



CITY OF VINCENT

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Wednesday 9 May 2018 at 4.10pm

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

MINUTES

Attendees:

<u>Design Advisory Committee Members:</u>	<u>City of Vincent Officers</u>
James Christou (Chairperson)	Cathrine Temple (A/Manager Approval Services)
Munira Mackay	Rana Murad (Senior Urban Planner)
Joe Chindarsi	Remajee Narroo (Senior Urban Planner)
Simon Venturi	Kylie Harrison (Urban Planner)
Tom Griffiths - observer	Roslyn Hill (Minute Secretary)
Sid Thoo - observer	

Applicant-Item 3.1

Deon White	Roberts Day
Emma Van Der Linden	Roberts Day
Gary Mackintosh	Hames Shanley
Rod Gardiner	Qube Property Group
Steven Postmus	CAPA
Matthew Pike	Full Circle Design Services

Applicant-Item 3.2

Greg Moore	Building Development Group
Hugh Rogers	Building Development Group
Heath Moloney	Building Development Group

Applicant-Item 3.3

Jeff Freeman	Jeff Freeman Architects
S Freeman	Jeff Freeman Architects
Henry Betlehem	Urban Concepts
C Bradshaw	
Rich Hoad	O Corp

4.10pm Member Discussion
4.20pm

1. Welcome / Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson, James Christou declared the meeting open at 4.20pm.

2. Apologies

3. Business

4.20pm–4.50pm – Applicant’s Presentation – DA Lodged

3.1 **Address:** Nos. 295-307 Stirling Street, Perth

Proposal: Four Storey Development Comprising of 47 Multiple Dwellings consisting of 26 One Bedroom Dwellings and 21 Two Bedroom Dwellings and Associated Basement Car Parking- Extension to the Validity of the Planning Approval

Applicant: Roberts Day

Reason for Referral: The proposal will likely benefit from the referral to the DRP in terms of the City’s Built Form Local Planning Policy 7.1.1 (LPP 7.1.1).

Discussion: The Design Advisory Committee comments from the meeting on 2 April 2014

- Design Excellence is required to achieve the extra floors.
- The resulting proposal is not ideally oriented, however it was previously demonstrated as being a sensible approach given the site constraints, *however to achieve Design Excellence, more effort could be made to develop this approach to improve the amenity of residents, neighbours and the public domain.*
- Currently, most apartments are single aspect and face east or west.
- As previously recommended, optimise amenity to apartments by increasing the number of apartments which receive northern light.
- Previously, the DAC suggested that, as a minimum, at least the northern apartments should capitalise on their location and open up to northern solar access. On the upper floors, at the northern end of the front block, it was suggested that the end apartments could be removed, reduced in size, or reconfigured to one, to provide an appropriate setback allowing north facing balconies and living areas. In doing so, this would also serve to reduce building mass to the neighbouring single storey residential. *The applicant is reluctant to lose any apartments and instead has introduced balconies to the existing end apartments. Because these remain close to the boundary, high privacy screens are required which works against the objective of improving Northern solar access.*
- To assist maintain yield, the DAC had suggested exploring four storeys plus loft in the rear block. *The applicant was reluctant to pursue this as it was felt to be a less attractive proposition to the market.*
- As previously suggested, consider optimising northern solar access via roof for top floor apartments. The applicant has introduced a strip of clerestory windows. Consider making these operable to also improve cross ventilation, which is currently limited.
- The DAC previously recommended providing views out of the corridors to improve amenity. Continue corridors through to the southern end to obtain light and ventilation. *The applicant still has not pursued this.*
- Articulation and materiality of elevations has improved and provides a contemporary and appropriate response to context.
- Articulation of the front wall has been improved. However, as previously recommended, stair access could still be considered as it would benefit the ground floor apartments and further activate the street.
- Improve daylighting and natural ventilation to bathrooms.
- Most apartments remain single aspect limiting cross ventilation.

