TOWN OF COTTESLOE

DESIGN ADVISORY PANEL

MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE
5.00 PM, WEDNESDAY, 8 AUGUST 2018

MAT HUMFREY
Chief Executive Officer

27 August 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The meeting was declared open at 5:10 pm, and Cr Young announced as a visitor.

2. ATTENDANCE

Panel Members Present

Cr Michael Tucak	Chair, Elected Member	
Dick Donaldson	Panel Member	
Simon Rodrigues	Panel Member	
Laurie Scanlan	Panel Member	
Trevor Saleeba	Panel Member	(Arrived 5:13pm)

Officers Present

Mat Humfrey	Chief Executive Officer	(Arrived 5:58pm)
Ms Denise Tyler-Hare	Project Manager	

Apologies

Craig Shepherd	Panel Member
Deon White	Panel Member
Shaun Kan	Manager of Engineering Services

Observers

Cr Lorraine Young

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

One amendment to note that James Atkinson attended as the deputy.

Moved Cr Tucak, Seconded Mr Donaldson

That the Minutes of the Design Advisory Panel Meeting held 11 July 2018, as amended, be confirmed.

Carried 4/0

4. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Nil

5. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

The Chair noted the Officer's Report was included to provide background information to the Panel only, and that the Panel was not required to vote on or endorse the proposed design, but consistent with DAP Policy, provide input on the merits and adverse effects of design.

5.1 FORESHORE RENEWAL - SHADE STRUCTURE PROTOTYPE

File Ref:	**SUB/2525**
Attachments:	**Proposed prototype images**
Responsible Officer:	**Mat Humfrey, Chief Executive Officer**
Author:	**Denise Tyler-Hare, Project Manager**
Proposed Meeting Date:	**8 August 2018**
Author Disclosure of Interest:	**Nil**

SUMMARY

The Design Advisory Panel is requested to review the proposed prototype images for the beach shade structures and provide an endorsement of the design to Council.

BACKGROUND

At the May 2018 Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee Meeting, the Committee resolved to endorse the plans for tender, subject to review of the retaining wall materials and paving extents.

This documentation for the ocean universal access and beach shade structure prototype was sent to Council for call-in, with 3 call-ins received by 12pm on the 25th June. Due to the call-ins, both the beach shade structure prototype and the ocean universal access path tenders were put on hold.

The call-ins can be summarised as follows:

Beach Shade Structures

1. Climate change and the wisdom of building permanent structures on the beach, particularly with the amount of erosion we get on the main beach in winter. Any new beach structure should be wholly removable in winter;
2. Cost – concerns over value for money with design life of less than 25 years, the use of galvanised steel in lieu of a high grade stainless steel which would be prohibitively expensive and moving forward with a design that is regarded as unsatisfactory. The proposed cost does not reflect the “off the shelf” nature of the proposed materials, and nor does the design.
   Maintenance costs associated with posts being encased in concrete.
3. Aesthetics – does not fit in with the curves along the beach and is too angular. The new design does not tie in with the curves of the beach path, the terrace curves, or relate in any way to the foreshore design. The placement of the structures in front of each other on the beachfront is too congested/cluttered, and bamboo does not fit the palette of the WA coastal landscape, as well as not providing full shade.
   The shade structures would look better if they were a single line width and followed the curve of the path all the way round, with gaps in between say banks of three.
4. Durability – concerns over compliance with Australian Standards for materials within 200m of the ocean, type of steel, and the components of steel knuckles, wire lacing and poles in a corrosive environment. Additionally, concern over the concrete footings being exposed and damaged during a storm surge.

There does not appear to be any diagonal bracing to stop swaying and being sideways.

5. Flat roof design – concerns over the increased lift, and arbitrary pitching of the roof planes for sub control, cost and aesthetics.
6. Permanent Structure – concerns over the way it would look if the roof was removed every winter e.g. scaffolding.
7. Workability - concerns over forcing people into a confined space.
8. Design – current design bears little relation to the original design and has far less architectural merit. The original choice of "off the shelf" materials by the designer is now dictating the design, as they do not have the strength to span the previous design. The choice of materials is flimsy/cheap, and not in keeping with the rest of the foreshore design.
9. Concern with accumulated litter under the shelters, and provision of seating.

At the July 31st meeting, the Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee resolved:

Moved Cr Young, Seconded Mr White

That the Committee:

1. *Endorse the design and recommend that a prototype be built.*

Carried 6/1
For: Crs Harkins, Young, Mr Fini, Mr Donaldson, Mr White, Mr Rodrigues
Against: Cr Sadler

Moved Cr Harkins, Seconded Cr Young

2. *Refer the design to the Design Advisory Panel for further comment.*

Carried 7/0

Moved Cr Young, Seconded Mr White

3. *Recommend that Council endorse the design and proceed to tender for the prototype.*

Carried 6/1
For: Crs Harkins, Young, Mr Fini, Mr Donaldson, Mr White, Mr Rodrigues
Against: Cr Sadler

The Committee considered the design, timing, duration, and commencement of the project and determined they would endorse the design and send it to the DAP and Council.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

The implementation of the Foreshore Master Plan is identified as a community priority in the Strategic Community Plan.

Strategic Community Plan 2013 to 2023
Priority Area Three: Enhancing beach access and the foreshore.

Corporate Business Plan (2014 – 2018)
Priority Area Three: Enhancing beach access and the foreshore.

