



## NOTES DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

**Meeting Date:** 5 December 2018  
**Meeting Time:** 9.30 am  
**Venue:** Swan Room  
**Meeting Started:** 9:35 AM

### 1. Attendance

#### (a) Panel Members

Dominic Snellgrove (Chairman - Cameron Chisolm Nicol)  
Damien Pericles (REALM Studios)  
Fred Chaney (Taylor Robinson Chaney Broderick) - *Item 1, 2 & 3*  
Malcolm Mackay (Mackay Urban Design) – *partial item 3 and Item 4*

#### (b) Proponents

Matt Buckley Design - *Item 1*  
Pinnacle Planning – *Item 2*  
T & Z Architects – *Item 3*  
MJA – *item 4*  
Developwise – *item 4*  
Tuscom Subdivision Consultants – *item 4*  
Malcolm Mackay – *Item 5*  
John Hirdman – *Item 5*  
Ryan Lucy – *Item 5*

#### (c) City Officers

Siven Naidu (City of South Perth)  
Laura Kelliher (City of South Perth)  
Kevin Tang (City of South Perth)  
Peter Prendergast (City of Melville)  
Ben Ashwood (City of Melville)  
Paula Venter (City of Melville)  
Madison Rea (City of Melville)

#### (d) Note Taker

Antonetta Papalia (City of Melville)

### 2. Apologies

Chris Maher (Hames Sharley)  
Malcolm Mackay (Mackay Urban Design) - *Item 1, 2 & partial 3*  
Hans Oerlemans (Place Laboratory)

### 3. Declaration of Interest

Item 3 – Opal Applecross – 30 Carron Street Applecross – T & Z Architects

Damien Pericles recently finished working with T & Z on the inner city college project. Damien was not deemed in conflict with the applicants and was able to remain seated in the meeting and allowed to participate as a panel member.

Item 4 – 10-14 Forbes Road & 40 Kishorn Road Applecross - MJA

Fred Chaney declared an interest for item 4 presented by MJA Studios and Developwise due to a professional relationship on another project with MJA and therefore has to be excused from the meeting.

Item 5 – Carrawatha - 10 Archibald Street Willagee – Element

It is understood that this project has been led by Malcolm MacKay. Due to partial conflict per item 4 with MJA, Fred was required to restrict his comments to planning issues only and did not comment on the architectural component of the proponents. Fred was able to remain seated in the meeting and allowed to participate as a panel member on restricted terms however; Fred Chaney decided to excuse himself from this item.

Item 5 – Carrawatha - 10 Archibald Street Willagee – Element

Malcolm Mackay declared an interest in Item 4 presented by Alison Healy at Element, and was excused from the meeting for this item. Mackay Urban Design undertook concept planning and prepared the 'Draft Design Guidelines' for this item.

#### 4. Item 1 – 24 Edgecumbe Street, Como (Pre-Lodgement)

14 Multiple Dwellings building with a combined mezzanine and roof terrace level.

##### 4.1. Officer Presentation – Started 9:35 AM

City of South Perth Senior Statutory Planning Officer, Laura Kelliher briefly introduced this item to the Panel.

##### 4.2. Proponent Presentation – Started 9:38 AM

Applicant from Matt Buckley Designs introduced and presented this item 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

- Social, cultural and historical context study and background information is comprehensive and the proposal presentation is to be commended.
- 45% landscape coverage, deep soil zone and canopy is a strength in the proposal.
- Primary living areas, balcony and outdoor living areas orientated to north is positive.
- 9/14 apartments have cross ventilation = 64% plus natural ventilation into lobby area.
- Rooftop terrace, setbacks and concealed car parking well considered.
- Well-grounded project with great objectives and principles with significant landscape proponent, deep soil and good size tree canopy.

- Refreshing to see the landscape thinking around the proposal and not just for the residents but for the interface between a 4 storey building and neighbours – well considered.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- Internal studies are not supported by the panel – refer to Design WA (yet to be signed off by minister) which doesn't approve of internal rooms. Need to visually see a window from any point within the space. Significant issues with the internal studies and high-level windows. Should the fire solution need a high level window it would not be supported. Either delete the rooms or make them significantly smaller than would be necessary to accommodate a single or double bed. The space should not be capable of being converted to or used as a bedroom.
- Cross ventilation through lobby area – It is unlikely that the fire solution will not allow for openable windows or low level glazing.
- Main entrance is not clearly visible from the street. Entry legibility would benefit from further enhancement.
- Privacy issues for the path leading to entrance for the unit adjacent to the entrance.
- Concerns with internal access issues, escape distances, fire compartments – building code issues need to be addressed.

