



CITY OF VINCENT

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Wednesday 17 October 2018 at 3.15pm

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)	Joslin Colli (Coordinator Planning Services)
Anthony Duckworth-Smith	Mitch Hoad (Senior Urban Planner)
Sid Thoo	Fiona Atkins (Urban Planner)
Stephen Carrick	

\*\*\*\*\*

Applicant-Item 3.1

Applicant-Item 3.2

REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

Applicant-Item 3.3

REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

Applicant-Item 3.4

REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

4.00pm–4.30pm – Applicant Presentation – DA Lodged - 5.2018. 358.1

3.1 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 8 August 2018

**Applicant's Presentation:**

Applicants did not attend

**Recommendations & Comments by DRP on 8 August 2018:**

<b>Principle 1 – Context and Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Committee does not support the current design location of the car bay and ground floor entry.</li><li>• Reconsider the position and location of the Lobby, bins, stores and visitor bay to front. This impacts on the level of streetscape activation.</li><li>• Stores to the front does not allow for street activation.</li><li>• Positive internal apartment planning as well as external materials and colour selections.</li><li>• Height of boundary walls to the south relies on 'borrowing' setback from neighbour's ROW to reduce impact. Consider the bulk impact of viewing large boundary walls from the adjoining property plus overshadowing impacts.</li><li>• Boundary walls on south to rear block are also not of a similar scale to existing parapet wall and require additional height which will impact on rear neighbour.</li><li>• Concern for the lack of ground level activation streetscape level.</li></ul>
<b>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Landscaping to be increased to meet the City's requirements and be of benefit to all residents. Rear communal space is isolated from the majority of residents. Consider relocating part or all of the communal space to the middle or front of the site. This will soften the experience of the development as viewed from the street and when residents are moving through the site</li></ul>
<b>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited north light to front apartments.</li></ul>
<b>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider placing an apartment at the front of the site on ground. Can deliver a good apartment within a 6m width. A front fence can provide a level of screening and privacy for residents of this unit whilst also achieving a level streetscape activation and passive surveillance.</li><li>• Location of stores visible to front of development, not active use/function of development. Potential to move stores to below ground.</li></ul>
<b>Principle 5 – Sustainability</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 6 – Amenity</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 7 – Legibility</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 8 – Safety</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 9 – Community</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Common space to the rear is not in an ideal location. Isolated communal area in back will likely not be used by all residents. Though it is noted that this could be good outcome for the adjoining block it also contributes to generating a poor outcome for resident amenity on this lock. Consider relocating the communal space to the front or middle of the block rather</li></ul>

	than rear or alternatively part front and part rear.
<b>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	N/A

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

<b>Principle 1 – Context and Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skillion roof may allow good access but does not consider the impact of shading to neighbouring dwellings.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced setbacks and height concessions are being sought, this is in a transition area and will impact on the neighbouring property significantly, if not supported by neighbouring property concessions will not be appropriate</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DRP and the City generally do not support visitor car parking located at the front of the development</li> <li>• Reconsider the layout of the upper floor apartments to create a side setback.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 5 – Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A207 shows solar access and ventilation which have shown the sun coming from the west which is not ideal</li> <li>• Cross ventilation relies on main entry door being open which may not work with fire requirements</li> <li>• Proposed exposed concrete soffits are unlikely to work as thermal mass and also satisfy sound transmission and insulation requirements between sole occupancy units.</li> <li>• Consider flipping the colours so that majority of external walls are lighter in colour ie. low solar absorptance.</li> <li>• Solar PV on adjoining site will be overshadowed completely; suggest applicant provide specific details regarding relocation of panels and/or strategy proposed for mitigating impact on affected neighbour.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 6 – Amenity</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 7 – Legibility</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 8 – Safety</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 9 – Community</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	N/A

**Conclusion:**

Amendments to be considered.



CITY OF VINCENT

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Thursday 13 December 2018 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>
Sasha Ivanovich (Chairperson)	Joslin Colli (Coordinator Planning Services)
Ailsa Blackwood	Kate Miller (Senior Urban Planner)
Anthony Duckworth-Smith	Karsen Reynolds (Urban Planner)
Joe Chindarsi	Stephanie Norgaard (Urban Planner)
	Roslyn Hill (Minute Secretary)

\*\*\*\*\*

Applicant-Item 3.1

**REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS**

Applicant-Item 3.2

**REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS**

Applicant-Item 3.3

**REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS**

Applicant-Item 3.4

Robert Eprio                      Owner

\*\*\*\*\*

**3.30pm**  
**4.00pm**

#### Member Discussion

#### 1. Welcome / Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson, Sasha Ivanovich declared the meeting open at 4.05pm.

