

Attachment D

Competitive Design Alternatives Report

COMPETITIVE DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PROCESS REPORT

COMPETITIVE PROCESS SITE 2

**118-130 Epsom Road & 905 South Dowling Street,
Zetland**

30 July 2024

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

Selection Panel Endorsement

Name	Signature	Date
Peter Spira		30/7/2024
Tai Ropiha		30/7/2024
Jane Johnson		06/08/24
Richard Johnson		31/07/2024

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Overview	4
1.2	Site Description	5
1.3	The Proponent.....	5
1.4	The Consent Authority	5
1.5	Regulatory Framework.....	5
1.6	Assessment of the Scheme and Winning Design	5
2	Competitive Design Alternatives Process.....	6
2.1	Overview	6
2.2	Participating Architectural Consortiums	6
2.3	Technical Advisors	7
2.4	Observers.....	7
2.5	Selection Panel	7
2.6	Key Dates.....	8
3	Assessment of Final Submissions.....	9
3.1	Consortium 1 – WMK and Welsh + Major.....	9
3.1.1	Overview of the Design Scheme.....	9
3.1.2	Assessment of Submission.....	10
3.2	Consortium 2 – Sissons and Alexander Symes Architects	12
3.2.1	Overview of the Design Scheme.....	12
3.2.2	Assessment of Submission.....	13
3.3	Consortium 3 – Crone and Youssofzay + Hart	15
3.3.1	Overview of the Design Scheme.....	15
3.3.2	Assessment of Submission.....	17
3.3.3	Recommendations	18
5	Conclusion.....	19

Annexure

Annexure 1: Design Competition Brief

Annexure 2: Assessment Criteria

Annexure 3: Summary Packs

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

The purpose of this Competitive Design Alternatives Process Report (“the report”) has been prepared to inform the City of Sydney Council (City of Sydney) of the process and outcomes of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for the redevelopment of Competitive Process Site 2 at 118-130 Epsom Road & 905 South Dowling Street, Zetland, and the selection of the winning architectural design.

Karimbla Properties (No. 60) Pty Ltd (the Proponent), part of the Meriton Group, selected three architectural consortiums to participate in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process and prepare design proposals for Competitive Process Site 2.

	Consortium 1	Consortium 2	Consortium 3
Lead Architect	WMK Architecture	Sissons	Crone Architects
Emerging Architect	Welsh + Major	Alexander Symes Architect	Youssofzay + Hart

All three architectural consortiums participated wholly in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process and produced a final submission for consideration and assessment by the Selection Panel.

The Competitive Design Alternatives Process was undertaken in accordance with the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012, the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012, and the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2020.

Section 4.3 of the City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2020 sets out the requirements for a Competitive Design Alternatives 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 the preferred design and clearly demonstrate how this best exhibits design excellence in accordance with the provisions of Clause 6.12C(2) of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy.; and*
 - 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 applicant 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 Section 4.3 and outlines the Competitive Design Alternatives Process, the Selection Panel's assessment of each scheme, and demonstrates the

Selection Panel's rationale for selection of the winning scheme. Each Selection Panel member has reviewed and endorsed the content contained within this report.

The Competitive Design Alternatives Process was undertaken in accordance with the approved Design Excellence Strategy for the Subject Site, and in accordance with the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief prepared by Meriton Property Services Pty Ltd and endorsed by the City of Sydney on 23 April 2024.

1.2 Site Description

The Competitive Design Alternatives Process relates Competitive Process Site 2 within the Subject Site known as 118-130 Epsom Road and 905 South Dowling Street, Zetland. The Subject Site is legally described as Lot 7 in Deposited Plan 24134 and Lot 2 in Deposited Plan 830870

1.3 The Proponent

The Proponent for this Competitive Design Alternatives Process is Karimbla Properties (No. 60) Pty Ltd, part of the Meriton Group.

1.4 The Consent Authority

The subject site is located within the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA). The Consent Authority for the approval of the Competitive Process Site 2 will be the Central Sydney Planning Committee (CSPC) since the estimated value of the project will exceed \$50 million.