Recommendation:

- **This proposal requires Design Excellence to achieve support for the additional (fourth) floor.**
- **Policy No. 3.5.11 Exercise of Discretion for Development Variations offers development bonuses in return for exemplary design only. Well-designed buildings can optimise yield without negatively impacting on the amenity of residents, neighbours and the public domain. This proposal is yet to achieve this.**

- The resulting proposal is not ideally oriented, however was demonstrated as being a sensible approach given the site constraints, however to achieve Design Excellence, more effort could be made to develop this approach to improve the amenity of residents, neighbours and the public domain. Currently, most apartments are single aspect and face east or west.
- Many recommendations have been made to improve this proposal and it is acknowledged that some improvements have been made, however the applicant has left many unaddressed, prioritising yield.
- To achieve DAC support and Design Excellence, there are further improvements sought to;
 - improve the level of occupant amenity
 - provide an appropriate building mass that “steps down” between the “superlot” on the corner and the single residential lots adjacent.
 - Improve street engagement

Mandatory:

- Policy No. 3.5.11 Exercise of Discretion for Development Variations offers development bonuses in return for exemplary design only. Well-designed buildings can optimise yield without negatively impacting on the amenity of residents, neighbours and the public domain. In order to achieve Design Excellence the design is required to have adequately responded to the DACs 10 Principles of Good Design.
- To improve resident amenity;
 - Improve the number of apartments with northern solar access to balconies and living areas and cross ventilation.
 - On the upper floors, at the northern end of the front block, either remove apartments, reduce in size, or reconfigure to one, to provide an appropriate setback allowing north facing balconies and living areas. In doing so, this would also serve to reduce building mass to the neighbouring single storey residential. The applicant has gone some way to address this, however, instead of reducing building mass to achieve a reasonable setback, the balconies introduced to the existing end apartments are close to the boundary and thus require a high privacy screen, *which works against the objective of improving solar access and maintains the perceived bulk of the proposal.*
 - Optimise cross ventilation to apartments. Optimise the number of dual aspect apartments. Develop ventilation diagrams to demonstrate how cooling breezes, from the South West, can penetrate the building.
 - Improve the number of apartments with access to daylight and natural ventilation to bathrooms.
 - Optimise daylight, views out and potential for natural ventilation out of the corridors.
- To reduce building mass and improve amenity for neighbouring single residential;
 - Reduce building mass to the northern edge of the site, to transition between the superlot on the corner and the single storey, single residential lots adjacent. To achieve this reduce building mass to the upper floors, at the northern end of the front block.
- To improve street engagement and improve the amenity for the public domain;
 - Introduce stair access to the front courtyards to provide street access to front apartments, to further articulate the front wall, and to improve street activation.
- If the applicant wishes to maintain yield, consider relocating some apartments into a loft in the rear block.

Discussion:

The Design Review Panel provides architectural advice to the City of Vincent to inform the City’s assessment and determination of future planning applications. The DRP’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:

The Applicant gave a PowerPoint presentation.

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

<p>Principle 1 – Context and Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consideration is required in relation to the selection of materials and finishes. Consider neighbouring developments, heritage buildings and the ‘place’ based study that was undertaken to identify the strong local features that could be reinterpreted into the façade to contribute to and strengthen the identity of the area and immediate neighbouring streetscape. • Look at stepping the form back at the upper level. Create a legible three storey podium and the upper level to read as a recessed penthouse. The podium element can relate to the height/scale of the neighbouring developments and reduce the impact of bulk/mass of the building. Also consider a different material/finish and detail at the upper level. The side elevation clearly shows a four storey building with no set back that impacts on the streetscape and adjoining properties. A study of the 45 degree sightline to for a pedestrian at footpath level to the upper storey should assist in determining this setback dimension. • The ground level is not activated. The public area should be enhanced rather than relegated. More consideration is needed for the ground level in terms of façade articulation, fence design and relationship to local context. • The fence is high and increases as the footpath slants to the south. Possibly look at creating steps to the apartments from the footpath and change of fence height to better relate to the pedestrian footpath. • Integrate cues from the landscaping and ‘place’ based investigation into the architectural language of the proposals built form.
<p>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent of the landscaping proposal based on a ‘place’ investigation positively contributes to the development. • Confirm / increase deep root zones, canopy coverage and overall landscaping coverage to meet the City’s policy requirements.
<p>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed setbacks do not meet the City’s current Built Form Policy No: 7.1.1. The applicant is to refer to Figure C1.2.5 – Lot boundary setbacks adjoining properties coded R60 and above, in relation to the northern and western boundary setbacks, and respond accordingly. • It is noted that the current Built Form Policy currently only allows for 3 storeys, so in principal any consideration of an additional floor how this additional bulk and form is handled to minimise it’s impact on the surrounding levels where the future desired character is for 3 storeys.
<p>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of more natural light and ventilation to the internal passage way is encouraged. • It is noted from the previous minutes above that “the DAC previously recommended providing views out of the corridors to improve amenity. Continue corridors through to the southern end to obtain light and ventilation. <i>The applicant still has not pursued this.</i>”

