



CITY OF VINCENT

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Wednesday 6 February 2019 at 3.30pm

**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)	John Corbellini (Director Development Services)
Simon Venturi	Jay Naidoo (Manager Development & Design)
Ailsa Blackwood	Joslin Colli (Coordinator Planning Services)
Joe Chindarsi	Mitch Hoad (Senior Urban Planner)
	Karsen Reynolds (Urban Planner)
	Roslyn Hill (Minute Secretary)

Applicant-Item 3.1

Alene Sullivan	FJM Property
Kyle Jearons	FJM Property
Dan Lees	Element
Yong Lee	Hassell
John Paul Davies	Hassell

Applicant-Item 3.2

Ara Salomone	State of Kin
Jessie Nguyen	State of Kin
Dean Kyron	Client
Arthur Kyron	Client

Applicant-Item 3.3

Leigh Caddy	Element
Tony Di Leo	STH
Mark Zuvela	STH
Tony Paduano	Element

3.15pm Member Discussion
4.10pm

1. Welcome / Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson, James Christou declared the meeting open at 4.10pm.

2. Apologies

3. Business

4.10pm–4.50pm – Applicant Presentation – No DA Lodged

3.1 **Address:** 742 Newcastle Street, Leederville

Proposal: Mixed Use Development comprising of One Showroom, Two Café/Retail and Four Offices, and Associated Car Parking

Applicant: FJM Property

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 presented 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">• Consider how the surrounding character is interpreted at the ground level, particularly in relation to how the showroom sits in the context of surrounding shop tenancies and activation.• Transparency for the Ground Level is very important and needs to be maintained• Consider multiple entry points into the ground floor showroom.• Approach to materiality should assist to break down the bulk and massing of the building. Streetscape materiality could use further development, drawing from the materials and detailing of the character shopfronts in the area to take into further consideration the Leederville Town Centre context.• Consider some stepping down on the upper levels in line with the Leederville Masterplan intent. The box approach is convincing but there needs to be some consideration on how light might reach into adjoining lots. Stepping of massing down on the western side would provide a better transition to the heritage-listed character buildings and reduce the impact of the proposed building bulk/scale.• Engage an artist early. Consider possibilities to deliver artistic interventions at the building and laneway level. For instance an Artist could develop a structure for the green creeper wall.• It is noted that the articulation, façade and materials are a good approach• Detail is needed on how the rear tenancies will open up to the laneway, consider if these panels can be articulated and opened up completely to allow full engagement• The width of glazing at ground level on Vincent Street is not convincing given the building next door has three tenancies in an area half the size of the frontage. More
--	--

	refinement is needed on the glazing at ground level.
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping is a strong priority for the City, and the proponent is to consider the following points when progressing • Look at opportunities to meet the City's deep soil and canopy coverage requirements. Reminder that the City's requirement for deep soil zone can be situated on structures as long as the soil is a minimum of 1m wide, 1m long and 1m deep. • The current planting mostly on the rooftop seems exclusive/privatised. Consider planting opportunities in the laneway to achieve public amenity and street-scape activation. This will also aid to achieve the City's deep soil zone and canopy cover calculations. Planting here will be a valuable asset if delivered well • Consider further canopy cover on the rooftop in the central areas that does not increase the bulk of the building from the streetscape. • Consider relocation of existing street tree rather than removal given its maturity. • Consider creating views from Vincent Street through the building to the laneway planting and green climbing wall. • On top of the two site context drivers defined that contribute to generating the interlocking building language, there is opportunity to bring a third green/garden influence from the laneway direction, working with the tall eucalypt trees, into the building. This could help bring more of an interesting pattern to the green veneer and aid to break up the potential bulk of block creeper planting. It could also contribute to conceptual design of landscape elements in laneway activation.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The laneway is a fantastic opportunity that can only be successful with a building of this size and density. Future modifications to the hotel at the rear adjoining the laneway would also assist in activating this space.
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle access off Vincent is not ideal. It is noted that the laneway could be used rather than Vincent Street.
Principle 5 – Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central void appears small given the size of the building floorplates. Light study is recommended to be undertaken on the central sky light to ensure appropriate size and appropriate materials that might be required to reflect and increase the natural light down into the central areas of the building.
Principle 6 – Amenity	N/A
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"> • Policy for developments adjoining heritage sites is to be considered

Conclusion:

The DRP commends the proponent on conflating the internal program with the public realm, specifically to the Southern Lane interface.

The DRP supports the development on the basis of the proponent refining the following key items:

- The frontage of Vincent Street ground plane. The proponent should consider reviewing the grid within the shop fronts to achieve a high level of glazing, transparency through the building with well detailed fronts and entries. (Avoid long uninterrupted expanses of floor to ceiling glass on the Ground).

The detailing of the shopfronts to respond to the finer grain elements of the precinct and its scale in line with the scale of the Leederville Precinct, in order to avoid the shop front of a showroom. Detailing of the shop fronts should consider:

- i. Operable elements
- ii. Low canopies to determine shop fronts – high canopies main entries, canopies should be high quality. Use of colour and framing types to the shopfronts should be considered.
- iii. That the proponent meet the City’s deep soil zone and canopy coverage area requirements; and work these to bring about street activation and public amenity.

Proposal to be returned to DRP.

