

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 October 2018

Applicant's Presentation:

The applicant presented a power point presentation

Recommendations & Comments by DRP on 17 October 2018:

<p>Principle 1 – Context and Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DRP generally supports the design, however, the applicant needs to address way finding, function and resolution of material and detail. • Be true to the existing materials • Concern regarding the presentation to the street for the rear dwellings • Retention of the existing dwelling and northern orientation of dwellings is supported • Existing residence – consider retention of the existing balustrading and other distinguishing features and reinterpret in a contemporary way • Consider the 1970s (existing residence) as a reference point with the landscaping to the front
<p>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In seeking height and side boundaries variations, consider how the bulk can be ameliorated through landscaping species. At present it is not clear that the landscaping proposed will sufficiently mitigate building bulk. Management of landscaping to also be considered
<p>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering using a visitor bay as a residents bay to make it compliant • Wayfinding through development is difficult and needs to be further addressed. Need to consider functional element for moving furniture from ROW level to the upper apartments.
<p>Principle 5 – Sustainability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority use of light-coloured external walls is commendable • Consideration of opportunities to improve natural and cross ventilation are evident in the proposed design, and is also commendable. • A number of sustainable design initiatives are evident in the proposed design; it would be valuable to provide a summary of these design initiatives • Consider preliminary NatHERS assessments for each proposed dwelling to determine likely star rating and construction specification requirements.
<p>Principle 6 – Amenity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlooking may be mitigated by the proposed screening. A cone of vision diagram to assist with showing the intent • Look at more opportunities to implement bicycle parking
<p>Principle 7 – Legibility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the potential at the rear to redefine the entry by shifting the bays across so there could be a central access to the stairwell to give a sense of entry and avoid an indirect path where people have to walk back into the laneway to access the entry. • Presentation to streets – does not provide a sense of entry as people move through vehicle parking. Consider a separate pedestrian gate to increase legibility from Blake Street. Rearrange the parking to provide a clear and legible pedestrian entrance from the ROW (see above comment also). There is currently no sense of entry from either end.

Principle 8 – Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting and passive surveillance of rear entry will be an important consideration, currently ground access is indirect and past non-habitable rooms.
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	N/A

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

Principle 1 – Context and Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept of retaining the existing building is a positive outcome. Consider what additional elements could be retained that form part of the existing building and street character - for example, external rendering, replacement of roof with Trimdek in order to maximise character retention where appropriate. Further consideration needs to be given to the existing character and scale of the surrounding area - the proposed three storey height may establish an undesirable precedent in terms of bulk and height in particular. Generally it is a balanced use of contrast between the existing and the new building, combined with some good references in relation to materiality from the existing building into the new building There are major concerns regarding the impact of the proposed third storey within the two storey height limit and context of the area, including adjoining residential properties. It is acknowledged that the impact and appearance from the right of way is mitigated by the use of articulation, roof terraces/balconies and choice of external cladding materials. Provide further evidence – street elevations of adjoining and neighbouring buildings to demonstrate response to existing scale and character
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate the potential to provide landscaping/canopy cover within the car parking area adjacent to the ROW There are concerns as to whether landscaping within the side setback areas of the new building would sufficiently reduce the impact of the bulk of the building. The narrow side setbacks are likely to inhibit the growth of large trees in these areas. Currently landscaping exists on the edges of the design. There is potential for the landscaping to be a more integrated part of the whole design, with areas of landscaping/canopy cover that the future residents can be within/under. Look at opportunities to meet the City's deep soil and canopy coverage requirements. 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. There are substantial walkways adjoining the apartments. These walkways have the potential to

