

**Design Advisory Committee (DAC) Comments dated 5 July 2017 & e-mail 30 November 2017**

4.3 **Address:** No. 137 (Lot 141) West Parade, Mount Lawley

**Proposal:** 2 Storey Multiple Dwelling Development

**Applicant:** Aaron Sice

**Reason for Referral:** The proposal will likely benefit from the referral to the DAC in terms of the City's Built Form Local Planning Policy 7.1.1(LPP7.1.1).

*Recommendations & Comments by DAC, Applicant's Response – 5 July 2017:*

<i>Principle 1 – Context and Character</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider angled/raking wall to second floor bedroom wall on boundary to create loft form tying into the existing top of wall to the neighboring building. As an alternative to this, possibly a diagonal in the façade via a change of material/colour to lock design into context acknowledging the neighboring boundary wall may suffice.</li> </ul>
<i>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A landscape architect will need to sign off on the landscaping requirements to confirm they comply with the City's requirements.</li> <li>An arboriculturalist consultant report will need to be submitted for the existing tree at the entry</li> </ul>
<i>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<i>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider removing the left wall around the existing tree and set the gate further back into the property thereby creating an entry niche for letterboxes etc.</li> <li>Whilst the entry sequence is generous consider trading ground space allowed to entry sequence for terrace space provided to units at first floor, northeast boundary.</li> </ul>
<i>Principle 5 – Sustainability</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<i>Principle 6 – Amenity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amenity from the upper floor is impacted from the entry being too generous – as per Principle 4 above.</li> </ul>
<i>Principle 7 – Legibility</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<i>Principle 8 – Safety</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<i>Principle 9 – Community</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<i>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical services to advise on the turf drive way deep soil zone and turf hardstand deep soil zones.</li> </ul>
<i>Comments</i>	

*Conclusion:*

*To be returned to DAC.*

*Applicant Response*

*DAC comments that we are reducing private open space to favour the communal open space is back-to-front. The design can only fit a minimum balcony and comply with fire separation requirements in the same breath by providing a minimum 3.0x3.6 balcony; and because of this reason, it was chosen to provide extra open space for the occupants' benefit.*

*The applicant has slid the second floor over to the South in an attempt to address the request, but it not only created setback issues, but fire issues as well (3.0m for a Type A Class 2). The cost to do this was also astronomical for little amenity gain.*

## **Design Advisory Committee (DAC) Comments dated 5 July 2017 & e-mail 30 November 2017**

*These concerns can be better addressed with flush sills to stacker-style sliding doors and timber-look tiles to the living room and balcony for a near-seamless transition between indoors and outdoors. With the void over, the designer considers the open feeling will be enhanced considerably.*

*For these reasons, the request has not been followed through.*

*DAC comments about sculpting the upper floor to reference the adjacent parapet has merit and was something that was considered. However, doing this has made a 2.7m wide bedroom feel even smaller. The external requirements meant creating a roof instead of a wall and from the very view it was designed to address, looked ill-referenced because the materials required didn't reference the development anymore. The need to reference a parapet wall is also debatable given that is unlikely to remain in perpetuity once TPS2 is gazetted and the heights to Lord St are realised. Once the neighbouring lot is developed, the site will be left with a wall that references nothing.*

*The materials provided to this section of wall, however, wrap the entire upper section to provide a level of 'placement' in the space, rather than something that looks like it's simply been built up to another wall, ignoring its presence above the height of the immediate area. For these reasons, DAC recommendations have not been implemented.*

*DAC comments regarding the gatehouse entry are very valid and changes have been made to simplify the construction and promote the tree to the entry way. Revision 2 reflects these changes.*

*Changes have also been made to the ROW balcony, providing the portal frame as discussed to provide a scaled 'step away' from the ROW and better address the human scale.*

*The living room windows, facing south, have been flipped vertically to provide for an obscured lower panel to meet the R Codes. Note the 'OBSC' window notation to the Elevation.*

*There are also a few minor changes here and there but inconsequential to the overall assessment.*

*By moving the gatehouse structure away from the tree, the root zones are not being disturbed, therefore an arborist ort isn't needed.*

### **E-mail from DAC – 30 November 2017**

*It appears that the applicant has explored options to address the DAC comments and returned, for the most part, to the original design proposal. It has not changed much since we reviewed it.*

*I am satisfied with the applicant's justification as to why they don't wish to amend the design (costs very high and benefits small)*

*It appears that the visitor parking bays have gotten longer / protrude further into the site from the laneway. This puts more pressure on the communal space, and has shifted the seating / pergola space such that it no longer lines up with the building entry. This alignment increases the legibility of the project and is a nice way to integrate the landscape and building, and could still be achieved with a minor redesign of this element.*

*I also note that the paving treatment on the visitor bays appears to have changed. Perhaps this was under direction of Technical Services?*

*In sum, I think this is a creative solution to a tricky site and should be commended. It has my support in the current form*