

Attachment D

<p>Competitive Design Alternatives Process Report</p>
--

COMPETITIVE DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PROCESS REPORT

**57 ASHMORE STREET,
ERSKINEVILLE**

BLOCK A & D

URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:

Director Stephen White
Senior Consultant Ryan Macindoe
Consultant Naomi Weber
Project Code SA5912
Report Number 57 Ashmore Street, Erskineville | Block A & D – Competitive Design Alternatives Process Report

SELECTION PANEL MEMBER SIGN OFF

Name	Signature	Date
Tony Caro		22/12/2017
Paul Berkemeier		22/12/2017
Sherwood Luo		22/12/2017
John Pradel		22/12/2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Selection Panel Member Sign off	2
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Overview	1
1.2. The Site.....	2
1.3. The Proponent.....	2
1.4. The Consent Authority	2
1.5. Regulatory Framework.....	2
1.6. Assessment of the Scheme & Winning Design	2
2. Competitive Alternatives Process	3
2.1. Overview	3
2.2. Participating Architectural Firms	3
2.3. Participating Architectural Firms	4
3. Review of the Design Alternatives	5
4. Selection Panel Recommendations.....	13
5. Summary and Conclusion.....	14
Disclaimer	15

Appendix A Design Competition Brief

FIGURES:

Figure 1 – Group GSA Scheme – South Façade	7
Figure 2 – PTW Scheme – South & West Façade	8
Figure 3 – Turner Scheme – South Façade	9
Figure 4 – Tribe Scheme – South Façade.....	10
Figure 5 – Collins and Turner Scheme – South Façade	11
Figure 6 – Andrew Burns Architects Scheme – South Façade	12

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this *Competitive Design Alternatives Report* (Report) is to inform the City of Sydney Council on the process and outcomes of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process (Competitive Process) for the selection of the architectural design for the redevelopment of Blocks A and D (the site) located at 57 Ashmore Street, Erskineville.

Greenland Golden Horse Investment Pty Limited is the proponent for the Competitive Process and invited three architectural consortiums (the Competitors), made up of one (1) established architect design a scheme for Block A, in conjunction with one (1) emerging architect designing a scheme for Block D. The three consortiums invited to participate in the Competitive Process were:

- Group GSA and Tribe;
- PTW and Collins and Turner; and
- Turner and Andrew Burns Architects.

All Competitors completed the Competitive Process, and produced a final submission for consideration by the Selection Panel.

The Competitive Process was undertaken in accordance with the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP 2012), the *Sydney Development Control Plan 2012* (Sydney DCP 2012), and the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2013*.

Clause 4.3 of the *Policy* sets out the requirements for a Report, as follows:

- (1) *When competitive design alternatives have been prepared and considered, the consent authority requires the applicant to submit a Competitive Design Alternatives Report prior to the submission of the relevant Stage 2 Development Application.*
- (2) *The Competitive Design Alternatives Report shall:*
 - (a) *include each of the design alternatives considered;*
 - (b) *include an assessment of the design merits of each alternative;*
 - (c) *set out the rationale for the choice of preferred design and clearly demonstrate how this best exhibits design excellence in accordance with the provisions of Clause 6.21(4) of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy.*
 - (d) *include a copy of the brief issued to the architectural firms.*
- (3) *The consent authority will advise the applicant whether it endorses the process and outcome and whether it fulfils the requirements of the competitive design alternatives process in the form of pre-development application advice.*
- (4) *The consent authority may need to determine whether the resulting development application or subsequent Section 96 modification is equivalent to, or through design development, an improvement upon the design qualities of the endorsed outcome. If necessary, further competitive processes may be required to satisfy the design excellence provisions.*

This report has been prepared in accordance with this Clause and outlines the Competitive Process, the Selection Panel's assessment of each scheme, and demonstrates the Panel's rationale for selection of the winning scheme. Each Panel member has reviewed and endorsed the content contained within this report.

The competitive process was undertaken in accordance with the Design Excellence Strategy for the site and the Competitive Design Alternatives Process Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by Council on 05 October 2017.

1.2. THE SITE

The Competitive Process refers to Block A and Block D (the subject site) at 57 Ashmore Street, Erskineville. The subject site is a portion of the lot legally described as Lot 23 in DP 849857.

1.3. THE PROPONENT

Greenland Golden Horse Investment Pty Limited is the proponent for the Competitive Process and invited three architectural consortiums to prepare design proposals for the site.

