

Design Review Report – Item 2

Local government:	City of Stirling	
Item no.:	Item 2 – DA21/1723 – 8, 10 & 10A Chesterfield Road, Mirrabooka – Development Assessment Panel – Form 1 – Mixed Use Development	
Chairperson:	Emma Williamson	
Panel members:	Jackson Liew Stephen Carrick Tony Blackwell Lisa Shine	
Local government officers:	Karina Bowater Robert Woods Cameron Howell Michael Italiano Doreen Rowley Andrew Karagoglou Simone Palmer	Acting Coordinator Planning Planning Officer Senior Planning Officer Acting Senior Planning Officer Planning Officer Planning Officer DRP Support Officer
Observers		
Date:	18 August 2022	Time: 3pm
Venue:	City of Stirling – Challenger Room	

Proponent/s

Matthew Cain	Planning Solutions (<i>Applicant</i>)
Malcolm Mackay	Mackay Urban Design
Frank Giannasi	Building Workshop
Pride Pavicic	Building Workshop
Ben Della Vedova	Mainstreet Properties
Owners	Mainstreet Properties Pty Ltd

Observer/s

Briefings		
Development assessment overview	Cameron Howell	Senior Planning Officer
Technical issues	Cameron Howell	Senior Planning Officer
Design Review		
Proposed development	Item 2 – DA21/1723 – 8, 10 & 10A Chesterfield Road, Mirrabooka – Development Assessment Panel – Form 1 – Mixed Use Development	
Property address	8, 10 & 10A Chesterfield Road, Mirrabooka	
Background		
Proposal		

Applicant or applicant's representative address to the design review panel	Matthew Cain Malcolm Mackay	Planning Solutions Mackay Urban Design
Key issues / recommendations	The Panel has limited the comments following DRP3 based on the limited information provided by the applicant. Whilst the Panel notes the suggested improvements to the scheme these have not been evidenced in drawings and therefore cannot be assessed. Further, where no change has been proposed or the presentation was silent the Panel comments from DRP 2 remain. Refer to attached Design Quality Evaluation Report.	
Chairperson signature		

Design quality evaluation**Item 2 – DA21/1723 – 8, 10 and 10A Chesterfield Road, Mirrabooka – Development****Assessment Panel – Form 1 – Mixed Use Development****DRP Meeting – Thursday 18 August 2022*******PLEASE NOTE:**

Where aspects of the design have not changed the previous comments from DRP 2 held on 26 May 2022 remain.

A full submission was not lodged by the Applicant with the Panel Members receiving two pages. The commentary below is based on the documents submitted **ONLY** and no traffic lights will be incorporated into this third review.

	<i>Design Principle satisfied</i>
	<i>Design Principle pending further attention</i>
	<i>Design Principle not satisfied</i>
Principle 1 Context and character	<i>Good design responds to and enhances the distinctive characteristics of a local area, contributing to a sense of place.</i>
	1a. The proposed changes to the design are considered indicative only. The changes as shown address some of the concerns previously raised by the Panel. Further information is required in order for more detailed feedback to be provided.
Principle 2 Landscape quality	<i>Good design recognises that together landscape and buildings operate as an integrated and sustainable system, within a broader ecological context.</i>
	2a. The Panel commented the retention of the existing trees is positive. 2b. Comment was made by the Panel the proposed piazza is an improvement. 2c. The relocation of the playground is a positive progression. 2d. The Panel expressed concern around the exposed northwest parking, noting there is an opportunity for a vegetation buffer. 2e. It was stated by the Panel the pedestrian experience could be improved in relation to the hardscape and materiality. 2f. The Panel strongly encourage the Applicant to engage the services of a suitably qualified landscape architect.
Principle 3 Built form and scale	<i>Good design ensures that the massing and height of development is appropriate to its setting and successfully negotiates between existing built form and the intended future character of the local area.</i>
	3a. The Panel requested a re-evaluation around the pedestrian experience and how this can be enhanced. 3b. The Panel commented Yirrigan drive is not meeting aspirations for frontage and a small section outside the fast food outlet could be enhanced through landscaping. 3c. The Panel questioned the location of staircase on the corner of Building A as this does not deliver the best outcome for this edge of the site.
Principle 4 Functionality and build quality	<i>Good design meets the needs of users efficiently and effectively, balancing functional requirements to perform well and deliver optimum benefit over the full life-cycle.</i>
	4a. Comment was made by the Panel the servicing of the Tavern away from the residential portion of the design addresses some of the acoustic concerns.
Principle 5 Sustainability	<i>Good design optimises the sustainability of the built environment, delivering positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.</i>
	5a. The Panel expressed disappointment with the minimum ESD 4 star rating and commented there is opportunity for improvement in this area.
Principle 6 Amenity	<i>Good design optimises internal and external amenity for occupants, visitors and neighbours providing environments that are comfortable, productive and healthy.</i>
	6a. Comment was made by the Panel the amenity offered to residents within the building could be reviewed as part of the landscape architect's scope.

