

Design Advisory Committee (DAC) Comments dated 4 February 2015 and 18 March 2015

4.5 **Address:** No. 50 (Lot 10) Scarborough Beach Road, North Perth

Proposal: Demolition of Existing Single House and Construction of Two Storey Development Comprising of Five (5) Two-bedroom Multiple Dwellings and Associated Car Parking

Applicant: Design Right

Reason for Referral: Multiple Dwellings

“Discussion:

The Design Advisory Committee provides architectural advice and context which informs the planning process at the City of Vincent. It does not constitute general planning advice or reflect the final decision which is solely at the discretion of the decision making body, which is the Council or the Development Assessment Panel (as applicable).

Applicants Presentation:

- *The Applicant provided details of the development by going through the plans.*
- *The previous design was six dwellings on two levels and it is now five dwellings over two levels with a basement car park.*
- *There is a sewer line running at the back of the property.*

Recommendations & Comments by DAC:

- *The DAC previously suggested the site was under-developed and the design could be spread over three levels to open up the design. This seems to also occur with this design.*
- *The DAC do not support car parking and car parking infrastructure in-between the street and dwellings as it affects interaction and activity with the street.*
- *Way finding and legibility to the rear units from the street is convoluted, long and inefficient.*
- *The northerly aspect is not being utilized to gain northern solar access to the units.*
- *The units that front Scarborough Beach Road have poor access to northern sun.*
- *Privacy issues need to be resolved.*
- *Consider privatizing communal areas to improve usability and maintenance.*
- *Develop a meaningful landscape strategy. Communal areas should be meaningfully planned and equally accessible and located for all units, not simply left over space.*

Mandatory:

- *Will be required to return to DAC with perhaps two or three design alternatives.*

Site Planning:

- *The applicant needs to re-design to overcome the following design short falls.*
 - *The DAC do not support car parking and car parking infrastructure in between the street and dwellings, as it affects interaction and activity with the street. This needs to be addressed.*
 - *Way finding and legibility to the rear units from the street is convoluted, long and inefficient.*

Amenity:

- *The northerly aspect is not being utilized and requires re-planning.*
- *The units that front Scarborough Beach Road have poor access to northern sun and requires re-planning.*
- *Privacy issues need to be resolved.*
- *Privatise current communal areas to improve usability and maintenance.*

Architecture:

- *The DAC require more detail, but supports the direction on addressing the massing issues that were raised by the DAC on the previous proposal for the site (by a different designer).*

Landscaping:

- *Develop a meaningful landscape strategy. Communal areas should be meaningfully planned and equally accessible and located for all units, not simply left over space, and clearly define landscaping intended for private use.*

Design Considerations:

Looking at a complete new direction with a redesign could make much better use of the space, provide greater amenity for occupants and interact with the surrounding local context in a more meaningful way.

Technical:

- *All technical issues must be resolved with the City of Vincent officers.”*

Design Advisory Committee (DAC) Comments dated 4 February 2015 and 18 March 2015**Response to previous mandatory requirements – 4 February 2015**

“Will be required to return to DAC with perhaps two or three design alternatives.

Site Planning:

- *The applicant needs to re-design to overcome the following design short falls.*
 - *The DAC do not support car parking and car parking infrastructure in between the street and dwellings, as it affects interaction and activity with the street. This needs to be addressed. **Addressed***
 - *Way finding and legibility to the rear units from the street is convoluted, long and inefficient. **Addressed***

Amenity:

- *The northerly aspect is not being utilized and requires re-planning. **Addressed***
- *The units that front Scarborough Beach Road have poor access to northern sun and requires re-planning. **Addressed***
- *Privacy issues need to be resolved. **Addressed***
- *Privatise current communal areas to improve usability and maintenance. **Addressed***

Architecture:

- *The DAC require more detail, but supports the direction on addressing the massing issues that were raised by the DAC on the previous proposal for the site (by a different designer). **Addressed***

Landscaping:

- *Develop a meaningful landscape strategy. Communal areas should be meaningfully planned and equally accessible and located for all units, not simply left over space, and clearly define landscaping intended for private use. **Addressed***

Recommendations & Comments by DAC:

- *“The DAC preferred option 3.*
- *The dwellings are already staggered and the development is relatively small in scale in relation to the lot size, therefore the design should not be over articulated. In fact over articulation would reduce the aesthetic quality of the design. Use subtle articulation and avoid a collage of materials.*
- *Reference and provide a modern interpretation of the aesthetics found in the local area.*
- *Consider expressing the roof form or a skillion parapet.*
- *Consider the use of voids to extend access to natural light and ventilation between storeys, such as opening up stairwells. However also consider the impact to heating and cooling.*
- *Maximise the amount of bathrooms that abut an external wall so that they have direct access to natural light and ventilation.*
- *Maximise the amount of meaningful soft landscaping.*
- *Create a landscaping strategy, consider how landscaping can be used to soften the built form especially through the inclusion of tree planting opportunities and integrate landscaping into the overall design of the development.*
- *Use landscaping to demarcate public, private and communal space.*
- *Allow for climatic shelter of the front doors (such as a recessed porch or canopy).*

Mandatory:**Amenity:**

- *Consider the use of voids to extend access to natural light and ventilation between storeys.*
- *Maximise the amount of bathrooms that abut an external wall so that they have direct access to natural light and ventilation.*

Architecture – Built Form and Scale:

- *Develop the aesthetics of the elevations. Use subtle articulation and avoid a collage of materials.*
- *Reinforce the planning modules into the built form.*

Design Advisory Committee (DAC) Comments dated 4 February 2015 and 18 March 2015Landscaping:

- Maximise the amount of meaningful soft landscaping.
- Create a landscaping strategy, consider how landscaping can be used to soften the built form especially through the inclusion of tree planting opportunities and integrate landscaping into the overall design of the development.
- Use landscaping to demarcate public, private and communal space.

Conclusion:

- Will not be required to return to DAC, but will require to be circulated to the Committee.

Technical:

All technical issues must be resolved with City of Vincent officers.”

Email dated 18 June 2015 following DAC Meeting

“Further to my email sent on 12 June, 2015, please see the comments below from the DAC.

Amenity:

- Consider the use of voids to extend access to natural light and ventilation between storeys. **ADDRESSED**
- Maximise the amount of bathrooms that abut an external wall so that they have direct access to natural light and ventilation. Bathrooms with natural light and ventilation should be achievable on a development such as this (low rise). **ADDRESSED**

Architecture – Built Form and Scale:

- Develop the aesthetics of the elevations. Use subtle articulation and avoid a collage of materials. **ADDRESSED** The applicant has not met the DAC expectations with regards to the architectural resolution in terms of proportions, articulation and manipulation of the building elements (windows and wall elements). The facades are over articulated and a collage of materials is shown. The dwellings are already staggered and the development is relatively small in scale in relation to the lot size, therefore the design should not be over articulated. In fact over articulation would reduce the aesthetic quality of the design.
- Reinforce the planning modules into the built form. **ADDRESSED** The over articulation of the facades loses the effect of the staggering modules. Incorporate a roof canopy to the unit entries. The identification of materials is not clear or co-ordinated on the drawings.

Landscaping:

- Maximise the amount of meaningful soft landscaping. **ADDRESSED** more soft landscaping areas are required and the scale/species of landscaping should be maximised to match the scale of the development. Landscaping is dominated by hard paving and built form, a more balanced approach is required, in fact landscaping could dominate built form. Terminate the view-path from the communal pedestrian walkway with landscaping instead of bike racks.
- Create a landscaping strategy, consider how landscaping can be used to soften the built form especially through the inclusion of tree planting opportunities and integrate landscaping into the overall design of the development. **ADDRESSED** The internal courtyard requires further detailing, provide seating integrated with planter walls and boxes and shade areas, soft landscaping should be maximised here, paving should be reduced as much as possible and confined to functional entry paths only. The use of large planter boxes can provide deep soil beds for landscaping where a basement is proposed and double up as area for casual seating. The landscaping strategy needs to consider bike racks and bin storage.
- Use landscaping to demarcate public, private and communal space. **ADDRESSED**
- **Eliminate the steps from the western ramp – this adjustment will also reduce the visual impact of the car park stair walls (they are too high). ADDRESSED**

Conclusion:

- **DAC supports the proposal.**

Technical:

- **The two end car parking bays require a minimum 3.0m wide bay, plus turning circle. Whilst a reversing bay has been provided what will stop a visitor or owner parking in that spot, show bike park, City needs to control.”**