development prior to lodgment of Stage 2 DA.</i></p>

4.3 Selection Panel Final Resolution and Recommendation

The Selection Panel recommends the DKO submission as the winning scheme for the competition. As outlined above, it is considered that the scheme best fulfils the design, commercial and planning objectives of the brief and demonstrates the potential to achieve design excellence as required by Clause 9 of *Sydney Local Environmental Plan (Green Square Town Centre—Stage 2) 2013*, and as outlined in the approved Design Excellence Strategy. It also creates a building that will provide a positive contribution to the existing urban fabric in this important location and support the achievement of significant improvements to the public domain within the precinct.

The DKO submission is recommended by the Panel as the winning scheme with potential to meet design excellence pending design development. The Panel noted that the variations to the masterplan approved envelopes are supported and recommends design development outlined in the Panel's comments in the table in section 4.2 of this report.

The final Panel recommendation is as follows:

“The Panel considers that DKO Architects have satisfactorily addressed the matters raised in the letter of 17 October.

Accordingly it is that Panel's recommendation that the revised DKO scheme submitted at meeting 29 October is the winner of the design excellence competitive process and that it has the capacity to achieve design excellence.”

5 Conclusion

This Report summarises the outcomes of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for 811 Elizabeth Street, Zetland.

The Competitive Design Process has been carried out in a professional and thorough manner in accordance with the Design Excellence Strategy and endorsed Competitive Design Brief, prepared by Meriton Property Services. This Design Alternatives Report documents the competitive process, and the Selection Panel's final recommendation.

The winning entry, designed by DKO, fulfils the design, commercial and planning objectives of the brief and demonstrates the potential to achieve design excellence.

The significant efforts made by all Competitors are recognised and the Selection Panel and Proponent wishes to thank them for their participation.

This report is endorsed by the Panel.



Robert Nation, Proponent's Panel Representative – Panel Chair



Richard Johnson, City of Sydney Panel Representative



Tony Caro, City of Sydney Panel Representative



Peter Spira, Proponent's Panel Representative

1. Competitive Design Brief

2. Design Excellence Strategy

3. Turner Submission

4. SJB Submission

5. PTW Submission

6. DKO Submission

7. Panel Directed Design Changes

8. Design Changes Presented by DKO