1.4. THE CONSENT AUTHORITY

The subject site is located within the local government area of the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA). The consent authority for the approval of the development application will be the Central Sydney Planning Committee (CSPC), as the value of the project exceeds \$50 million.

The Competitive Process manager liaised with Council officers throughout the competitive process, and Council officers observed the competitive process and the architect presentations to ensure the integrity of the outcomes.

1.5. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The primary planning instrument applying to the site is the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (the SLEP 2012).

There are provisions within SLEP 2012 which allow the Consent Authority to grant, at its sole discretion, up to an additional 10% floor space or building height if it is satisfied that the development is a result of a competitive process and the building exhibits design excellence.

1.6. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHEME & WINNING DESIGN

An analysis and assessment of the designs was undertaken on the basis of compliance with the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief, satisfying the design, planning and commercial objectives of the brief, compliance with relevant planning controls (SEPPS, LEPS, DCPS, ADG) and the Stage 1 DA approval (pending at the date of this report).

The competitive design process has resulted in a scheme that was judged to be of high design quality. **The Panel resolved that the Turner (Block A) and Andrew Burns Architects (Block D) schemes are capable of achieving design excellence as per Clause 6.21 of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the Design Brief requirements and accordingly was awarded the winner of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process.**

Details of the Panel's deliberations of all schemes are discussed in the following sections

2. COMPETITIVE ALTERNATIVES PROCESS

2.1. OVERVIEW

The Proponent 'invited' three architect teams to make submissions in response to a Design Brief, prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney. The process undertaken is described below:

- Three architectural consortiums (one established and one emerging architect) were invited to participate in the Competitive Process, held over a five-week period.
- A briefing session was held on 9 October 2017 to provide an overview of the site, the planning parameters and the design brief and an opportunity for the competitors to ask questions and seek clarification regarding the brief and competitive process procedures. This was followed by a site visit.
- All consortiums submitted a Progress Session Submission. A high-level compliance assessment and relevant feedback by the technical advisors was provided to all Competitors.
- A Register of Enquiries was kept during the Competitive Process documenting each enquiry and answer without revealing the source of the enquiry.
- A QS was made available to competitors during the competition process. No QS meetings occurred.
- All competitors submitted an A3 design report (Final Submission), articulating their proposed architectural scheme for the site.
- Each Competitor presented their architectural schemes to the Selection Panel at Final Presentation date held on 17 November 2017 and answered questions provided by the Panel and technical advisors.
- The Selection Panel deliberated the day of the Final Presentations and a final recommendation on the winning scheme was made.

The competitive design alternatives process was undertaken in an open and transparent manner in full consultation and disclosure with Council officers in attendance at Observers. In accordance with the City's Competitive Design Policy, City of Sydney Council officers:

- Reviewed, provided comment and endorsed the Design Brief.
- Provided clarification on planning compliance and Competitive Process procedures. Reviewed, provided comment on the feedback provided to Competitors in the Optional Progress Session.
- Council observers were copied into all communication between the Competitors and the Competitive Process Manager regarding questions or requests for additional information.
- Attended the Competitor briefings, Final presentations and Panel deliberations. The following Council officers were in attendance:
 - Anita Morandini, Design Excellence Manager; and
 - Shannon Rickersey, Senior Planner – Planning Assessment.

2.2. PARTICIPATING ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS

The following three consortiums were invited to participate in the Competitive Design Process were:

- Group GSA and Tribe;
- PTW and Collins and Turner; and
- Turner and Andrew Burns Architects.

All Competitors participated in the Competitive Process.

2.3. KEY DATES OF COMPETITIVE PROCESS

The key dates for the competitive process were as follows:

Date	Milestones
6 October 2017	Commencement Date
9 October 2017	Briefing Session and Site Visit
24 October 2017	Progress Submission Lodgement Date
10 November 2017	Final Submissions Lodgement Date
17 November 2017	Presentation Date
Within 14 days of Presentation Date	Decision Date
Within 14 days of Presentation Date	Notification to Competitors
22 December 2017	Competitive Design Alternatives Report

3. REVIEW OF THE DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

3.1. OVERVIEW

Following the lodgement of the final competitive design schemes, a technical assessment and compliance review of the Competitor's submissions was undertaken by the technical advisors. This review was provided to the Selection Panel.

Each Competitor presented their scheme to the Selection Panel explaining their approach to the site, design concept, compliance with the planning framework and design, planning and commercial objectives of the brief, and benefits of their scheme.

The design schemes were then evaluated by the Selection Panel. Technical advisors provided input limited to technical matters and compliance only.

