



#### **DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

#### Wednesday 18 September 2019 at 3.30pm

Venue: Function Room
City of Vincent
Administration and Civic Centre
244 Vincent Street Leederville

#### Attendees:

**Design Review Panel Members** 

Sasha Ivanovich (Chairperson)

Ailsa Blackwood Joe Chindarsi

Stephen Carrick

City of Vincent Officers

Jay Naidoo (Manager Development & Design)

Joslin Colli (Coordinator Planning Services)

Natasha Trefry (Urban Planner)

Karsen Reynolds (Urban Planner)

Applicant – Item 3.1

Jason Potalivo Salacen

Ben Tremlett Cameron Chisholm Nicol

Justin Carruk CAPA Chris Formaor CCN

Applicant - Item 3.2

Bianca Sandri

Clement Liao Huirun Pty Ltd

Applicant – Item 3.3

Jarrod Ross TBB

Mitch Edwards Hamlen Homes

Stephen Pelosi Hamlen

#### 1. Welcome/Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson, Sasha Ivanovich declared the meeting open at 4.00pm

- 2. Apologies
- 3. Business

#### 4.00pm-4.30pm - Applicant's Presentation - Pre-Lodgement

3.1 Address: Nos. 318, 324, 330, 332, 334 Charles Street, North Perth

**Proposal:** Mixed Use Development

Applicant: Urbis / Saracen Properties 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)

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

Principle 1 – Context and Character	<ul> <li>More information needs to be provided with regard to the f proposed materials and colours.</li> <li>Consider the locations of the garden centre and café. Both provide real opportunities to meet the city's requirements for street activation and also provide buffer between residential neighbours and commercial activities. Consider different proposals of garden centre and café at street level, to the rear of site (to enable buffer) or as a roof top experience to find which best enables activation and increased landscape opportunities for public.</li> <li>Building facade is generally well articulated. Consider scaling down façade elements and introducing vertical elements or vertical brakes, to achieve a better form and visual relationship to the surrounding built form.</li> <li>Consider 'sleeving' the carpark to the back of the site whilst placing and exposing public shopping spaces to the street and other options that offer active uses of the ground floor such as relocation of facilities from the roof area to the ground floor.</li> <li>A glass façade alone to the multi-storey carpark is not considered sufficient as a device to establish an active relationship between the building occupants and the street.</li> </ul>
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul> <li>Landscaping is mostly provided within the road widening zone; there will be little landscaping left once road widening takes place. Look at increasing landscaping by setting back the development further from the lot's future street boundary to ensure landscaping will not be taken away at a later stage</li> <li>Laneway side – it is not compliant with the setback requirements; it is also short on landscaping. Consider providing a more positive buffer from the development to the adjoining residential properties. The development's interface with adjoining properties could be softened with landscaping As per note above one potential in relocating the garden centre to the rear of the site, is that this position allows for more stepping down of the development to tie in with the lower scale of the residential interface at the rear of the site</li> <li>The proposal does not meet the city's requirements for deep soil and canopy cover. Consider ways to meet these requirements such as introducing rooftop gardens, and increasing activation landscaping to ground floor.</li> <li>Could the garden centre come to the bottom/ ground floor to improve activation to the street</li> <li>The front landscaping, albeit being too small, is well designed with good themes and well selected species</li> <li>Consider further proposals for landscaping in the front façade</li> </ul>
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul> <li>Look at incorporating additional vertical elements to increase articulation and introduce a finer grain/scale as the façade is currently feels very large</li> </ul>

	Look at stepping the building to the rear to reduce impacts to the adjoining residential properties.
Principle 4 –	N/A
Functionality and	
build quality	
Principle 5 –	N/A
Sustainability	
Principle 6 –	N/A
Amenity	
Principle 7 –	N/A
Legibility	
Principle 8 –	N/A
Safety	
Principle 9 –	N/A
Community	
Principle 10 –	Early presentation of intended signage, integration into the
Aesthetics	design, location and intended scale, as well as any use of bulk
	colour, for consideration by the DRP, is encouraged.
Comments	N/A

**Conclusion** To be returned to the DRP

### 4.30pm-5.00pm - Applicant Presentation - DA Lodged 5.2019.201.1

3.2 Address: Nos. 514 and 516 (Lots 14, 15 and 16) William Street Highgate

**Proposal**: Four Grouped Dwellings

**Applicant**: Urbanista Town Planning / Huirun 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)

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

Principle 1 –	Τ_	There appears to be a 'disconnect' between the language of
Context and Character	•	There appears to be a 'disconnect' between the language of this proposal and the general character of to the adjoining properties and the street.
	•	The terrace houses nearby are a good reference, however referencing to this immediate neighbourhood requires further analysis, consideration and development. There is a heaviness and a strong classical motif that is not consistent with the street. Consider steering the design to a more Federation Style. Simplify the façade and refine the intensity of its current character so that it is more reconcilable with the surrounding context and reduces impacts of building bulk There is a considerable amount of detail to the front facade (recesses, quoining, arches etc) – look at stripping this back a little bit to get some consistency across the elevation. Simplify the central elevations – pull the detailing back and put some time into the tones and colours.
		The development is imposing to the street. The peripheral units are a little closer to the mark as they are a little simpler in design.