Principle 7 Legibility	<i>Good design results in buildings and places that are legible, with clear connections and easily identifiable elements to help people find their way around</i>
	7a. The Panel expressed concern around the lack of demarcation of commercial parking in relation to possible conflicts with residential parking. 7b. There was concern around the entry and exit off Chesterfield Road. 7c. The Panel commented that pedestrian zones could be improved.
Principle 8 Safety	<i>Good design optimises safety and security, minimising the risk of personal harm and supporting safe behaviour and use.</i>
	8a. The Panel commented that the proposed 90 degree parking will be successful in slowing down traffic on the shared internal street. Consideration should be given to the movement of pedestrians with this zone.
Principle 9 Community	<i>Good design responds to local community needs as well as the wider social context, providing environments that support a diverse range of people and facilitate social interaction.</i>
	9a. The Panel noted the playground is an improvement and discourage any suggestion that this is beneficially located in proximity to the tavern.
Principle 10 Aesthetics	<i>Good design is the product of a skilled, judicious design process that results in attractive and inviting buildings and places that engage the senses.</i>
	10a. The Panel noted there is many opportunities for the design to improve. 10b. Comment was made the name Mirrabooka has a meaning and there is opportunity for that to extend to something memorable, beyond the suggested paving pattern for the piazza. 10c. It was suggested by the Panel renders could expand to describe the context and future context of the proposal.

Design Review progress DA21/1723 – 8, 10 and 10A Chesterfield Road Mirrabooka Thursday 18 August 2022			
	<i>Design Principle satisfied</i>		
	<i>Design Principle pending further attention</i>		
	<i>Design Principle not satisfied</i>		
	DR1 25/11/2021	DR2 26/5/2022	DR3 18/8/2022
Principle 1 - Context and character			N/a
Principle 2 - Landscape quality			N/a
Principle 3 - Built form and scale			N/a
Principle 4 - Functionality and build quality			N/a
Principle 5 - Sustainability			N/a
Principle 6 - Amenity			N/a
Principle 7 - Legibility			N/a
Principle 8 - Safety			N/a
Principle 9 - Community			N/a
Principle 10 - Aesthetics			N/a

Recommendations Summary**Item 1 – DA21/1723 – 8, 10 and 10A Chesterfield Road Mirrabooka**

DRP1 – DRP Recommendations DRP Meeting – 25/11/2021	DRP1 – Applicant Response DRP Meeting – 25/11/2021	DRP2 - DRP Recommendations DRP Meeting – 26/5/2022	DRP2 – Applicant Response DRP Meeting – 26/5/2022	DRP3 – Recommendations DRP Meeting 18/8/2022
1b. The Panel encouraged the Applicant to consider activation on all the edges, ensuring that large blank walls are avoided, and articulation of the streetscapes is achieved.		1b. The Panel commented it would have been beneficial if sections through were provided to assist with understanding opportunities which exist in relation to the level changes and description of shared spaces. 1c. Further detail was requested by the Panel in relation to the ramping onto Chesterfield Road specifically the extent of glass balustrading and the impact on the existing context. 1d. It was stated by the Panel the address to Yirrigan Drive could be improved to better respond to the future context of the neighborhood.		1a. The proposed changes to the design are considered indicative only. The changes as shown address some of the concerns previously raised by the Panel. Further information is required in order for more detailed feedback to be provided.
2a. The Panel strongly recommended a site survey be carried out to assist with understanding the entire site and the		2a. The Panel requested further clarification in relation to the true deep soil calculations throughout the		2d The Panel expressed concern around the exposed northwest parking, noting there is an opportunity for a