3.1 Implement the 'Foreshore Redevelopment Plan' in consultation with the community

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Beach Policy
The Foreshore Renewal Masterplan complies with the policy as adopted by Council.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

All works in the Cottesloe Foreshore Precinct will require a planning approval from the West Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) as the land sits under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. The WAPC have confirmed that this is public works and therefore does not require approval from them.

The State Heritage Office have confirmed the proposal as acceptable.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This project is expected to require significant resources over the next two years. The prototype has an approved budget of $25,000.

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

There are no perceived staffing implications.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

The design approach for the Foreshore Masterplan has covered issues such as sustainability and the long term maintenance and management of the precinct. The design will need to include selected materials that have been chosen to ensure sustainability, longevity and ease of maintenance.

CONSULTATION

Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee
Elected Members
Town of Cottesloe Staff

STAFF COMMENT

Beach Shade Structures Current Design

It is noted that the current design is proposed to remain in place all year round, negating the removal costs that come with this, and the bare structure look in winter. The original proposal was to have the roof covering coming off in winter, however through much discussion with the Committee, the decision was made to make it an all year round element.

The structures do not follow the soft curve of the existing path. This has been done so that rather than forcing a mismatch between the curve and the inherent straight edge of the rectilinear form of the componentry, the design responds to the axis of the groyne by proposing a strong, counter, cross axis at 90^{o}. Additionally, the basis of achieving maximum shade for the dollars is based on using off the shelf components, unfortunately the connectors only accommodate a 90^{o} connection.

The suggestion of a single line width with banks of three and gaps between the shade structures would be an alternative design response. As to whether it would be better is a subjective view.

With regard to the positioning of the structures, it is noted that beach users do not form a single file fronting the water. They form a random, multi-layered matrix, many people deep, and they traditionally, and without fuss, weave their way past others to the water. People using the design would do the same.

There is no compulsion for people to sit under the shades. The beach goers will retain their freedom of choice to sit in the sun, the provided shade, or bring their own shade. The objective is to provide as much shade as possible for the money spent.

The structural engineer and structure designer have confirmed that the design life is 25 years for the steel, and 15 years plus for the bamboo. The proposed bamboo will be in one length, without an intermediate join. They will be supplied in panels, woven together with marine grade stainless steel 316 lacing wire. The strainer wire cable will also be marine grade stainless steel 316. All hot dip galvanising will be in accordance with AS4680 and AS1650. The pros and cons of galvanising and marine grade stainless steel 316 have been considered in the design, and whilst the marine grade stainless steel 316 is more corrosive resistant, it will cost many times more, and is also not available in some of the coupling componentry necessary for the project.

It is noted that the footings have been designed to account for the lowest winter sand level, with the footings set 500mm below, so the possibility of them becoming exposed is very low. A substantial limestone outcrop adjacent to the beach means that it would be a good idea to do a subsurface investigation, as it is likely to be present under the beach sand. It is prudent to provide as much information to tenderers as possible, to avoid cost variations.

The flat roof and associated structure have been designed to accommodate the upwards lift caused by the wind, and lateral forces. The footings have three options, one will be to use a bolted baseplate on to a concrete pad. The design has been certified by a structural engineer.

It is also noted that any litter accumulating under the shelters would be comparable to what is there currently.

Seating is not proposed under the shelters.

Summary of discussion

The following is a summary of the discussion around the design of the proposed shade structures, noting that the Panel considered the visual harmony, comparative scale, standard of design and impact on the public domain as well as standard of design, and contribution to the public domain (in terms of built form, facilities and infrastructure):

- Potential impact on public domain and comparative scale – some discussion around the full structure area relative to the available space on the beach (e.g. volleyball

area to be considered), however the view was put, and general consensus agreed, that the location was not obstructive to the grass banks and beach area. This extent can be varied if the full structure is constructed, following the prototype trial.

- Visual harmony – the design is sited well, and the complexity to form is acceptable, with offset angles (which are critical to the design success), allowing some sunlight to get through. One query was raised about the visual harmony of the galvanised steel.
- Standard of design – lightweight structure is acceptable, particularly when considering the difficulty of designing on the coast. Provision of gaps between the bamboo slats provides a much better design outcome. The design is sound.
    - Quality of materials is acceptable, noting that galvanising is acceptable, as long as it is thick enough and can withstand the rigors of a coastal environment. This quality/durability should be checked by Council Officers.
- Whilst there was a view expressed within the panel about whether the shade structures were necessary on a beach within the sand area, the panel confirmed that proceeding with the prototype (constructed as one discrete element) is a good idea.

6. GENERAL BUSINESS

6.1 SEAPINES

There was some conversation about Seapines arising from the Council decision in the July meeting to defer the matter for further consideration and the email sent around by Cr Boulter concerning ground floor. The Panel summarised their points as follows:

1. The current 4m on the ground floor is too tight for a ground floor (as it is 3.3 metres effective floor to ceiling).
2. There would be more flexibility and options in design if it was kept at 5 floors, in terms of visual and quality outcomes.
3. There should be some level of guidelines for design standards along the foreshore, however there was discussion around these not being too prescriptive, and that they should reward good design.
4. 4.3m floor to floor should be the minimum, however 4.5m would be ideal.

7. NEXT MEETING

To be confirmed.

8. MEETING CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 6:05pm.