

NOTES DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Meeting Date: Wednesday, 4 December 2019
Meeting Time: 9.30 am
Venue: Council Chambers
Meeting Started:

Note: Items 3-5 were considered by the panel in their capacity as the City of Melville Design Review Panel.

1. Attendance

(a) Panel Members

Mr Domenic Snellgrove	(Chairman – Cameron Chisolm Nicol)
Mr Damien Perciles	(Realm Studios)
Mr Fred Chaney	(Taylor Robinson Chaney Broderick)
Mr Malcolm Mackay	(Mackay Urban Design)
Mr Chris Maher	(Hames Sharley)

(b) Proponents

PTS Town Planning	- Item 1
Embrace Architects and Element	- Item 2
MJA Studio	- Item 3
TBB Planning	- Item 4
Planning Solutions	- Item 5

(c) City Officers

Ms Fiona Mullen	(City of South Perth)
Mr Siven Naidu	(City of South Perth)
Ms Victoria Madigan	(City of South Perth)
Ms Laura Kelliher	(City of South Perth)
Mr Troy Cappellucci	(City of Melville)
Mr Ben Ashwood	(City of Melville)
Mr Mark Scarfone	(City of Melville)

2. Apologies

Nil

3. Declaration of Interest

Item 3 – 10 Archibald Street, WILLAGEE

Mr Malcolm MacKay and Mr Fred Chaney left the room for the duration of this item.

Item 4 – Lot 369 (109-141) Sommerville Boulevard, WINTHROP

Mr Dominic Snellgrove left the room for the duration of this item.

4. Item 4 – Lot 369 (No.109-141) Sommerville Boulevard, WINTHROP (DAP-2019-11)

Proposed Four & Five Storey Multiple Dwelling Development (34 Apartments)

4.1. Officer Presentation – TO COMMENCE APPROX 11:45am

City of Melville Senior Planning Officer, Ben Ashwood briefly introduced this item to the Panel.

This item was previously presented to the August 2019 Design Review Panel Meeting.

4.2. Proponent Presentation – TO COMMENCE APPROX 11:50am

A representative from CCN Architects briefly presented the proposal to the DRP concentrating on changes made since the August meeting.

4.3. Design Quality Principles

Items presented to the Design Review Panel are assessed by a panel of architects, urban designers and landscape 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.

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 DRP considers that the applicant has addressed the key weaknesses which were outlined at the previous meeting and overall considers the proposal to be of an acceptable quality. The suggested improvements outlined below will further enhance the quality of the architecture.

Key strengths include:

- The building presents well in all directions, providing an architectural response that distinguishes between the private and public realms, but in a manner that is still a unified design language.
- The modifications to the upper floors assist in reducing the perceived bulk of the building.
- The refinement to the vertical alignment of the apartments results in a more rational front elevation.
- The approach sequence to the southern entry is very successful, with the use of timber decking thought the landscaped area and the brick wall flanking either side of the door providing an improved texture over the previously illustrated rendered walls.
- The treatment of south elevation works well and animates the façade.
- The fire booster is catered for in an integrated manner rather than a stand-alone piece of infrastructure in the streetscape.

- The fence at the rear is a more visually appealing fence than previously presented and overcomes the DRP's previous concerns regarding interface.
- The planning of the building remains logical - circulation spaces allow for good views and natural ventilation.
- Overall landscape treatment to the street and street setback area is good, although the weaknesses in regard to landscape, identified below, should be noted.

(b) Weaknesses of the proposal

- It is unclear from the plans which windows are highlight windows, but it appears that a number of bedrooms may be highly reliant on highlight windows for light and ventilation. The DRP does not support this outcome.
- The artificial turf may be appropriate for the communal courtyard on the south, subject to the use of a technology that does not result in an excessively hot surface. Revisit the quantum of artificial lawn provided to north balcony and consider more planting in this space.
- The perspectives of the communal open space do not accurately depict the levels of the planting beds. No section has been provided to show how soil is being supported on slab.
- The lobby area of the southern entry is not particularly 'entrancing' with the lift located out of sight from the front door and accessed via a narrow passage lined with service infrastructure.
- The metal roof 'skirt' to the rear of the building looks unresolved.
- The pedestrian paving to the car park is overly complex and may lull pedestrians into a false sense of safety.
- The large areas of artificial turf in the front setbacks appear excessive.
- The door to the car park appears to be solid and doesn't acknowledge that there is daylight visible through the entrance.

(c) Suggested improvements to the proposal

- Seek to improve the legibility of lobby 1 to make the lift more prominent.
- Consider modification of the lower floor metal roof to improve the outlook from the dwellings above and ensure this is more integrated into the rest of the elevation.
- Improve the pedestrian experience through the car park by rationalising the paved areas and/or making the paved areas more generous.
- Consider providing on-structure planters on the south west corner of the communal open space to enable shade to be established.
- Consider reducing the extent of artificial turf in the northern setbacks and introducing more planters for real vegetation.
- Consider including street trees within the shopping centre parking area, especially where trees appear to be missing.
- Consider a more visually permeable door to the car park to enable daylight to be seen through the opening and make the building feel more transparent.

(d) Recommendation

- The weaknesses should be addressed and suggested improvements should be incorporated into the final design.