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- Entry to building on ground floor needs more work to make it clearly visible and legible
- Detach entry path away to the side of the building and introduce landscape to give the ground floor bedroom of Unit 1 some privacy.
- AC condensers at GF need to be screened and are not to be located on balconies. The same applies to the upper levels
- Circulation and way finding of the project seems logical, however the width/dimensions of the pathway seems constrained. Consider this for when people are moving furniture into the complex.

(d) Recommendation

- Address weaknesses identified above
- With the half width crossover, come to an agreement with the neighbouring property regarding the removal of it and making good of their side of their crossover. Perhaps speak with City's Infrastructure Design Services for further clarification.
- Amended plans to be seen again at a DRP meeting.

## 5. Item 2 – 464 Canning Highway (DAP Application)

3-Storey Office Building plus Basement Parking with Advertisement (Digital Signage)

### 5.1. Officer Presentation – Started 10:23 AM

City of South Perth Statutory Planning Officer, Kevin Tang, briefly introduced this DAP item to the Panel

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

### 5.2. Proponent Presentation – Started 10:28 AM

Applicant from Pinnacle Planning presented their application to 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

- Strong and well considered adaptive re-use proposal.
- Carefully considered response to previous commentary and additional information on materiality is helpful.
- The reduced number of crossovers and enhanced landscape is a substantial improvement and is a bonus to the development.
- Panel acknowledges and appreciates the applicant taking careful consideration of the comments and responding accordingly.
- Extra landscaping is a welcome addition to the proposal.
- Screening between commercial and residential is good to see.

- Provision of canopy to the car parking
- 20KW solar PV
- Passive shading to the glazing and sectional studies illustrating depth and visual interest in the façade treatment

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- Nil

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- Tree species could be something worth considering in light of solar panel encroachment with future trees.
- More effective location for buffer trees would be on lot boundaries instead of being behind the car park canopy. The trees would overshadow the solar panels on the canopy and thereby making them ineffective.
- Tree species – relook into what you use for screening. The Betula Pendula trees are deciduous. It is suggested that you provide an evergreen tree species.
- Review the turning circle on the last bay/disabled bay for the reversing back out – pedestrian concerns.

(d) Recommendation

The proponent has responded comprehensively and worked diligently with the design review panel. The proposal is a well-considered adaptive re-use project with both strong landscape and architectural outcomes and is supported by the members of the DRP.

## 6. Item 3 – Opal Applecross – 30 Carron Street Applecross

Opal - 150 bed Aged Care Facility

### 6.1. Officer Presentation – Started 10:58 AM

City of Melville Senior Planning Officer, Ben Ashwood and Planning Officer, Paula Venter briefly discussed changes made by the applicants to the Panel.

This item was previously presented to the July 2017 Canning Bridge Design Review Panel Meeting as a 120 bed Aged Care Facility. In September 2017 it was presented as a 150 bed Aged Care Facility.

### 6.2. Proponent Presentation – Started 11:07 AM

Applicant from T & Z Architects presented the changes made to their 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

- Replacing the existing building to tie in with the approved building to the south will bring some positive coherence and integration to the site.
- The proposed balconies.
- Simple and coherent façade approach incorporating a brick base, timber boxes and metal clad upper levels provides a comfortable and familiar setting.
- Natural light to all corridors.
- 2.7m minimum floor to ceiling. (but really should just be standard).
- Introduction of allied health facilities

- Enhanced entry providing a more generous and legible front of house experience.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- Two communal balconies to the east and west interface directly with bedrooms, compromising the balcony usability and room privacy.
- The increase to the overall building height of 0.5M is noted.
- Legibility and wayfinding issues associated with complex internal circulation.
- Unnecessary loss of existing tree canopy. No consideration of retention of onsite trees which could provide a visual buffer.
- Tree species list does not offer large growth species
- Significant number of solely south facing rooms

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- Introduce larger growth or canopy trees within deep soil zones
- Investigate re-organising balconies in the southern building to the east and west to avoid the direct interface with the adjacent rooms.
- Ensure all balcony balustrades don't obscure line of site for residents sitting in their rooms.

(d) Recommendation

- The applicant shall incorporate the suggested improvements to the proposal and present its response to a future DRP meeting.