The Competition Manager liaised with Council Officers throughout the Competition. Council Officers observed the Competitive Process and the competitor's final presentation to ensure the integrity of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process and the outcome.

1.5 Regulatory Framework

The key Environmental Planning Instrument that applies to the site is the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP).

Clause 6.21D(3)(b) of the SLEP allows the Consent Authority to grant a Floor Space Ratio bonus of up to 10% if it is satisfied that the development is the result of a Competitive Design Process and that the building exhibits design excellence.

The Proponent is seeking to be granted up to 10% additional floor space in accordance with Clause 6.21D of the SLEP.

1.6 Assessment of the Scheme and Winning Design

An analysis and assessment of the designs was undertaken in accordance with the assessment criteria contained within the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief. This included the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, compliance with the relevant planning controls and the approved Stage 1 Concept DA.

The Selection Panel, by majority vote, recommended the **Crone Architects and Youssofzay + Hart** submission as the winning scheme for the competition. Details of the competitor's schemes and the Selection Panel's deliberation are discussed in the following sections.

2 Competitive Design Alternatives Process

2.1 Overview

The Proponent selected three consortiums made up of two architecture firms to prepare submissions in response to a Design Brief as part of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process. The Brief was prepared by Meriton Property Services Pty Ltd and endorsed by the City of Sydney Council on 23 April 2024. The process undertaken is described in more detail as follows:

- Three architectural consortiums were selected, each consortium was comprised of a lead architect and an emerging architect, all architects are recipients of an award or commendation from the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA).
- The Competitive Design Alternatives process commenced on 29 April 2024, ran for 8 weeks, and concluded on 24 June 2024 with final submissions lodged to the competition manager.
- A site visit and briefing session was held on 1 May 2024 to provide an overview of the site, allow competitors to see the site in its context, outline the planning controls and parameters of the Competition Brief, and outline key elements of the brief procedures to be adhered to during the process.
- The Selection Panel members were provided a copy of the Design Brief on 10 May 2024.
- An optional Progress Session was made available to each competitor during the Competition for competitors to ask questions of Technical Advisors. Only one consortium elected to participate in a Progress Session.
- A Register of Questions and Clarifications was kept during the process to document all questions received, responses given, clarifications to competitors and amendments to the Brief, without revealing the source of the questions.
- All competitors submitted an electronic Design Report (Final Submission), articulating their architectural proposal for the site.
- Each competitor presented their proposed architectural scheme to the Selection Panel during the Final Presentation date held on 8 July 2024. The Selection Panel deliberations were held immediately following the presentations on 8 July 2024. The discussions and deliberations of the presentations form the basis of this report.

The Competitive Design Alternatives Process was undertaken in an open and transparent manner with full consultation, consideration and disclosure with the City of Sydney in attendance as observers. In accordance with the City of Sydney's Competitive Design Policy, the Council was involved in the process as follows:

- Reviewed, provided comment and endorsed the Brief.
- Provided clarification on procedures where necessary and relevant advice.
- Approved brief amendments.
- Copied in to all correspondence between competitors and the Competition Manager regarding questions, amendments and clarifications.
- Attended the briefing session, the site visit, progress sessions, QS meetings, final presentations and were present during Selection Panel deliberations.

2.2 Participating Architectural Consortiums

The three architectural consortiums which participated in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process were:

1. WMK and Welsh + Major
2. Sissons and Alexander Symes Architect
3. Crone Architects and Youssofzay + Hart

All architectural consortiums listed above participated wholly in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process.

2.3 Technical Advisors

Technical Advice was made available to the competitors throughout the process and an assessment of the final submission schemes was undertaken. The technical advisors involved in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process are outlined in the table below.

Name	Company	Advising for
William Brindle	Meriton Group	Competition Manager/ Planning
Eirian Crabbe	Taylor Thompson Whitting (TTW)	Flooding
Ben Liddell	TRAFFIX	Traffic
Joanna Zhou	Meriton Property Services Pty Ltd	Structural Engineering
Steven Wehbe	Meriton Property Services Pty Ltd	Quantity Surveyor

2.4 Observers

The following observers from the City of Sydney were present at various stages of the process.