#### 2. Apologies

#### 3. Business

---

## REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

### 6.05pm–6.45pm – Applicant’s Presentation – DA Lodged 5.2018.358

3.4     **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 applicant presented a power point presentation

#### **Recommendations & Comments by DRP on 17 October 2018:**

<b>Principle 1 – Context and Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Skillion roof may allow good access but does not consider the impact of shading to neighbouring dwellings.</li></ul>
<b>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduced setbacks and height concessions are being sought, this is in a transition area and will impact on the neighbouring</li></ul>

	property significantly, if not supported by neighbouring property concessions will not be appropriate
<b>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DRP and the City generally do not support visitor car parking located at the front of the development</li> <li>Reconsider the layout of the upper floor apartments to create a side setback.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 5 – Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A207 shows solar access and ventilation which have shown the sun coming from the west which is not ideal</li> <li>Cross ventilation relies on main entry door being open which may not work with fire requirements</li> <li>Proposed exposed concrete soffits are unlikely to work as thermal mass and also satisfy sound transmission and insulation requirements between sole occupancy units.</li> <li>Consider flipping the colours so that majority of external walls are lighter in colour ie. low solar absorptance.</li> <li>Solar PV on adjoining site will be overshadowed completely; suggest applicant provide specific details regarding relocation of panels and/or strategy proposed for mitigating impact on affected neighbour.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 6 – Amenity</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 7 – Legibility</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 8 – Safety</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 9 – Community</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	N/A

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

<b>Principle 1 – Context and Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>Over-height boundary walls are still a concern, especially to the rear overlooking the neighbouring outdoor living area</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moving the visitor car bay to the street would create more landscaping opportunities at the front</li> <li>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</li> <li>Consider more edible species around the Olive tree in the communal area</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>Replan the rear units perhaps longer but pulled away from the boundary and change materials to make more</li> </ul>

	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
<b>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The lobby is considered long and tight – width to be reviewed</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 5 – Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 6 – Amenity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider a full length window to the north on the 1<sup>st</sup> apartment</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 7 – Legibility</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 8 – Safety</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 9 – Community</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

#### **Conclusion:**

To be returned to the DRP.

#### **4. General Business**

#### **5. Close / Next Meeting**

There being no further business, the Chairperson, Sasha Ivanovich declared the meeting closed 6.45pm.

The next meeting will be held on 16 January 2019



CITY OF VINCENT

## DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Wednesday 20 February 2019 at 3.30pm

Venue: Function Room  
City of Vincent Administration and Civic Centre

### MINUTES - UNCONFIRMED

#### Attendees:

<u>Design Advisory Committee Members:</u>	<u>City of Vincent Officers</u>
Sasha Ivanovich (Chairperson)	Joslin Colli (A/Manager Development & Design)
Stephen Carrick	Kate Miller (A/Coordinator Planning Services)
Ailsa Blackwood	Dan McCluggage (Urban Planner)
Joe Chindarsi	Mitch Hoad (Senior Urban Planner)
	Karsen Reynolds (Urban Planner)
	Roslyn Hill (Minute Secretary)

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Applicant-Item 3.1

REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

#### Applicant-Item 3.2

REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

#### Applicant-Item 3.3

Will Thomson	Wilt Design
Robert Epiro	Land Owner

REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

---



## REDACTED FOR PRIVACY REASONS

### 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:**

<b>Principle 1 – Context and Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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</li><li>• Over-height boundary walls are still a concern, especially to the rear overlooking the neighbouring outdoor living area</li></ul>
<b>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Moving the visitor car bay to the street would create more landscaping opportunities at the front</li><li>• 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</li><li>• Consider more edible species around the Olive tree in the communal area</li></ul>
<b>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li></ul>

<b>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The lobby is considered long and tight – width to be reviewed</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 5 – Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 6 – Amenity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider a full length window to the north on the 1<sup>st</sup> apartment</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 7 – Legibility</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 8 – Safety</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 9 – Community</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

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

<b>Principle 1 – Context and Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stores look like they have just been tacked on. Look at sloping the roof of the stores so it fits into the rest of the development</li> <li>Responding to the local context well. Architectural language is great for this site</li> <li>Reducing the rear building to two storey works well</li> <li>Potential to create an outside/inside feel with retainer walls and sitting areas in the front.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 2 – Landscape quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Look at landscaping between parking bays. Look at possibly connecting up to the trellis</li> <li>Landscaping has been integrated well both vertically and horizontally</li> <li>Consider more edible species to the rear of the site. This will increase the canopy cover</li> <li>Magnolia little gem is heavy foliage and may restrict sunlight into the front of the building. Look at replacing the tree closest to the driveway with a deciduous tree such as a Poinciana.</li> <li>Consider using part of the space between the bays closest to the fence for additional landscaping areas. Fine tuning turning circles may free up some space.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 3 – Built form and scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shadow diagrams show that the boundary wall will not have an adverse impact on the courtyard.</li> <li>Look at the boundary wall height – could either reduce the height to comply or a reshuffle of the rooms (moving the bathroom) could assist with the wall length/height</li> <li>Look at visual privacy and reduce overlooking to northern properties outdoor space</li> </ul>

<b>Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taking the visitor bay off and increasing landscaping is a better outcome and it will soften the outlook from the communal space</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 5 – Sustainability</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 6 – Amenity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared space – look at adding a kitchenette so that it is a flexible space. The ability to use the space needs to be followed through. This creates sense of arrival and connects well to the front setback</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 7 – Legibility</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 8 – Safety</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 9 – Community</b>	N/A
<b>Principle 10 – Aesthetics</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City appreciates the applicant working with the DRP and the Council to achieve a positive design outcome</li> </ul>

**Conclusion:**

Does not need to be returned to DRP.