## **7. Item 4 – 10-14 Forbes Road & 40 Kishorn Road Applecross**

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

### **7.1. Officer Presentation** – *Started 12:12 PM*

City of Melville Senior Planning Officer, Ben Ashwood discussed the changes made to this item to the Panel.

This item was previously presented to the August 2018 Design Review Panel Meeting.

### **7.2. Proponent Presentation** – *Started 12:27 PM*

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

### **7.3. 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 proposal continues to have significant support from the DRP.
- The project achieves a high quality architectural and landscape outcome.
- The DRP commends the proponent for their response to previous issues discussed.
- One cross over in lieu of two is a better public domain outcome.
- The generous provision of landscaping is acknowledged.
- Increasing the setbacks which are now largely compliant is a substantial improvement.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- Service entrance at 11M is too wide and will have a negative and visual impact on the street.
- Maintenance of a greywater system is critical to this project and the difference between the landscaping being a centrepiece and a resource burden.
- Podium car parking is a backwards step that may compromise the ground and first floor street interface
- The podium car park has also resulted in an excessively wide cross over and vehicle entry point

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- Consider the use of a door or otherwise to screen the vehicular access point.
- Consider whether the use of Jacarandas at high levels is viable.
- Investigate the elimination of the remaining minor setback infringements to remove this issue from the approvals process.
- Consider the removal of the recently implemented podium car park level. Whilst there may be design strategies that could mitigate the visual impact of a blank podium car park level there remains concern about the consequential cross over width at ground necessary to access the podium car park ramp.

(d) Recommendation

- The applicant shall incorporate the suggested improvements to the proposal and present its response to a future DRP meeting.

**Addendum**

Due to numerous reasons, this meeting did not meet quorum for item 5 regarding 10 Archibald Street Willagee presented by Element. It was agreed upon for a special meeting to be held on Friday, 7 December 2018 as an extension to today's meeting, Wednesday 5 December 2018.

*The meeting was adjourned at 1:04pm Wednesday, 5 December 2018.*

*The meeting reconvened at 12:00pm on Friday, 7 December 2018*

## 8. Item 5 – Carawatha - 10 Archibald Street, Willagee

Subdivision and Design Guidelines for Carawatha Primary School Redevelopment  
North Lake Road, Willagee

### 8.1. Officer Presentation – Started 12:04 PM

City of Melville Acting Planning Coordinator, Madison Rea briefly discussed changes regarding this item to the Panel

This item was previously presented to the November 2018 Design Review Panel Meeting.

### 8.2. Proponent Presentation – Started 12:08 PM

Malcolm Mackay from Mackay Urban Design, Ryan Lucy from Element and John Hirdman discussed the two major changes made for their application to the Design Review Panel.

### 8.3. 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

- A lot of strengths for this proposal.
- Retained open space parkland and trees to the west
- Pocket park and retained trees to the east.
- Diverse mix of apartments and town houses.
- Entry experience has been improved which has addressed some of the previous concerns.
- Net increase in on-site trees (89) is a positive.
- East-west site permeability

- Widening the lots from the original proposal is good, the width will accommodate the crossover and the trees.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- Whilst disappointing to lose a significant number of mature onsite trees the panel appreciates the broader approach to the site which allows for the implementation of a dedicated POS to the west.
- Previous drawings have illustrated apartment building layouts where the ground floor facing North Lake Road is occupied by car parking. The DRP does not support ground floor uses adjacent to public domain (North Lake Road) that is not occupied by active and inhabited spaces.
- No pedestrian walk way, refuge or path north to south on the east laneway adjacent to proposed apartment buildings.

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- Improving the North Lake Road interface is not just about passive surveillance but the pedestrian and public domain experience. Site dimensional characteristics should allow for the substantial sleeving of the car park both east and west and also to the east pocket park between the two apartment sites with active and inhabited spaces.
- Explore the potential for a foot path to the eastern laneway.
- Provide a site cross-section to illustrate intent in regards to public domain interface
- Confirm DDA compliant access for the POS.

(d) Recommendation

- The applicant shall incorporate the suggested improvements to the proposal and present its response to a future DRP meeting.

## 9. Next Meeting

The next meeting is yet to be confirmed in the New Year. Have a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!

Wednesday, 5 December 2018 meeting was adjourned at 1:04pm  
Friday, 7 December 2018 meeting finished and closed at 1:08pm