



CITY OF VINCENT

DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Friday 27 April 2018 at 3.30pm

**Venue: Committee Room
City of Vincent Administration and Civic Centre**

MINUTES

Attendees:

<u>Design Advisory Committee Members:</u>	<u>City of Vincent Officers</u>
Munira Mackay (Chairperson)	Joslin Colli (Coordinator Planning Services)
Joe Chindarsi	Rana Murad (Senior Urban Planner)
Damien Pericles	Stephanie Norgaard (Urban Planner)
Jeff Thierfelder	Fiona Atkins (Urban Planner)
	Roslyn Hill (Minute Secretary)

Applicant-Item 3.1
Chris Becvarovski

<u>Applicant-Item 3.2</u>	
Adriano Piviaci	
Ella Lin	Motus
Kate Whitton	Motus
Alan Stewart	Alan Stewart Planning

Applicant-Item 3.3
No applicant

3.30pm Member Discussion
4.00pm

1. Welcome / Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson, Munira Mackay declared the meeting open at 4.10pm.

2. Apologies

3. Business

4.10pm–4.30pm – Applicant Presentation – No DA Lodged

3.1	Address:	No. 47 Jugan Street, Mount Hawthorn
	Proposal:	Five, Two Storey Grouped Dwellings
	Applicant:	Risbec Designs

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 (LPP 7.1.1).

Discussion:

The Design Advisory Committee provides architectural advice to the City of Vincent to inform the City's assessment and determination of future planning applications. The DAC's advice is not planning advice and will not fetter the final determination made in respect of an application for planning approval for the proposed development.

Applicant's Presentation:

No presentation.

Recommendations & Comments by DAC (using the Built Form Policy Design Principles):

<p>Principle 1 – Context and Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The design creates one big house. Consider more articulation to look more like individual town houses that creates a repetitive rhythm down the street. Drawing on existing development for design is not necessarily the best approach in this area. Site suits a repeated module with a unique unit at the end that addresses both streets.• Consider tandem parking to reduce the bulk of garages with two crossovers adjoining from Leeder Street. This would allow outdoor living areas to be relocated and to be north facing instead of where the garages currently are located. The dwellings would have better frontage to the primary street.• Consider bringing the brickwork to the ground to emphasise the townhouse look. Look at how the detail of the ground and first floor interact. The gable end design elements could be further developed and emphasised to provide rhythm and provide a sense of individual identity for each of the townhouses.• The narrow townhouse is a good approach, appreciate attempt to address the street• Unit 1 becomes a prominent unit on the corner –therefore it needs to be carefully considered, perhaps with its own design elements to depart from repetition of the adjacent units (which should be repeats of one another).• Fencing is continuous and repetitive. Consider how the fence could be more informed and altered by redesign of the proposal. If private gardens are shifted to the north side of the buildings, fencing along the street can be reduced in height and made more visually permeable.• Concerns regarding lack of response to north facing aspect and Jugan Street and that the garages are seen from Jugan Street. Unattractive façade to the driveway• Both street elevations are important. Try to get some interaction along both streets• If reconsidered access, then the corner dwelling could move north to achieve a better design outcome and landmark on the corner• Roof pitch on all gable ends to increase to min 30 degrees
---	---

Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at the City's policy requirements in relation to landscaping (deep soil zone, canopy cover etc). • The site does not allow for the planting of mature trees to provide canopy cover. Opportunity for street tree planting on Leeder Street. Increase canopy cover to enhance the amenity of the residents. Possibly trees in the backyards. • Consider separating the dwellings with some greenery. Also consider putting in some greenery along the fence line.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	N/A
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take into account the position of the mailbox when designing boundary fencing and piers. • Swap ensuite and Walk In Robe to have more direct relationship to the exterior, increase light into the bathroom and create a bigger bedroom.
Principle 5 – Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide native tree and shrub species to enhance local biodiversity.
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider the orientation of the outdoor living spaces to face North. Dimension of courtyards to be revised and to be compliant. Needs to be at least 4x4 metres minimum dimension as per the R-Codes. Also consider private backyards as opposed to courtyards in the front setback. Flipping design would allow private outdoor living areas that are north facing. If private areas were at the rear, the fence could be lowered as there is no need for as much security/privacy. • Toilet accessed from the kitchen is not supported. Consider opening in to laundry.
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	N/A
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fence line should modulate and provide some increased interest as opposed to the very regular and monotonous design put forward. Change materials forms and colours and respond to adjacent uses/view requirements.
Comments	N/A

Conclusion:

Amendments to be further referred to DAC.