	T
Principle 2 – Landscape quality	<ul> <li>Design between the front and rear appears disconnected. Look to better connect the design intent and character between the front to the rear, to achieve a good design outcome on both sides – there are some fundamentals that need to be drawn upon.</li> <li>Consider how the elevation to the rear can engage more with the ROW - such as providing larger windows even 'French' balconies to ROW facing living areas.</li> <li>Internal courtyard elevations – try to connect them to the front façade and achieve a design consistency throughout the development</li> <li>Consider the use of single thin columns instead of heavy masonry piers - to the last two façade end balconies. to lighten the character of the façade, as a response to existing neighbourhood character and to make the form of the development appear more permeable</li> <li>Fencing character is inconsistent with the façade. Look at incorporating detail that will better relate to the façade</li> <li>The idea and development of central courtyards' landscaping, and the provision of deep soil, are commended.</li> <li>Investigate opportunities to add more trees to the landscape to meet the city's canopy coverage expectations.</li> <li>Look at incorporating landscaping as a buffer between the lots</li> <li>Look at incorporating more species diversity across the site. Mass plantings are attractive but can be more vulnerable to complete loss if plant conditions change.</li> </ul>
Principle 3 – Built form and scale	<ul> <li>The top floor breaches height requirements. Look at setting in the top floor, min. 500mm, in from the side boundaries.</li> <li>Provide articulation &amp; depth to facades, to side boundary elevations corresponding to front elevation - to achieve a cohesive built form whole.</li> </ul>
Principle 4 – Functionality and build quality	N/A
Principle 5 –	N/A
Sustainability	Consider the use of single this columns instead of bases
Principle 6 – Amenity	Consider the use of single thin columns instead of heavy masonry piers to the last two façade end balconies
Principle 7 –	N/A
Legibility Principle 8 –	N/A
Safety	IV/A
Principle 9 –	N/A
Community	
Principle 10 –	N/A
Aesthetics	
Comments	N/A

Conclusion: To be returned to DRP

3.3 **Address**: 149 -153 Alma Road, North Perth

**Proposal**: Eight Grouped Dwellings

**Applicant**: Taylor Burrell Barnett

**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

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

Principle 1 – Context and Character	<ul> <li>Consider incorporating treatments that more directly reference the immediate streetscape and surrounding locality. Select character references that bring in but do not replicate, the neighbouring area. An analysis/investigation of the surrounding building-built character would assist in creating more meaningful interpretations and links to the street and retained dwelling</li> <li>Verandahs, fence, facebrick render is in contrast to the existing streetscape. Look at materials from the streetscape and reinterpret those elements into the development</li> <li>Look at the existing house (federation era house) – tie this simplified style form of this dwelling in with the proposed dwellings especially the roof form and pitch.</li> <li>Look at incorporating vertical articulation to front of dwelling</li> <li>Consider how the detail and materiality will work together</li> <li>Reconsider the render as it appears quite dark. Look at taking the red brick a bit further into the façade in terms of scale. Red brick is more consistent and appropriate with the surrounding areas.</li> <li>Access from Alma Road provides clear line of sight to the ROW at the rear – look at ways to soften this impact</li> <li>Look into introducing more timber detailing as a means to soften the character of the development.</li> <li>Provide a greater sense of identity for each dwelling</li> <li>Consider additional scale of colours and materials to break down the massing and repetitive elements</li> </ul>
Principle 2 – Landscape quality  Principle 3 –	<ul> <li>Pedestrian access separate to road – it is important that the 'green space is unified and pedestrian zones are legible, perhaps by different surface treatments.</li> <li>Green spaces to driveway are broken and not consistent A public green space that can be accessed and used by multiple units is recommended.</li> <li>Review landscaping calculations – canopy coverage noted in the legend has discrepancies with the canopy annotated. Ensure space for trees planted will provide the intended and required canopy cover</li> <li>Further articulation of courtyards is needed. Look at the ratio of interactive and liveable spaces - sitting areas/planting/paving</li> <li>Consider introducing pergola 'horizontal landscape forms over the driveway to make the space more pedestrian friendly and encourage through car traffic to treat it the same.</li> </ul>
Built form and scale	<ul> <li>Box element Lot 2 – feels stuck on to front of dwelling</li> <li>Reconsider the upper floor setbacks. Lot 1, 2 in particular</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Provide a vertical element or different treatment to lot 1, lot 2 to provide defined separation between the 2 dwellings</li> </ul>
Principle 4 –	Reconsider proportions of living spaces upstairs. Consider to resizing balcony to be more useable

Functionality and	The study near the entrance is considered too small as a liveable
build quality	area
	<ul> <li>Improve interaction of internal dwellings to the common property</li> </ul>
Principle 5 –	N/A
Sustainability	
Principle 6 – Amenity	Enhance the experience between the dwellings and common property
	<ul> <li>Consider some semi-park spaces and a shared open space for all dwellings</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Common property may become rat run – need to consider differentiation of this space</li> </ul>
Principle 7 – Legibility	<ul> <li>Consider elements (paving, surface treatment) to enhance and differentiate between the vehicle and pedestrian experience</li> </ul>
Principle 8 – Safety	N/A
Principle 9 –	<ul> <li>Look at creating a more comfortable walking space. Potentially</li> </ul>
Community	'bench' space
Principle 10 –	N/A
Aesthetics	
Comments	NA

### **Conclusion:**

### To be returned to DRP

# 4. Close/Next Meeting

The Chairperson closed the meeting at 5.30pm

The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Wednesday 2 October 2019