



NOTES DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting Date: 1 August 2018
Meeting Time: 9.30 am
Venue: Swan Room
Meeting Started: 9:40

1. Attendance

(a) Panel Members

Dominic Snellgrove	(Chairman - Cameron Chisholm Nicol)
Chris Maher	(Hames Sharley)
Fred Chaney	(Taylor Robinson Chaney Broderick)
Malcolm Mackay	(Mackay Urban Design)

(b) Proponents

Hillam Architects - *Item 1 & 2*
Tuscom Subdivision Consultants Pty Ltd - *Item 3*

(c) City Officers

Siven Naidu	(City of South Perth)
Cameron Howell	(City of South Perth)
Mark Scarfone	(City of Melville)
Ben Ashwood	(City of Melville)
Jack Hobbs	(City of Melville)

(d) Note Taker

Antonetta Papalia	(City of Melville)
-------------------	--------------------

2. Apologies

Peter Prendergast	(City of Melville)
Damien Pericles	(REALMstudios)

3. Declaration of Interest

Nil

4. Item 1 – 117-119 Lockhart Street, Como (Pre-Lodgement Item)

The proposal is for a Mixed Development within a 15-level building plus basement car parking

4.1. Officer Presentation – Started 9:40

City of South Perth Senior Planning Officer, Cameron Howell briefly introduced this item to the Panel.

- M10/Q4 zoning.
- Mixed Development within a 15-level development plus basement.
- 132 Multiple Dwellings, Consulting Rooms tenancy, “community hub” + public plaza and community meeting room.
- 4 car parking levels (1-2 basement levels).
- Bonus building height proposed – Elements 21 and 22 apply.

*** The applicant’s focus for this item relates to the bulk, scale and setbacks of the proposed development, having regard to the previous DRP comments

This item was previously presented to the May and July 2018 Canning Bridge Design Review Panel Meeting.

4.2. Proponent Presentation – Started 9:44

Applicant from Hillam Architects presented and discussed the application to the Design Review Panel.

4.3. Design Quality Principles

Items presented to the Design Review Panel are assessed by a panel of architects using the “design quality principles” and with due regards to Design WA. The design principles include but are not limited to – character, continuity and enclosure, quality of the public realm, ease of movement, legibility, adaptability, diversity and sustainability.

In respect of development within the Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan area for which a bonus is sought under Clause 21 of Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan, the development shall, in the opinion of the Panel, be of exemplary design. The proponent shall provide detailed commentary to demonstrate how exemplary design has been achieved.

The Panel will provide commentary regarding the elements of the design that are supported and those that would benefit from further consideration. For preliminary applications, the Panel’s comments shall be provided to the proponent to assist in the development of the design.

(a) Strengths of the proposal

- Increased 8m setback is a positive step.
- Relocation of amenities to the roof is beneficial.
- An improved proposal compared to the previous submission.
- Considerable thought given in regards to the articulation of the envelope.

- Manipulating plan for more east facing apartments is good and with the decreased amount of apartments facing north.
- There is improvement and logic with how you're presenting the future developments.
- The 8 metre setbacks up to the balcony are a good improvement.
- The inclusion of more apartments facing Lockhart Street is a good design outcome.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- Corner bedrooms would benefit from openings to facilitate cross ventilation.
- The provision of sheer walls on the external façade of the north east apartments presents unsympathetically in relation to mass, form detail. The wall design needs to break up the vertical shafts of concrete, for example through the inclusion of ribbon windows.
- Improved on western side however still feel there are concerns on amount of natural light into apartments. The increased setbacks are a better outcome for reducing visual privacy impacts
- Concerned on South west apartments for natural lighting.
- Massing diagrams should also consider and visualise the potential construction of 15 storey buildings on the neighbouring properties.