	•
Principle 5 – Sustainability	N/A
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve amenity by access to northern light and cross ventilation into a higher proportion of apartments.
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	N/A
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that the built form design has not changed in principle and additional information on landscaping and sustainability has been submitted. • It is notable that some significant comments from the previous DAC comments have not been addressed, and that the project <u>had not</u> received Design Excellence. • Landscaping intent and Sustainability is positive

Conclusion:

Amendments to be further referred to DRP. The comments provided on 2 April 2014 are still valid. Applicant is to address these matters.

4.55pm–5.40pm – Applicant’s Presentation – No DA Lodged

3.2 **Address:** Nos. 377 Walcott Street, Coolbinia

Proposal: Three Storey Multiple Dwelling Development with associated car parking basement

Applicant: Building Development Group Pty Ltd

Reason for Referral: The proposal will likely benefit from the referral to the DRP in terms of the City’s Built Form Local Planning Policy 7.1.1 (LPP 7.1.1).

Applicant’s Presentation:

The applicant made a power point presentation.

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

Principle 1 – Context and Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited surrounding context shown on floorplans, elevations and perspectives. Show this to illustrate how the proposal responds to the surrounding context. • The skillion roof adds to the bulk/mass of the building without providing significant shading to the windows.
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping is considered well below the requirements as outlined in the City’s policy. • Give regard to the tree in the visitor parking and the need for a pedestrian clearance of 1 metre. This tree also impacts on the sightlines to the footpath.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regard should be given to future maintenance requirements for landscaped areas when considering the space provided, positioning of trees and garden beds and also the species of plants being considered. Engage a landscape architect to consider the landscaping in greater detail. • More detailed plans are needed for calculating and assessing required landscaping (canopy cover, deep soil zone etc) to comply with the City's policy
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	N/A
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A management plan will be needed for the visitor car parking bays. For example, a visitor to Unit 2 could park in front of Unit 4's garage and block access. • Reconsider the position of the bin store that is currently too prominent in the front setback. Possibly a different location and access point to the bin store. This could free up the path for more landscaping. Also the proximity of the bin store to Unit 1's outdoor area adversely affects its level of amenity. • Store room on the upper level looks like an 'add on'. Look at integrating it into the form and materiality of the development. • Provide a floorplan of the upper level storage area. • Consider the position of services (hot water system, air condition etc)
Principle 5 – Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide greater sun shading to north, east and west facing windows.
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bedroom 1 on the lower levels will receive noise from traffic through the entry. Acoustic measures will need to be explored. • Look at increasing the northern light to the upper units • The visitor experience along the side passage to the main entry and from the rear visitor car bays needs to be more articulated. Include lighting details to make it more legible and improve safety. • Also examine designing a more legible entry on the ground floor plan notably down the side. • The living spaces have a lack of outlook with a number of high level windows to these spaces. Consider flipping the bedroom and living areas. This could assist in accessing more northern light into living areas, reducing acoustic issues and possibly fire separation between the bedrooms. • Consider larger windows
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate the fire separation issue between the bedrooms facing each other, as well as having openings adjacent to fire-escape pathways. Also give regard to whether the windows are openable to achieve cross ventilation. If these windows are fixed due to fire-separation requirements, then they will not be beneficial for cross ventilation.
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 –	N/A

Aesthetics	
Comments	N/A

Conclusion:

Amendments to be further referred to DRP.