4.50pm–5.25pm – Applicant’s Presentation – DA Lodged 5.2018.372.1

3.3 Address: 58 Kalgoorlie Street, Mount Hawthorn

Proposal: Single House

Applicant: Caitlin Kyron / Konstantine Dean Kyron

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 presented a power point 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"> • Passive surveillance is important; Mt Hawthorn has a friendly community and engaging community. The proposal appears like it is gated bunker and turning its back on the street. The design is internally focused with minimal interaction with the streetscape • Look at the possibility of flipping the wardrobe and master bedroom and adding windows to this room. This would assist with the blankness of the upper floor. Glazing of the study is so far on the right that it is not visible • Consider opportunities to soften the approach to the house and increase passive surveillance of the street from the house.
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DRP has no concern with contemporary nature. The aesthetic is bold, and the DRP can understand why it might be considered out of context, due to the smooth white rendered form which appears void of context • There is insufficient information provided on surrounding context as shown on floorplans, elevations and perspectives in the original submission. Show the adjoining buildings including Cleaver Court to illustrate how the proposal responds to the surrounding context • Suggest putting a side-lite to the front door or could make front door glass to improve interaction between the street and house • Combination of really strong front fence with the solid building behind contributes to gated house aesthetic – consider softening. • Consider a perforated garage door (the doors to the front and rear of the garage). This will provide security but also create more transparency • Architectural outcome is heavily reliant on high quality detailing. Consideration is needed through the detailing stage to ensure the architectural intent is maintained and achieved. • Look at adding in additional materials to the front façade such as white face brickwork to relate back to the local context • Think about elements that can be brought in that can enhance the streetscape and community feel such as bench seating on the front fence
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing the invitation of the eye into the site. Planting could assist with this and increase with making it seem ‘friendly’ • Recommend getting a landscape architect involved before getting approval • Potential for some pruned low planting within the front grassed area – small citrus trees for example – this foliage seen from the street will help create depth in the front yard and soften the gated aesthetic.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly over height, look at way to push down a little • Study area could open up a little more – look at increasing glazing • Potential highlight window around the mudroom
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	N/A
Principle 5 – Sustainability	N/A
Principle 6 – Amenity	N/A
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrace will provide some good opportunities for passive surveillance
Principle 9 – Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest providing bench seats to the front fence to create better interaction to the streetscape

Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	N/A

Conclusion:

The client, the design team / contractor are very enthusiastic about the design of the residence and how it is inserted into the site to comply with the Cities Planning Policies.

The DRP support the contemporary design, however strongly suggest the following refinements are considered:

- Create greater visual interaction with the street
 - Consider perforated garage doors front and rear (off the garage) to create transparency and depth
 - Consider increasing the glazing to the study area, front entry area, and upper level habitable room, to visually link into the front yard and the street.

- Mass and Scale

Consider incorporating a window or highlight window to the mud room, the study façade and upper level to create further visual relief from ground level and first floor.

To be returned to DRP

5.30pm–6.10pm – Applicant’s Presentation – No DA Lodged

- 3.4 **Address:** 2 Alfonso Street, North Perth
- Proposal:** Aged Persons development
- Applicant:** Element / Southern Cross Homes Inc

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 presented 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"> • Some concern around the outlook from units on to the ramp. Look at screening or planting. • Opportunity to develop campus type palate of materials. Consider how the façade may change on the different streetscapes and acknowledge the adjoining monastery building by trying to draw from its materials in a contemporary way. Design from the perspective that the site is the whole Cathedral lot. • Consider the potential impact from Vincent Street so that the Cathedral line of site is not impacted.
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly note on the drawings which trees are to be retained, and any to be removed. • Recommend engaging landscape architect early – Consider engaging with a landscape architect that has

	<p>experience in designing for the future occupants, for example in creating sensory, memory evoking gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider planting to soften the two storey outlook • Consider the design of multiple garden types for both silent, personal contemplation, and for social amenity and gathering.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general site organisation appears to maximise north sun to a high number of units, and the ability to provide cross ventilation through the complex and into units and a high level of outlook from many units • Consider potential for a mix of single occupancy units and 2 bedroom etc • Breaking the architectural form of the complex along the streetscapes is encouraged to soften / break the massing of the complex and integrate into the surrounding single residential context
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtyards needs consideration to provide a diversity of areas for residents (privacy vs encouraging interaction) • Look at opportunities to reduce the length of the long corridors. Consideration needed for accessibility to the lift so that people can access the open space equally. Possibly installing seating along the corridors or something that encourages a communal feel and interaction of residents – this is their ‘streetscape’. • When the unit floor plans are developed consider cross ventilation through and natural light into the rear and sides of the units where possible. • Positive removal of multiple crossovers, ensure traffic engineer considers impact of the single access proposed • Individual pedestrian entries are encouraged along streetscape to integrate the complex into the surrounding single residential context
Principle 5 – Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bathrooms do not have natural light/ventilation. This is not supported.
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Try to get pathways away from the units to provide privacy from rear windows and allow for voids/ /bridge elements/openings and use of landscaping to act as buffers along these sections to improve amenity for residents • Accessibility needs to be considered. • Consider adding another lift in the southern half of the complex
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	N/A
Principle 9 – Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction in the communal outdoor areas - consider how this can be encouraged while still providing private / quieter areas
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	N/A

Conclusion:

The DRP commend the proponent on presenting their high-level masterplan, site plan and general arrangement of the serviced apartments and the consultation process they intend to follow.

There was general support for the approach and the DRP looks forward to further development.

To be returned to DRP.

4. General Business

5. Close / Next Meeting

There being no further business, the Chairperson, James Christou declared the meeting closed 6.10pm.

The next meeting will be held on 20 February 2019