opportunities for the retention of existing trees near tenancy 11 in the northeast corner. 2b. The Panel recommended engaging the services of a landscape architect and requested a detailed landscape plan and arborist report. 2d. The Panel suggested softening of the edges of the site through additional landscaping. 2e. The Panel encouraged the Applicant to prioritize the pedestrian experience in the design of the road network, hardscape and landscape. The inter-relationship of these elements could be useful in creating shared spaces that prioritize pedestrians.		proposal. 2b. The Panel expressed concern in relation to the extent of paving as this will have a detrimental impact on the urban heat island effect. Wherever possible paving and hard surfaces should be minimised. 2c. Comment was made by the Panel there is a missed opportunity in the failure to retain most existing trees on the site. 2d. The Panel stated it is important to have confidence around the render of the internal streets, this is particularly the case when considering the size of trees that will be planted within the development.		vegetation buffer. 2e. It was stated by the Panel the pedestrian experience could be improved in relation to the hardscape and materiality. 2f. The Panel strongly encourage the Applicant to engage the services of a suitably qualified landscape architect.
3b. The Panel emphasized the importance of the trading frontage on Chesterfield Road and encouraged the Applicant to ensure the building design is appropriate to the use and activation.		3b. The Panel suggested applying further thought to find ways to give priority to the pedestrian experience. The proposal is currently vehicle dominant and there is a lot of car penetration		3a. The Panel requested a re-evaluation around the pedestrian experience and how this can be enhanced. 3b. The Panel commented Yirrigan drive is not meeting aspirations for frontage and a small

		into the site. 3d. The Applicant was encouraged to think about the arrangement of the tavern and commercial tenancies within the site noting that the current arrangement poses potential acoustic issues in terms of the tavern proximity to the residential development. 3e. It was suggested by the Panel it may be beneficial to move the playground closer to the residential development.		section outside the fast food outlet could be enhanced through landscaping.
4b. The Panel requested clarification in relation to structural resolution, specifically the need for columns and / or transfer beams in the basement which could end up putting more pressure on the site. 4d. The Panel requested sections illustrating the functionality of the streetscape interface.		4b. The Panel urge the applicant to push the opportunity of maximizing the landscaping whilst maintaining functionality. 4c. It was mentioned by the Panel there has not been significant changes in the functionality of the units in relation to the internal bathrooms and the size of the rooms. Comments from the		

		previous DRP remain.		
5a. The Panel encouraged the Applicant to explore options and look at ways to incorporate additional initiatives and make a commitment to sustainability. 5b. The Panel noted this principle has not been adequately addressed and requests further information in relation to a detailed sustainability strategy being provided at the next meeting. 5c. The Applicant was encouraged to engage the services of a sustainability specialist at an early stage. 5b. The Panel suggested thinking creatively in relation to the apportionment of car and bike bays.		5b. The Applicant is strongly encouraged to engage the services of a sustainability consultant to ensure an integrated approach to sustainability. 5c. The Panel recommended the Applicant makes a commitment to sustainability as there is currently intent only. 5d. It was stated by the Panel sustainability should be a minimum of 4 stars but the Applicant was encouraged to be more ambitious. 5f. The Panel stressed the expectation of providing sustainability strategies and commitments through a combined approach to material selection, waste management, passive and active design initiatives.		5a. The Panel expressed disappointment with the minimum ESD 4 star rating and commented there is opportunity for improvement in this area.
6a. The Panel requested further information and clarification around waste		6b. The Panel questioned the lack of development in		6a. Comment was made by the Panel the amenity offered to residents

management in relation to the tenancies. 6e. The Panel request apartment layouts with furniture at future presentations to understand the amenity of the layouts.		relation to the communal open space and stated there is opportunity for further thought and development in relation to amenity and privacy. 6c. Concern was expressed by the Panel in relation to the size of some living spaces, bedrooms and kitchens. SPP7.3 provides guidance in relation to minimum sizes. 6d. The suggestion was made by the Panel to give more consideration to the true amenity of the alfresco area of the GYG tenancy.		within the building could be reviewed as part of the landscape architect's scope.
7b. Comment was made by the Panel that the Guzman and Gomez (G&G) proposal falls short on the language of the brand, the quality of other developments by the same company, and articulation of the building form generally. The Panel recommend the exploration of				7c. The Panel commented that pedestrian zones could be improved.