3.2. SELECTION PANEL

The Selection Panel appointed by the Proponent for the Competitive Process comprised:

Tony Caro (Director at Tony Caro Architecture) Selection Panel Chair person

Paul Berkemeier (Director at Paul Berkemeier Architects)

Sherwood Luo (Managing Director at Greenland Australia)

John Pradel (Director at SJB Architects)

Two Selection Panel members were nominated by the City of Sydney and two were nominated by the Proponent. The Panel has extensive experience covering architectural and urban design and development.

3.3. TECHNICAL ADVISORS

Technical advice was provided to the competitors throughout the competitive process and an assessment of the schemes was undertaken at the progress session and final submissions. Technical advisors included the following:

Stephen White (Urbis) – Planner

Ryan Macindoe (Urbis) – Planner

Naomi Weber (Urbis) – Planner

James Doolan (Slattery) – Quantity Surveyor

Jamie Shelton (Northrop) – Structural Engineer

Ben James (Wood & Grieves) – Services

Nicholas Johnson (Wood & Grieves) – Services

Nathan Mitchell (AECOM) – Infrastructure & Flooding

Gwion Schiavone (AECOM) – Infrastructure & Flooding

Andrew Hulse (ARUP) – Traffic

James Turner (ARUP) – Traffic

Stuart Boyce (BCA Logic) – BCA

Andrew Newberry (BCA Logic) – BCA

The technical advisors also provided technical and compliance feedback to the Selection Panel at Final Presentations .

3.4. CITY OF SYDNEY OBSERVERS

The Competitive Process and assessment was also overseen by the following City of Sydney Council Observers who attended the final presentations of the schemes and provided planning and procedural clarification to the Selection Panel:

Anita Morandini, Design Excellence Manager; and

Shannon Rickersey, Senior Planner – Planning Assessments.

3.5. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

An analysis and assessment of each design was undertaken using the assessment criteria in the Design Brief. The Selection Panel focussed on design quality and undertook an assessment of each of the schemes identifying positive attributes and areas for further development. Based on this method of assessment, a winning scheme was recommended. A completed Assessment Criteria, signed by the Selection Panel, is attached to this report.

3.6. PANEL COMMENTS

The three submissions all demonstrated to varying degrees an understanding of the Design Brief, site context and Stage 1 consent requirements, LEP and DCP controls and were accepted as generally fulfilling the submission requirements. Submissions were reviewed by Panel members prior to the presentations with regard to the assessment criteria, and then collectively for a comparative assessment following presentations. Details of the Competitor's schemes and Selection Panel's deliberations are discussed in the following sections.

BLOCK A

GROUP GSA

- **Planning:** The scheme largely respected the Stage 1 building envelope and presented justifications for any non-compliance. Overshadowing to McPherson Park was well considered, preserving sunlight and minimising shadow impacts. The ground level entry arrangement would be improved with an identifiable point of entry to each of the blocks from the public domain as well as from the communal courtyard. The balustrade around the rooftop terrace on the lower building form exceeded the maximum building height outlined in the LEP by approximately 900mm. The proposal is within the GFA allocated at Stage 1.
- **Commercial:** The scheme demonstrated generally efficient floor layouts and apartments are compact and well planned. Whilst the proposed access to all Level 7 apartments by internal stairs from Level 6 is compliant, it was not considered to be commercially desirable.
- **Design:** Urban design and broad site planning have been well considered. The overall planning strategy and moves such as the cutback western end to open up McPherson Park to additional sunlight were appreciated by the Panel. Generally, this scheme offered a very competent design approach.
- **Buildability:** Stacking of wet areas to avoid acoustic issues would need to be addressed. The Panel appreciated the limitation of the basement to a single level, however the need for sufficient ceiling height to accommodate services and structural transfers would require substantial resolution during design development.

Figure 1 – Group GSA Scheme – South Façade



PTW

- **Planning:** The scheme challenged the Design Brief with an alternative approach to the Stage 1 envelope. Whilst this offered advantages to the scale of the built form and solar access to the Park, it created other issues that were not sufficiently resolved to justify the departure. The design quality of the deep, single-level under-croft space at the main entry was not adequately resolved. The planning of apartments required further resolution, particularly with regard to separation distances and provision of adequate cross privacy. The PTW scheme was within the LEP height limit and GFA allocated in the Stage 1 approval.
- **Commercial:** From a commercial and marketability perspective, the Panel was concerned that the alternative built form did not provide sufficient units facing north to achieve both solar access compliance and optimisation of northern views towards the city.
- **Design:** Whilst the articulation of the upper levels into two separate forms to allow for more light into McPherson Park was supported, the amenity consequences were not thought to justify this approach. The Panel also questioned the two distinctly different aesthetic characters, with the strong, highly modelled three-storey masonry base unrelated to both the form of adjacent sites and the sheer upper level curtain walls.
- **Buildability:** Whilst the approach to facade material palettes met the brief in terms of creating architectural diversity, the matters of cost, buildability and compliance of the upper curtain wall were of concern to the Panel.