5.45pm–6.20pm – Applicant Presentation – No DA Lodged

3.3 **Address:** Nos. 37-43 Stuart Street, Perth

Proposal: 6 Storey Mixed Use Development (Multiple dwellings and commercial uses at ground floor level)

Applicant: Urban Concepts

Reason for Referral: For the DRP to consider the changes made by the applicant in response to the previous DRP comments and recommendations of 17 January 2018.

Applicant’s Presentation:

Applicant advised of the answers to the previous DAC comments.

Recommendations & Comments by DRP on 17 January 2018:

<p>Principle 1 – Context and Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consideration is required in relation to the selection of materials and finishes. Consider neighbouring developments and heritage buildings, identify their strong features that could be reinterpreted into the façade to contribute to and strengthen the identity of the area and immediate neighbouring streetscape. • The current materiality of the façades proposed, do not relate to the surrounding context. • More articulation is required to break down the building mass. Consider introducing different planes to the main façade (push and pull) to the front façade to break up the mass/bulk. Consider creating a podium height that matches the adjacent building and then step upper levels back. • The current façade is considered to be repetitive and does not give the impression of 4 different buildings. The narrow vertical indents between the buildings are insufficient to break up the building mass. • More active frontage is encouraged, particularly at ground level with the public realm. Relocate stores, utilities and car parking to create a more people friendly, interactive and attractive ground floor interface with the street. • Consider more activation of the laneway at the corner of the development. • Examine relocating the bins store under the car access ramps. • The façade is likely to dominate the heritage buildings so careful consideration is needed. • The design of the rear façade requires further consideration as to how it will coordinate with the heritage value of the rear properties. • Concerns with car parking being provided on the second floor will result in no activation to the street. • Take cue of the existing main features – horizontal banding, face brickwork & scale of the adjoining Maltings building - in applying elements to the façade that demonstrate a relationship to the existing context.
<p>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more detail on landscaping to demonstrate

	<p>compliance with the City's landscaping requirements including calculations of hard and soft landscaping areas to achieve compliance with the City's Policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the requirements of 'Design WA' regarding landscaping provision on structures. • A green wall could potentially be used along the full length of the upper car park façade to break up the vertical impact of the façade.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the usage of differing materials, form, colours and building plane to effectively transform the mass into smaller buildings rather than one big development that solely relies on repetition. • Examine the use of horizontal elements to mitigate the impact of the flat façade over 5 levels. • Look at stepping the form back at the upper levels and create a podium level. The podium element can relate to the height/scale of the neighbouring developments and reduce the impact of bulk/mass of the building.
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider relocating the car bays and stores to create more space for the commercial tenancies on the ground floor facing the street. • Level 1 parking has no interface to the street and provides a blank façade. This is not supported. Consider more articulation, full length vertical landscaping and the use of public art. • High water table of the site is acknowledged. Consider the nearby Bottleyard development on Palmerston and Stuart Street as an example where part below ground basement has been provided. Part below ground basement will reduce the length of ramps. • Lack of interface, windows and active surveillance from 1st level to the ground is a concern. • The ground level dominated by services and car parking bays. The public area should be enhanced rather than relegated. • Consider removing some car bays and reorientate the bays to parallel bays and free up some space to front facade.
Principle 5 – Sustainability	
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtyard windows adjacent to the bedrooms at the rear may not receive sufficient natural light and ventilation.
Principle 7 – Legibility	
Principle 8 – Safety	
Principle 9 – Community	
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the Maltings buildings will be helpful to improve the aesthetic outlook, including potential use of cooper/brewing references to reinterpret into façade treatment.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consideration of the City's Design Guidelines is required, especially with reference to the need for activation of both street frontages (laneway and primary street). • Given the context of the site in an inner City area a high quality design outcome should be sought that complies with the minimum car parking requirements but does not necessarily result in an oversupply of the car parking at the cost of design, response to context and activation of the main façade at street level. • Consider the courtyards to the bedrooms at the rear that are dependent on light and ventilation from the neighbouring

property to the south which at this stage has not been developed to the boundary.