	<p>become part of the revised landscape design, incorporating canopy and plantings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current proposal appears to be an overdevelopment of the site. The City's landscaping requirements must be fully met, in order for the city to consider additional design concessions in relation to density.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are concerns regarding the impacts on adjoining properties resulting from proposed reduced side lot boundary setbacks and lack of articulation to side facades It appears to be an overdevelopment of the site when considering variations to plot ratio, lot boundary setbacks and building height. This generates a shortfall in relation to required landscaping and the proposal's impact in relation to height and bulk to the adjoining neighbours. It is acknowledged that the additional height of the building has been addressed to the ROW through the stepping of the building however the same consideration has not been applied to the side lot boundaries. It is recommended the upper floor is stepped in on the side lot boundaries to offset the impact of the development on the adjoining properties. Consider impact of any proposed third storey bulk in relation to solar access into adjoining properties in relation to morning sun and afternoon sun, particularly during the winter months. This is outside of the scope of the R-Codes but is a real impact and should be considered when breaching height restrictions. In Victoria, overshadowing of adjoining properties is considered between 9am and 3pm on the 22nd of September
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	N/A
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DRP is satisfied that the wayfinding issues raised during the previous meeting have been addressed

Conclusion:

To be returned to DRP.

4.40pm–5.35pm – Applicant’s Presentation – DA Lodged 5.2018.315.1

3.2 **Address:** 536 Charles Street, North Perth

Proposal: Mixed Use Development

Applicant: Perth Residential Development/Thi Loam Tram Nguyen

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 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"> • Potential for greater streetscape activation to contribute to a “friendlier” community. Consider designing a storefront to accommodate community activity that will provide additional planting with opportunities for the community to informally congregate – enliven and activate the street • Consider the broader context of the site. Demonstrate how the new development will fit in and contribute positively to its immediate neighbourhood. Details of the neighbouring existing buildings in the area should be referenced and considered as to how their positive features and character could be reinterpreted into the proposed development, as evidenced in the use of materials and detailing that will assist in fitting the new development within the current context
<p>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider providing more landscaping on portions of the site that are not subject to road widening • Consider setting back the awning to accommodate mature trees, providing good tree canopy coverage and thus greater amenity whilst softening the impact of the development at this exposed location • Consider engaging a landscape architect to ensure appropriate species are selected in accordance with the City’s requirements • Follow the City’s requirements for provision of deep soil area and canopy coverage. • Triangular space between commercial tenancies can be used to accommodate deep soil landscaping and mature trees, whilst providing a focal point for the development and the community
<p>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overshadowing to the southern property is exacerbated by the non-compliant setback to boundary. Consider redesigning and/or relocating balconies to achieve a greater setback and providing articulation to the wall, which would help in mitigating the bulk. Consider balconies being provided on the northern elevation for greater amenity • Consider alternative design if the permanent awning

	<p>over road widening area cannot be accommodated. Recessing of the ground floor will soften the development by accommodating landscaping and provide shading for windows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider and further refine design of the external stairwell, currently it is a prominent feature of the facade. • Scale of the rear portion of the building should be reviewed as it currently does not fit within the existing streetscape. The east elevation presents as three storeys - it is not consistent with surrounding developments • The overall bulk of the building is exacerbated by nil setback to the primary and secondary streets as well as to the southern lot boundary • Overshadowing exceeds 50%, and falls into the solar collectors, into a major opening and over the outdoor living area of the southern lot • Insufficient open space has been provided. It indicates an overdevelopment of the R60 site and does not reflect the existing or preferred character of the locality
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the number of bins and/or bin collection methods as the number proposed (5) does not appear to be adequate • Parking bays do not appear to be compliant with Australian Standards requirement for 1:20 grade for a cross fall. Consider alternative designs to achieve compliance
Principle 5 – Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The eastern windows will be exposed the same as the western windows. The protection of window openings by use of canopies and screens needs to be addressed consistently across the various orientations in the development.
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the internal spaces for functionality and amenity. Spaces within the lobby and internal areas are quite tight.
Principle 7 – Legibility	N/A
Principle 8 – Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase security and safety, consider providing a gate to restrict access to the car park which is currently open to the street
Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulation and fenestration appears overcomplicated. Opportunities for simplifying of these features should be explored. A simplified but well-articulated development, softened with appropriate landscaping and architectural responses will appear less imposing.
Comments	N/A

Conclusion:

To be returned to DRP

5.40pm–6.15pm – Applicant’s Presentation – DA Lodged 5.2018.358.1

3.3 **Address:** 351 Stirling Street, Highgate

Proposal: Seven Multiple Dwellings

Applicant: Robert Epiro

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 October 2018

Applicant’s Presentation:

The presented a power point presentation

Recommendations & Comments by DRP on 13 December 2018:

<p>Principle 1 – Context and Character</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider more activation on the ground floor. Look at moving the visitor bay closer to the street (Australian Standard is a 1m off the boundary for reversing), and moving the stores to the balconies or in the apartments. An internal stair could be introduced from Apartment 2 above to the ground floor to create a habitable room (home office or studio room) forming part of the unit over. A corridor/lobby for pedestrian access separate from the driveway to still be provided Over-height boundary walls are still a concern, especially to the rear overlooking the neighbouring outdoor living area
<p>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moving the visitor car bay to the street would create more landscaping opportunities at the front Hibbertia Scandens is not strong enough vine to grow for three levels of screening. Will need additional planter beds at higher levels or a hardier vine species Consider more edible species around the Olive tree in the communal area
<p>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rear units flares running opposite ways to what they should. If bedroom wall flares into the lot instead of out, this would reduce the parapet wall, and suggest treating the top level as a loft to reduce building bulk Replan the rear units perhaps longer but pulled away from the boundary and change materials to make more like a roof form. Pulling top level away from the boundaries on both sides will improved amenity for adjoining properties – access to light and air
<p>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider opportunities to reconfigure bin store. Moving stores to the balconies or internal would create space for the bin store. Potential to stacking the bin stores with roller doors. Consideration needed for the seal on the bin stores to prevent smells from escaping. The lobby is considered long and tight – width to be reviewed
<p>Principle 5 – Sustainability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing setback off the boundary will allow more northern light access via additional windows. Consider clerestory/high-level windows to top level apartments to scoop high-level light and air down
<p>Principle 6 – Amenity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider a full length window to the north on the 1st apartment
<p>Principle 7 – Legibility</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Principle 8 – Safety</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Principle 9 – Community	N/A
Principle 10 – Aesthetics	N/A
Comments	•

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

Principle 1 – Context and Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stores are not integrated well to the rear – consider an angling of wall(s) and/or roof elements of the stores so it better fits into the design character of the rest of the development • The development responds well to the local context. The architectural language is contextual in relation to the site and its surroundings. • Reducing the rear component of the development to two storeys has worked well • There is potential to create an indoor/outdoor feel in the front (main street) by introducing seating-level retaining walls to landscaped areas
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is potential for canopy coverage over the parking bays. • The redesign has done well to consider the previous comments of the DRP. • Consider exchanging the tree species to the rear of the site with fruit trees. This will contribute to the communal garden space, and increase canopy cover. • ‘Magnolia Little Gem’ has heavy foliage and may restrict sunlight into the front of the building. It will also need height pruning and look stumped. Look at replacing the tree closest to the driveway with a deciduous tree such as a Poinciana. • Consider linking the landscaped area between the car bays and the front meeting room. There is potential for this room to spill out into outside space if designed well. Fine-tuning turning circles may free up space for further planting areas.
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shadow diagrams show that the boundary wall will not have an adverse impact on the courtyard. • Look at the boundary wall height – Consider either reducing the height to comply or a reshuffle of the rooms (moving the bathroom) in order to assist with this wall length/height issue • Consider further potential issues of visual privacy and how to further reduce overlooking to the adjoining northern property’s outdoor space
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposal that has substituted a visitor bay with increased landscaping immediately outside of the glazing line is a better outcome. This will soften the outlook from the communal space
Principle 5 – Sustainability	N/A
Principle 6 – Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared space – furniture selection needs to be carefully considered, and look at adding a kitchenette to enhance its use as a flexible space. This-needs to be

	followed through with, in order to ensure the space is well utilised. The shared space adds to a sense of arrival and connects well to the front setback
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"> The City appreciates the applicant working with the DRP and Council, in achieving this positive design outcome

Conclusion:

Does not need to be returned to DRP.

4. General Business

5. Close / Next Meeting

There being no further business, the Chairperson, Sasha Invanovich declared the meeting closed 6.15pm.

The next meeting will be held on 6 March 2019.