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- The architectural design diagrams show three towers. The floor plan proposes a 'packed layout'. The corridor floor plan design would benefit from incorporating natural light at each end (like the architectural design diagrams), as the proposal needs to demonstrate exemplary design.
- 10 apartments per level with 50% cross ventilation is not 'exemplary', it needs to be increased above entry level of 60%. Going for bonus height/ exemplary design, means a higher percentage of cross ventilation than entry level.
- Increase cross ventilation with more windows at corner bedrooms.
- Use corridors for natural light and to separate the towers. This will also help with cross ventilation, the project would benefit. Please note the birds-eye view compared to the plans reads differently.
- More work is required to the sheer walls to the north east apartments.
- Would like to see shadowing diagrams
- Consider a floor plan layout redesign that reallocates the floor space that forms the south western apartments into the north facing apartments to improve the development's overall apartment amenity for residents.

(d) Recommendation

- Amended plans to be seen again at a DRP meeting.

5. Item 2 – 55-61 Canning Beach Road & 6 Moreau Mews, Applecross (Pre-application proposal)

Three mixed-use towers with varying heights between 13 and 20 storeys

5.1. Officer Presentation – *Started 10:25*

City of Melville Senior Planning Officer, Ben Ashwood discussed improvements made regarding this to the Panel

This item was previously presented to the July 2018 Canning Bridge Design Review Panel Meeting.

5.2. Proponent Presentation – *Started 10:29*

Applicants from Hiram Architects discussed the changes and improvements made in response to previous comments from the Design Review Panel.

5.3. Design Quality Principles

Items presented to the Design Review Panel are assessed by a panel of architects using the “design quality principles” and with due regards to Design WA. The design principles include but are not limited to – character, continuity and enclosure, quality of the public realm, ease of movement, legibility, adaptability, diversity and sustainability.

In respect of development within the Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan area for which a bonus is sought under Clause 21 of Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan, the development shall, in the opinion of the Panel, be of exemplary design. The proponent shall provide detailed commentary to demonstrate how exemplary design has been achieved.

The Panel will provide commentary regarding the elements of the design that are supported and those that would benefit from further consideration. For preliminary applications, the Panel’s comments shall be provided to the proponent to assist in the development of the design.

(a) Strengths of the proposal

As acknowledged at the July 4 DRP meeting:

- In principle the idea of creating a high amenity space along foreshore is supported. The low vehicle speeds and shared space has the potential to create a very attractive environment.
- The elevations show a lot of promise.
- The podium level works well.
- The amended 18M tower separation is an improvement however does not compensate for or mitigate the aspect ratio of height to depth experienced between the towers.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

While the DRP acknowledged that proposal is an improvement to the previous scheme, it expressed strong concern in relation to the following:

- The height, depth and orientation of the buildings and the separation between buildings all combine to create a sub-optimal design outcome for the occupants of the building.
- The height and setbacks to the perimeter of the property, to the east and south create sub-optimal design outcomes for the precinct and for those in the buildings abutting the site. Whilst the structure plan allows for 4m boundary setbacks, when the building goes beyond 10 stories this dimension needs to be revisited.
- 80/90 percent of the frontages have orientation east west which reduces opportunity for views and does not capitalise on the strengths of this site.
- The minimal setbacks to the south create overshadowing concerns – need to improve access to sunlight.

The issues relating to the foreshore improvements, ground floor plane, podium level common areas, deep soils zones identified as a part of the July 4 DRP meeting were not covered by the applicant in this presentation and will be required to be addressed at a later stage.

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- The DRP has a fundamental issue with the proposed development in relation to its relationship to the existing buildings to the east and south as well as the combination of building height, depth and separation. The applicant is required to make significant amendments to the overall design, in order for the DRP to consider that it is moving in the direction of achieving exemplary design.

(d) Recommendation

- Applicant to make changes to the proposal taking into account the issues raised above. The panel queried the capacity of the site to accommodate three towers and would like to see an alternative two tower option explored on the combined sites.

6. Item 3 – 10-14 Forbes Rd & 40 A,B,C Kishorn Road (Pre-application proposal)

19-20 Storey Mixed Use Development comprising 98 Multiple Dwellings, 21 Serviced Apartments, 5 Commercial tenancies and Community Facilities

6.1. Officer Presentation – *Started 11:19*

City of Melville Planning Officer, Jack Hobbs introduced this pre-lodgement item to the Panel.

6.2. Proponent Presentation – *Started 11:34*

Applicant from Tuscom Subdivision Consultants introduced and presented the application to the Design Review Panel.