Name	Organisation	Position
Anita Morandini	City of Sydney Council	Design Excellence Manager
Silvia Correia	City of Sydney Council	Design Excellence Coordinator
Michael Stephens	City of Sydney Council	Senior Planner, Planning Assessment
Andrew Rees	City of Sydney Council	Area Planning Manager - South
Matthew Girvan	City of Sydney Council	Area Coordinator

The following observers from Meriton Group were present at various stages of the process.

Name	Company	Position
Walter Gordon	Meriton Group	Head of Planning and Development
Frank Ru	Meriton Group	Head of Architecture
Ian Lim	Meriton Group	Head of Design
Ching Oung	Meriton Group	Senior Design Manager

2.5 Selection Panel

The Selection Panel was comprised of two members selected by the Proponent, and two selected by the City of Sydney. The Selection Panel comprised the following members.

Name	Company	
Peter Spira	Spira Consulting	Proponent Nominee
Tai Ropiha	Director, CHROFI Architects	Proponent Nominee
Jane Johnson	Managing Director, Smart Design Studio	CoS Nominee
Richard Johnson AO MBE	Hon. Professor UNSW BE	CoS Nominee

All members of the Selection Panel have extensive experience in architectural design.

2.6 Key Dates

DATE	TASK/EVENT
	Commencement Date
29 April 2024	Design Competition began. Brief issued to Competitors
	Competitors briefing session and Site Visit
1 May 2024	A site visit was held on site at 10:00am. A briefing session for all competitors was held online following the site visit.
	Progress Session
28 May 2024	An informal progress session to seek clarifications limited to planning and technical compliance only was held. The session did not involve members of the Selection Panel. Presentations to be held online.
	Selection Panel briefing session
12 June 2024	A briefing session for the Selection Panel was held online.
	Quantity surveyor meeting
12 June 2024	Each competitor met with the quantity surveyor (QS) prior to the lodgement of final submissions.
	Final Submission Lodgement Date
24 June 2024	Competitors lodged their final submissions to the Competition Manager by 5:00pm (AEST).
	Lodgement of presentation date material and summary pack
1 July 2024	Competitors submitted a PDF presentation to the Competition Manager by 5:00 pm (AEST)
	Presentation Date
8 July 2024	Competitors presented final submissions to the Selection Panel. Presentations to be held at Meriton head office: Level 11, 528 Kent Street, Sydney NSW 2000]
8 July 2024	Decision Date

3 Assessment of Final Submissions

3.1 Consortium 1 – WMK and Welsh + Major

3.1.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design proposed by **WMK and Welsh + Major** is shown in **Figures 1** and **2**. A summary of the schemes credentials is detailed below:



Figure 1: View of proposal look west from future pedestrian link



Figure 2: View from North East, corner of Zetland and Defries Avenue

Element	Proposal		
Unit Mix	1 Bed/1 Bed + MPR	43	(15%)
	2 Bed	156	(57%)
	3 Bed	70	(25%)
	4 Bed	7	(3%)
	Total	276	
Residential Commercial / Retail	27,392 m ²		
	719 m ²		
Gross Floor Area (Max 28,105 m ²)	28,111.49 m ² 6.49m ² exceedance		
Car Parking	Residential	N/A	
	Visitor	N/A	
	Retail	N/A	
	Total	328 (Unit & Use mix allows 309)	
Amenities	1 x communal pool		
	1 x gym		

3.1.2 Assessment of Submission

The Selection Panel provided the following evaluation of the **WMK and Welsh + Major** scheme and presentation and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief and the potential to achieve design excellence.

WMK and Welsh + Major provided a well-considered public realm and urban design of the site, in particular the visual permeability from Zetland Avenue through to the internal square with a series of vistas.

The architectural grain and rhythm of building elements along Zetland Avenue was commendable. The arched form of the retail along Gunyama Park creates a distinctive expression and activation to the public realm. The additional retail location on the east-west pedestrian link creates an event and activation opportunities.