opportunities for this building to be developed by the G&G preferred architect.				
8a. Concern was expressed by the Panel around the safety of the internal streets and shared spaces. The Panels' suggestion was to reduce the speed limit to 20kph.		8d. The Panel requested further information to describe alternative ways to create safe pedestrian and vehicle share zones.		8a. The Panel commented that the proposed 90 degree parking will be successful in slowing down traffic on the shared internal street. Consideration should be given to the movement of pedestrians with this zone.
9c. The Panel suggested that the retaining wall on Chesterfield Road could be developed further as community infrastructure.		9a. The Panel do not support a strategy that delivers the residential component of the development in a second stage. Delivery of the residential units is considered fundamental to achieving a positive outcome for the community. Achieving a strong streetscape along Chesterfield Road is considered critical to the success of the project. 9b The Panel noted the opportunity to increase the amenity of the		

		proposed communal areas for the residential development.		
10b. The Panel requested further clarity around the material palette of the project. 10c. It was noted by the Panel that issues in relation to aesthetics may arise once guttering and down pipes are taken into consideration. Renders should be produced that reflect the impact of these on the design. Simplification of the roof form could assist with this.		10a. Comment was made by the Panel to consider the impacts of the aesthetics of the eaves, gutters and downpipes. These should be included on renders of the project. 10b. The Panel suggested further developing the combination of finishes and colours. 10c. The Panel encourage the applicant to consider the tactility of materials and the benefit of these to a project that is developing a human scaled and centered neighborhood. 10d. The Panel stated the use of coloured glass and angled steel needs further refinement.		10a. The Panel noted there is many opportunities for the design to improve. 10b. Comment was made the name Mirrabooka has a meaning and there is opportunity for that to extend to something memorable, beyond the suggested paving pattern for the piazza. 10c. It was suggested by the Panel renders could expand to describe the context and future context of the proposal.



Mark-up of original plan

Refer to following page for notes

Mark-up notes

1. No change to Building A.
2. Building B deleted.
3. 5x existing trees retained (Category 'B's – Arborist report).
4. Parking relocated amongst the trees.
5. Central buildings reconfigured.
6. Central walkway through the central buildings from the rear parking to the street (business hours only).
7. Internal layout of central buildings to be determined.
8. Servicing of central buildings from the rear laneway.
9. Openings from back-of-house for passive surveillance of the lane.
10. Prominent architectural features to terminate entry vistas (corner and playground/shade structure).
11. No change to parking bays along the eastern boundary.
12. Drive-through coffee and crossovers deleted.
13. Landscape to the setback area of GYG.
14. Pylon sign and GYG signage to be reviewed.
15. Playground relocated to the orange 'planning zone of financial death'.
16. Commercial building reconfigured to better address the adjacent streets.
17. Opportunity for visual connection between the Tavern and the playground.
18. Internal planning of the tavern to be reviewed to better suit servicing.
19. On-street service bays with appropriate management.
20. Street widened to enable 90-degree parking with landscape strips and street trees.
21. Central raised plateau with 'art feature' paving (could incorporate a stylised Southern Cross).

22. Clearly defined pedestrian crossing points.
23. Central landscape area with casual seating/parklet al fresco.
24. Use of coloured bitumen to help define the central zone and distinguish roads, lanes and parking and create thresholds at entry points.
25. Footpath paving extended across entry points to reinforce pedestrian movement.
26. Canopies to all building frontages.
27. M/C bays.
28. More trees wherever possible.
29. More landscape pockets at every available opportunity.

General notes:

- Central building footprints/storey heights to be reviewed in the context of the number of parking bays available.
- Provision of disabled bays to be determined.
- Street treated as a private street, which will readily enable closure of the central section for events.