6.3. Design Quality Principles

Items presented to the Design Review Panel are assessed by a panel of architects using the “design quality principles” and with due regards to Design WA. The design principles include but are not limited to – character, continuity and enclosure, quality of the public realm, ease of movement, legibility, adaptability, diversity and sustainability.

In respect of development within the Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan area for which a bonus is sought under Clause 21 of Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan, the development shall, in the opinion of the Panel, be of exemplary design. The proponent shall provide detailed commentary to demonstrate how exemplary design has been achieved.

The Panel will provide commentary regarding the elements of the design that are supported and those that would benefit from further consideration. For preliminary applications, the Panel's comments shall be provided to the proponent to assist in the development of the design.

(a) Strengths of the proposal

The Design Review Panel commended the applicant on its comprehensive presentation and congratulated the architect and developer for their roles in creating a very high quality proposal. The DRP consider that the proposed development is on the path to achieving exemplary design.

Strengths include:

- The design narrative is very important to the proposal, the idea of incorporating the things people love about the suburbs into a vertical form is a very strong one.
- The proposal seeks to exceed 5 star Greenstar rating
- Breaking the tower into three forms assists to break up the building bulk.
- Almost 100% cross ventilation of the dwellings.
- Very high levels of ground plane activation, through the use of the central pedestrian thoroughfare. Servicing and waste management

appears to be well considered, ensuring the majority of the ground floor plane is taken up with active uses.

- Extensive landscaping at all levels of the building.
- Natural light and ventilation to corridors.
- Wind-scoops are really interesting idea. Further detail should be provided as the proposal develops further to demonstrate how this works.
- High quality short-stay dwellings, accessed via dedicated lift.
- Well planned apartments, with good layouts, including good robe space. Typical apartment floor plates create sense of separation. Movement across apartments and communal spaces is good.
- Diverse range of uses and apartment types. The proposed co-working space and community gardens are considered to add another level of interest to the building.
- Amenity deck on the top floor provides all residents with the opportunity to access the available view. The landscape design is consistent with the story of the building and shows dedication to creating a high quality building.
- Community spaces are well thought out. The communal amenity areas on every third floor are well considered.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

The applicant is encouraged to consider the following;

- Increase the setbacks to the north and west boundaries to at least the minimum to ensure the amenity of future occupiers is not impacted, particularly for the balcony areas. The applicant is encouraged to provide greater setbacks and to be generous in this respect as increased setbacks will also reduce the impact on adjoining properties.
- Vertical landscaping is supported by the DRP however needs a compelling water, wind and landscaping strategy to demonstrate how this will be achieved in the Perth climate.
- No shadow diagram has been provided.
- The relationship between the proposed vehicle drop off and the streetscape needs further detail. The incorporation of three crossovers works against having a good public domain and good streetscape. The DRP acknowledges the idea behind the vehicle drop off however generally does not support multiple crossovers. If the applicant is to pursue this aspect it needs to demonstrate that it is creating a shared space where pedestrian needs are prioritised over vehicles.
- One apartment at the mezzanine level has an internalised bedroom. It's allowed to be a studio but if it becomes a bedroom then it needs access to natural light.
- Consider waste management to ensure this can occur in an efficient manner on site. The applicant is encouraged to liaise with the City in this respect.

- Provide a staircase to the community garden to draw people up to this space.
- Consider how the entry to the ramp is treated as this can be a prominent element in the streetscape.

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

While the Design Review Panel consider the proposal to be tracking to achieving exemplary design, the applicant should address each of the issues identified above as well as providing the following information.

- A wind study which details the impact of wind at the street level, podium levels, the open corridors and the impact on the proposed landscaping.
- Additions street level analysis to understand the impact on and interaction with the H4 zone to the west.
- Analysis of percentage of deep soil zones.

(d) Recommendation

The suggested improvements should be incorporated into the design and additional information provided in support of the proposal. The proposal should be presented to the next available DRP meeting for further comment.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting has been tentatively booked for 5 September 2018 from 9.30am until 12.30pm.

Meeting finished and closed at 12:55pm