The panel commends the schemes flexibility in planning through a modular approach. The architecture of standardised material and precast elements has potential and is integrated and expressed on the façade creating a fine grain urban character with a diversity and playful expression.

Independent access with direct lift access to the pool is a strong element of the scheme, which removes the need to enter residential lobbies of other buildings.

The scheme displayed a sound ratio of solid to void across the façade and has integrated good ESD principles and objectives.

The location of the loading dock on ground floor compromises the ground floor plane and needs further development.

General unit and layout planning would benefit from further development. The scheme would **also** benefit from further block layout development to create greater separation between ground plane and mid-rise blocks.

The Proponent and Selection Panel thanks **WMK and Welsh + Major** for their submission and recognises the quality and extent of the work involved. Despite the strengths of this scheme, it was decided not to proceed further with this proposal.

3.2 Consortium 2 – Sissons and Alexander Symes Architects

3.2.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design proposed by **Sissons and Alexander Symes** is shown in **Figures 3** and **4**. A summary of the schemes credentials is detailed below:



Figure 3: View of proposal from East-West Pedestrian Link looking



Figure 4: View from North East, corner of Zetland and Defries Avenue

Element	Proposal		
Unit Mix	1 Bed + MPR	42	(15%)
	2 Bed /2 Bed + MPR	169	(62%)
	3 Bed	51	(19%)
	4 Bed (TH)	10	(4%)
	Total	272	
Residential Commercial / Retail	27,227 m ²		
	843 m ²		
Gross Floor Area (Max 28,105 m ²)	28,070 m ²		
Car Parking	Residential	264 (unit mix allows 271)	
	Visitor	25	
	Retail	18	
	Total	307	
Amenities	1 x communal pool at mid-rise roof level		
	1 x gym		

3.2.2 Assessment of Submission

The Selection Panel provided the following evaluation of the **Sissons and Alexander Symes** scheme and presentation and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief and potential to achieve design excellence.

Sissons and Alexander Symes are to be commended for the quality and comprehension of its submission and presentation material. The Panel were impressed with the urban analysis and design principles which informed the scheme and the concept of connectivity at both a local level and beyond the site.

The treatment of the retail frontage and opening up of the corner to Defries was a fresh take on retail requirements. The opening up of Defries Avenue with links and ground floor apartment access creates sound activation along Defries Avenue and good permeability throughout the site. Differentiation between retail and ground floor residential requires further development.

The ESD objectives incorporated into the scheme were commended. The scheme showcased consideration of public art opportunities and water feature opportunities. The scheme's consideration and analysis of 8-12 Peters Street was a distinguishing factor.

The inclusion of townhouses created a 'soft centre' to the site, and the panel commends their connection to the basement. The idea and exploration of the arches is commended however they may compromise public open space and would benefit from further refinement.

The façade system of aluminium louvres, whilst being a strong unifying element of the scheme, would benefit from a greater diversity of detail and expression of balcony and windows to create a finer grain, rhythm and residential character.

The Proponent and Selection Panel thanks **Sissons and Alexander Symes** for their submission and recognises the quality and extent of the work involved. Despite the strengths of this scheme, it was decided not to proceed further with this proposal.

3.3 Consortium 3 – Crone and Youssefzay + Hart

3.3.1 Overview of the Design Scheme

The design proposed by **Crone and Youssefzay + Hart** is shown in **Figures 5 to 8**. A summary of the schemes credentials is detailed below:



Figure 8: View of proposal from Zetland Avenue looking South



Figure 8: View from North East, corner of Zetland and Defries Avenue



Figure 8: View of Low-Rise Building from Block NW-2 across Letitia Street



Figure 8: View of Proposal from Gunyama Park

Element	Proposal		
Unit Mix	1 Bed + MPR	41	(15%)
	2 Bed /2 Bed + MPR	167	(62%)
	3 Bed	56	(21%)
	4 Bed	5	(2%)
	Total	269	
Residential Commercial / Retail	27,084.18m ²		
	728.48m ²		
Gross Floor Area	27,812.66 m ²		
Car Parking	Residential	312 (unit mix allows 315)	
	Visitor	27	
	Retail	24	
	Childcare	12	
	Total	375	
Amenities	1 x gym		

3.3.2 Assessment of Submission

The Selection Panel provided the following evaluation of the **Crone and Youssofzay + Hart** scheme and presentation and its ability to meet the objectives of the brief and its potential to achieve design excellence.