Figure 2 – PTW Scheme – South & West Façade



TURNER

- **Planning:** The scheme largely respected the Stage 1 building envelope and presented justifications for non-compliances. The Turner scheme was within the LEP height limit and GFA allocated in the Stage 1 approval. It best addresses the intent of the City of Sydney's planning controls such as building height and the treatment of setback zones, and has the most potential to achieve design excellence. Floor layouts, common areas and unit plans are particularly well resolved and commended by the Panel for their efficiency, amenity and variety. The Turner scheme appeared to show additional shadow over McPherson Park in comparison to the approved Stage 1 building envelope.
- **Commercial:** The submission generally satisfied the commercial requirements of the Brief. The floor layouts maximise the number of north facing apartments and the apartment plans optimise useable floor area. The proposal includes two lifts in the cores of the eight level elements and this would provide a high level of amenity.
- **Design:** The preservation of the proposed materials palette (face brickwork and precast concrete) is considered important to the achievement of design excellence. The scheme has resolved internal courtyard corners, with privacy and acoustic amenity well considered. The common areas are superior with commendable amenity, good access to natural light and the lobbies have a strong street presence.

Whilst the building form is legible and well resolved, the Panel encourages articulation of the single mass of built form facing Macpherson Park to achieve a finer grain. The parapet *brise soleil* was also questioned as it amplifies the singularity of the built form and overshadows the Park. The articulation of the ground and first floor two levels into two horizontal bands requires further consideration to reinforce the scale, rhythm and form of the Andrew Burns terraces.

- **Buildability:** The level of architectural and engineering resolution is commended for this level of concept design and should translate easily into the next stage of development.
- The basement design needs further consideration to improve efficiency and deliver an acceptable deep soil outcome.

A photomontage of Turners winning scheme is provided below.

Figure 3 – Turner Scheme – South Façade



BLOCK D

TRIBE

- The central light well will bring natural light and enhanced solar amenity into what is otherwise a fairly conventional terrace house plan.
- The architectural expression of the terraces was questioned by the Panel, particularly in the context of the proponent's own analysis. The unarticulated horizontal spandrel at parapet level suggests the reading of the form to be that of a low apartment building rather than a terrace of individual attached dwellings.
- The continuous band of perforated screens and lack of external access at the top-level bedrooms and would require redesign. The kitchen location was questioned from a marketability perspective.
- Whilst the rhythm of angled wall elements was appreciated from an aesthetic perspective, they did not seem to offer any obvious advantage to the internal amenity of the dwellings.

Figure 4 – Tribe Scheme – South Façade



COLLINS AND TURNER

- The architectural proposition offers a nuanced contemporary architectural character of great quality, and demonstrates how variation and identity can be introduced within an over-arching aesthetic rationale.
- The terraces have good modulation, appropriate rhythm through vertical character and consequently a high level of perceived marketability.
- Largely due to the extended kitchen wing, the terraces present as very substantial, quite luxurious dwellings when compared to more conventional compact terrace layout and forms.
- The car-parking space and outdoor courtyard is tight, as the available width is reduced by the kitchen wing.
- The kitchen wings are a feature of this proposal but of concern from a cost perspective.

Figure 5 – Collins and Turner Scheme – South Façade



ANDREW BURNS ARCHITECTS

- The terraces show a clear design relationship to Turner’s Block A scheme, and are compact, well planned and highly considered.
- The urban approach is resolutely conventional and the architectural expression a subtle, modern interpretation of the classical terrace house. The Panel considers this to be an appropriate response to the urban context
- Substantial deep soil setbacks fronting Metters Street will allow for a strong landscape setting to be created for these buildings.
- The upper level balconies will provide added residential amenity and a pleasant district outlook.
- The bigger backyards enhance amenity for residents.
- The Panel notes that the 9m LEP height control (2 storey plus attic) in combination with the provision of minimum flood planning levels limits the provision of generous ceiling heights to primary living areas (i.e. 2.7m finished floor to underside of ceiling). Hence, pending environmental impacts, some additional height would benefit the proposal for Block D.