4.35pm–5.25pm – Applicant's Presentation – No DA Lodged

3.2 **Address:** Nos. 139 – 141 Lake Street,

Proposal: 3 Storey Multiple Dwelling Development and Eating House

Applicant: Alan Stewart Planning

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 (LPP 7.1.1).

Applicant's Presentation:

The Applicant gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Recommendations & Comments by DAC (using the Built Form Policy Design Principles):

<p>Principle 1 – Context and Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design does not address the single storey heritage building to the south, therefore consider some stepping down to the adjoining buildings to prevent overpowering • Remove this text • Corner should be more open. Might be more powerful as a floating box - consider blade columns if grounding is needed. • Northern elevations preferences both east and west in the angling of the reveals...suggest the east for the morning light. • Acknowledge Church Street has minimal existing streetscape, however concerned about the stores placed along Church Street • Lake Street elevation with the broader context should be provided to see how the development sits within this and the lot itself as it currently stands. Have not shown the double storey terraces. What materials and colours, textures etc can be drawn on to reduce the bulk and scale? • Show street elevation of proposal in context with street and existing heritage listed corner shop to the south. • Brick work is supported. Not convinced by uppermost floor - like the different material but the geometry simply repeated same as below should be reviewed – suggest a more sculptural approach as counterpoint for rigidity below. • Nice rhythm and simplicity on Church Street elevation which ties into the area – needs to be reinforced and strengthened as per previous notes.
<p>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some support for limited deep soil but ground plane needs to be highly activated, accessible and be very well resolved. • Check landscape area calculations are to the requirement of the City's policy or provide justification for the shortfall • Relationship to the park requires a more detailed proposal for council and community consideration.
<p>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height may be acceptable but keep in mind how the ground plane is considered. Take into account how the ground level will impact on the community and streetscape. Demonstrate how the ground level is of community benefit. • Height of the wall on eastern elevation adjacent café is well over head height and impacts negatively on streetscape. • Nil setback everywhere might be over development of the site

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streetscape and lack of massaging of the massing. Maybe emphasise frontage to the park. Feels like the building envelope is just being filled up. Consider playing with the levels rather than filling up the building envelope
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section reinforced that the entrance being single storey height is limiting - should consider double storey height void to allow more light, with brick screen treatment into void making more sense located here. Lightwell to west may work ok. Concerned about acoustic impacts where sound may bounce around through lightwell. Consider acoustic glass Consider integrating stores within apartments to free up Church Street frontage for interactive streetscape. Site access - 6 or 7 steps have been introduced which results in disabled access lift being required. Is there any potential to wrap a ramp around to do away with lift or lower level of commercial tenancy to be on grade/street level? Demonstrate how the park interface works out of hours Toilet on the ground floor – with the lobby being publicly accessible, there is concern about how this works particularly at night. Toilet for the commercial in lobby area needs to be handled carefully – demonstrate how this will not be a CPTED issue Consider removing a couple of apartments to get better internal flow, light and orientation – for instance it would be nice to be able to see out from windows at ends of corridors.
Principle 5 – Sustainability	N/A
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider rotating corner balcony to face north/east rather than south to maximize northern winter sun access where applicable Look into dropping the café lower – refer note above. Internal circulation upper floors with no views out – refer note above. Consider extending the central circulation all the way to the western edge of the building to let light in / create vista out.
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interface to the park and the security for the short stay - need to manage this interface
Principle 9 – Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level to the park should be reconsidered to activate the area - show how the community will access the café from the park
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mindful of services abutting neighbour. Consider the type of fencing to allow bins to be screened from view. Sections not provided – critical to review soil depth provisions

Conclusion:
Return to DAC.

4. General Business

5. Close / Next Meeting

There being no further business, the Chairperson, Munira Mackay declared the meeting closed 5.25pm.

The next meeting will be held on 9 May 2018.