The Selection Panel by unanimous vote, recommended the **Crone and Youssofzay + Hart** submission as the winning scheme for the competition. **Crone and Youssofzay + Hart** presented the most compelling scheme which was well received by the Panel with consideration of the health and wellbeing of Country and a strong understanding and response to the surrounding precinct and urban design.

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 Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012, the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 and the City of Sydney Competitive design Policy 2020. It proposes buildings that will create a distinctive skyline, a good level of urban integration and deliver high levels of amenity to future residents, all of which will benefit the immediate precinct.

The ESD objectives incorporated into the scheme were commended.

The scheme provided great visual permeability and sense of openness created by the omission of the low-rise building east of Letitia Street, complemented by sound choice of materiality and building form.

The scheme had effective deep soil distribution across the site. The landscape design is comprehensive and well thought out, further consultation with the Council would be beneficial.

Further design development of pedestrian permeability adjacent to the carpark ramp and design development of the Gunyama Park and Defries Avenue facade would benefit the scheme greatly.

The Proponent and Selection Panel thanks **Crone and Youssofzay + Hart** for their submission and recognises the quality and extent of the work involved. The Selection Panel recommends this scheme as the winner of the Competitive Alternatives Process.

3.3.3 Recommendations

The Selection Panel recommended retention of the following strong elements of the scheme during design development:

- The general landscape approach across the site.
- Encourage the continued consideration of the health and wellbeing of Country through landscape and public art.
- The approach to materiality is to be maintained.
- Omission of the low-rise building in Block NW-2
- The opening of the courtyard in Block NW-2 fronting Letitia Street
- The awnings over the retail areas in line with the DCP
- Visual permeability throughout the site, achieved largely due to the gaps between building blocks.
- The simplicity of internal layout planning
- Acknowledgement and integration of public art
- The quantum of deep soil provided
- The open space (east-west link) to the north of 8-12 Peters Street
- Clearly defined building entries and lobby planning within tall buildings
- Composition of Zetland Avenue Façade.

The Selection Panel recommended the following improvements to the scheme:

- External gallery access to all low-rise buildings should be removed
- Dual lifts should be utilised across the development
- Relationship of central low-rise building to landscape east & west must improve – no solely ground floor bedrooms and living room must be on ground floor
- Central low rise building of 4 storeys is acceptable only if bulk is minimised.
- Physical connection of the low rise building to the mid/high rise to the north is not successful and not necessary.
- Pedestrian link to Defries Avenue adjacent to the carpark entry needs to improve by avoiding a dog leg and providing greater visual connection. Levels need to be resolved.
- Blank wall on Corner of Defries and Zetland needs to be improved/opened up with greater activation of the public realm/ retail to corner is a possibility.
- Further development of the conceptual weave approach is needed, especially on Gunyama Park façade and its connection to the Zetland Avenue tower façade.
- Basement efficiency and loading dock configuration
- Include a pool and other communal facilities in line with the brief.
- Simplified access to low-rise building east of Letitia Street via foyer of the building fronting Defries Avenue
- Current ground plane along Zetland Avenue to the east does not comply with active frontage – consider flexible home office arrangement.
- Further development of Defries elevation is needed.
- Ensure design development of Letitia Street and east-west link progresses in full consultation with the CoS to ensure delineation between public and private land and compliance with City of Sydney standards.

5 Conclusion

This report summarises the outcomes of the Architectural Design Alternatives Process for the redevelopment of Competitive Process Site 2 at 118-130 Epsom Road & 905 South Dowling Street, Zetland.

The design competition process has been carried out in a professional and thorough manner in accordance with the Competitive Design Alternative Brief, prepared by Meriton Group.

The winning entry, designed by **Crone and Youssofzay + Hart**, best 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 Meriton Group wishes to thank all teams for their participation.

This report is endorsed by the Selection Panel.