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

**Principle 1 –
Context and Character**

- Consider the neighbouring streetscape, heritage buildings as well as context and identify some of the strong features and materials. Reinterpret these, without necessarily mimicking them, into the façades in a contemporary manner with the aim of positively contributing to the identity of the local area and streetscape.
- The significant character and heritage of the surrounding buildings generate an opportunity to make a meaningful architectural response contributing to the areas unique sense of 'place'.
- Look at stepping the form back at the upper levels and create a podium level. The podium element can relate to the height/scale of the neighbouring developments and reduce the impact of bulk/mass of the building.
- Improve streetscape activation by increasing the size and improving the layout of commercial tenancies to make this more viable. The current plan delivers a poor Urban design outcome
- Provide more articulation and detailed resolution to the street façade, with particular attention to street level activation of Stuart Street and Pandal Lane. The additional cross over reduces the interaction.
- Consider pulling back the sides of the upper floors to minimise the bulk/scale/visual impact from the street when approaching the building from both directions. The top floor (which exceeds the height permitted) requires increased side setbacks.
- More articulation is needed in breaking up the long horizontal appearance. Consider introducing vertical elements and consider creating smaller parcels. Repetition in the façade creates one long relentless horizontal form which adds to the bulk/scale of the building. There are four twinned apartments around lift cores in the overall building and this design approach should be expressed externally. One need only look over to the other side of the road at The Bottleyard Apartments at 99 Palmerston St to see a good example of how a well-articulated building can break down the scale of a large development to provide for a more intimate scale which responds appropriately to the scale of the surrounding buildings.
- Interface to the heritage building is considered overwhelming and no endeavour is taken to step down to integrate with the existing height of the adjoining heritage building.
- If over height is being proposed an attempt to minimise the impact/bulk of the additional levels should be shown whilst also providing sufficient justification for the concession being sought on height.
- The artwork proposed is generic and relies on a pattern

	to screening. Engaging a high quality artist to contribute to the proposal at an early stage is encouraged. It also not considered true interactive frontage at street level.
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detailed plans are needed for calculating and assessing required landscaping (canopy cover, deep soil zone etc) to comply with the City’s policy. • The deep soil zone is built over the cross over which creates an overhang where the trees are situated. This defeats the purpose of the deep soil zone and prevents the enjoyment of the landscape. It will be viewed from the streetscape but not from the apartments. • Engage a landscape architect to contribute to the proposal and confirm compliance with the City’s policy.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note the proposal is significantly over plot ratio and as such needs to make a significant positive contribution to the local context and provide a high level of amenity for users.
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excess car parking and overdevelopment provided is impacting on the ability of the project to activate the streetscape and provide a meaningful amount of landscaping. • Level 4 unit planning is considered dis-proportional. The living and dining areas are very large with small kitchens and bathrooms. • Lower level apartment layouts are irregular with living areas being small in the middle and generous at the end. • WC’s off dining rooms with no privacy transitions are not supported
Principle 5 – Sustainability	N/A
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider introducing light wells to increase natural lighting into the central areas of apartments. Deep floor plans minimise access to natural light. • Living areas adjoining the lifts have negative acoustic implications. Shielding lifts with bathrooms, laundries, store rooms is encouraged. • Consideration is needed to the commercial areas in relation to being able to change the use of the tenancies (acoustic and viability). • Bedroom windows are directly facing the long narrow gun-barrel communal walkways hindering privacy and generating acoustic issues. Provide shielding devices using voids, landscaping, screening etc. to enhance amenity and articulation.
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information is required in relation to the fire engineer’s analysis of the proposed single egress stair.
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design has changed minimally in principal and many previous comments from DAC have not been addressed. Significant changes to the general organisation of the proposal will be required to address a number of issues. • Further additional information on landscaping and

	sustainability is to be submitted. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Access to car parking from Pandal Lane is required
--	---

Conclusion:

The DRP does not support the design from an urban design, its ground plane -(its lack of activation of the street) its massing, its detail. Return to DRP.

4. General Business

5. Close / Next Meeting

There being no further business, the Chairperson, James Christou declared the meeting closed 6.20pm.

The next meeting will be held on 23 May 2018.