Figure 6 – Andrew Burns Architects Scheme – South Façade



4. SELECTION PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Selection Panel assessed the architectural schemes for the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for the redevelopment of Blocks A & D at 57 Ashmore Street, Erskineville. Of the three consortium schemes presented, the Turner scheme and Andrew Burns Architects scheme proposed the most convincing response to the commercial and planning objectives of the Brief, and in the opinion of the Panel these schemes are capable of achieving design excellence. The Panel therefore selected the proposals of Turner and Andrew Burns Architects to progress the design development of Blocks A and D respectively to Stage 2 development application (DA) stage.

In proceeding to Stage 2 DA, the Panel recommends that the following items be addressed:

Block A – Turner Architects

- Provide an increase in floor-to-floor height on the ground level.
- Consideration of a two-storey vertical articulation for the ground and first floor levels to relate to and reinforce the scale, rhythm and form of the Andrew Burns terraces.
- Reconsideration of the roof level *brise soleil* to assist with reducing overshadowing of Macpherson Park and to provide more formal variety, vertical rhythm and finer grain to the south façade.
- The overall built form should provide more formal variety and fine grain articulated to resolve the uniform character.
- Refine the solid to void ratios between windows and brickwork to optimise solar and visual amenity for occupants.
- Improve the efficiency of basement planning.
- For sustainability, the area of soft landscape on the rooftop should be maximised.
- Provide sufficient soil depth for significant planting to podium deck.
- The elevation treatment is to be developed and aligned with plans. Noting currently the proposals elevations and plans at the lower levels are not co-ordinated.
- Presentation of the material palette (face brickwork) and precast concrete is considered important to the achievement of design excellence.

The amenity requirements of the ADG are to be considered and met as the design develops. **Block D - Andrew Burns Architects**

- Effective weather protection should be provided to windows, entry points and outdoor living spaces.
- Improved privacy should be provided to all mid-level bedrooms.
- As noted, the Panel considers pending environmental impacts that some additional height would be of benefit to any proposal for Block D, and recommend that this should be resolved with Council prior to submission of the DA.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This Report summarises the outcomes of the Competitive Process for 57 Ashmore Street, Erskineville.

The Competitive Process was undertaken in accordance with the Design Excellence Strategy for the site and the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney on 05 October 2017.

The Report documents the Competitive process and the Selection Panel's final recommendation for the preferred design.

In summary:

- A competitive process has been undertaken for the design of the future redevelopment of 57 Ashmore Street, Erskineville – Blocks A & D. The relevant provisions of the Stage 1 DA consent (D/2015/966), SEPP 65, the ADG, Sydney LEP 2012, Sydney DCP 2012, and City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2013 have been considered through this competitive process.
- The competitive process undertaken and the submission of this report for Council satisfies the reporting requirements of Clause 6.21 of Sydney LEP 2012 and Clause 4.3 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2013.
- The Turner scheme (Block A) and Andrew Burns Architects (Block D) were recommended as the preferred schemes of this process and accordingly they are to progress the schemes to be lodged within a detailed development application to the City of Sydney. The decision was unanimous as the Selection Panel believes that these schemes best met the Brief and achieved the highest results in terms of the relevant assessment criteria.

It is considered that the winning schemes by Turner and Andrew Burns Architects, subject to further refinement as set out in Section 4, fulfil the design, commercial and planning objectives of the Brief and are capable of achieving design excellence.

The Selection Panel confirms that this report is an accurate record of the Competitive Process and endorses the assessment and recommendations.

DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 22 December 2017 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd's (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Greenland Golden Horse Investment (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Competitive Design Alternatives Process Report (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

APPENDIX A DESIGN COMPETITION BRIEF



BRISBANE

Level 7, 123 Albert Street
Brisbane QLD 4000
Australia
T +61 7 3007 3800

GOLD COAST

45 Nerang Street,
Southport QLD 4215
Australia
T +61 7 5600 4900

MELBOURNE

Level 12, 120 Collins Street
Melbourne VIC 3000
Australia
T +61 3 8663 4888

PERTH

Level 14, The Quadrant
1 William Street
Perth WA 6000
Australia
T +61 8 9346 0500

SYDNEY

Tower 2, Level 23, Darling Park
201 Sussex Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
T +61 2 8233 9900

CISTRI – SINGAPORE

An Urbis Australia company
#12 Marina View
21 Asia Square, Tower 2
Singapore 018961
T +65 6653 3424
W cistri.com

URBIS.COM.AU